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I.  EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A.  Summary of the Recommendations of the FTF to the Woodstock Library Board

The Facilities Task Force (FTF) believes that buying the laundromat property at 6 Library Lane was a sensible decision for the Library; it provides parking and land for potential expansion. It also protects the eastern edge of the Library Campus. The original Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Annex represented an admirable goal; to design a building with:

- Necessary flexible program, meeting, and media space
- The highest possible architectural and environmental design excellence
- Good indoor environmental quality
- Energy efficiency
- Cost effectiveness
- Full ADA Compliance

The project's original budget was $300K to $400K, which included the entire cost of design and construction. Some increase in the budget was understandable, as the Annex design process progressed and the project grew in scope. The Joel Sanders Architect (JSA) design plus construction budget is approximately $1.44 million, not including design fees that are typically 10-15% of construction costs. The Library Board believes that it may be able to raise that sum between private donations and public grants. With a budget of that size, we recommend the Board broaden its focus beyond the borders of 6 Library Lane and consider an expansion project that will address more of the Library's needs. For instance, the existing Library building is:

- Energy inefficient
- Not fully ADA compliant
- Has potential indoor air quality issues
- Overcrowded, with little flexible space
- Structurally overloaded

Available funds from private donations and public grants are finite. Spending over $1.5 million dollars on the Annex may leave structural and environmental problems in the existing Library building (beyond routine maintenance) unaddressed for the foreseeable future. Although the Library has done a commendable job keeping the existing building functioning, the program requirements of the Library have outgrown the existing building. The Library's additional programmatic space needs far exceed the program square footage of the Annex plan (1,190 SF). In short, the FTF believes the Library can achieve more of its program needs than the Annex would supply with the major fundraising effort the Annex would require.

The FTF recommends that the Library Board reconsider the JSA Annex plan. We propose they create an updated Master Plan for the newly expanded Library campus. This Master Plan should address how best to create most or all of the estimated 4,500 square feet of additional needed program space. It should also seek to remedy the structural and environmental issues of the existing building. It should consider other potential uses for the newly acquired property at 6 Library Lane.

An updated Master Plan will require extensive public outreach, analyses of the Library's program and space needs and a comprehensive site review. It is our belief that an Architect's creative solutions will
provide specificity and clarity to modifications to the existing building and the creation of much needed additional space. For these reasons, we make the following recommendations:

- All future projects and improvements should conform to a Master Site Plan for the Library campus, to be devised by an Architect or Architectural team with substantial library experience, working closely with the Library.

- Improving the existing Library building and bringing it up to current Library standards should be a priority of any expansion project. The Master Plan should detail both short and long-term solutions for the existing Library building.

- The Library has a site-constrained campus with limited areas available for expansion. Any additions or new buildings should make the most efficient use of the available land and strive to be both architecturally inspirational and fiscally responsible.

- The 6 Library Lane site is a valuable addition to the Library campus and a challenging but buildable site. However, we believe that a large, two story addition to the north side of the existing Library (the current site of the Book Barn) will prove to be the most cost-effective expansion approach. Such a building, which we have dubbed the "North Wing", could provide the Library with most or all of the flexible space to meet its foreseeable goals.

- The Library Green is a treasured public 'green space' that should be preserved.

- With professional assistance, and input from the citizens of Woodstock, the Library Board should use the updated Master Plan to agree upon a conceptual budget for expansion. We recommend the Library Board consider supplementing funds raised through private donations and public grants with a public bond measure that would allow for an even more ambitious and comprehensive expansion.

B. A Call for a Change in Tone

While this is outside the specific scope of the FTF, we hope that this document will serve as the basis for a new, more constructive (no pun intended) dialogue going forward. For the past year, the debate over the Annex has been heated. Consensus and comity can be reached only when score-settling and personal attacks come to an end. If the Library Board is to succeed with any expansion and renovation projects, this toxic atmosphere must be addressed. The passions (on all sides) must be harnessed and redirected into productive dialogue and tangible results.
II. BACKGROUND

A. 2007 Feasibility Study

About ten years ago the Woodstock Library began to consider the best way to provide the growing and changing services asked for by its patrons and the broader Woodstock community. After two years of professional study and consultation with community groups, the library design firm Architecture+ prepared a Feasibility Study. The study is available here:

In September 2007 the Library proposed to add about $700,000 to its annual budget for 2008, enough to begin detailed planning for a major renovation of the Library and to cover the estimated cost of repaying a bond issue to complete the renovation. The Library consulted with the community in the process of planning the renovation and received only encouragement and support for the renovation. However, it had undertaken no campaign to explain the proposal to the wider community. Many people who had not been aware of the Library's efforts felt the large increase, almost doubling the Library’s budget, was too much. The budget was soundly defeated and the project was shelved.

B. Five Year Plan of Service

In 2010 Amy Raff was appointed Library Director after the former Director, D. J. Stern retired. In that same year Director Raff and the Board began an in-depth process of consulting the community about its library as part of a mid-term review of the Five Year Plan of Service.

The review included a “World Cafe” to which the entire community was invited. The question discussed at the Cafe was, “What is your vision for Woodstock in the next five years if everything goes as well as it could?” Then the Library created a local focus group, the Local Library Task Force, to recommend the best way for the Library to support the public’s vision for the Town. The Task Force identified the following priorities for the Library to focus on:

- Increase communication about programs & services and the importance of the Library in the community
- Ensure the facility meets the needs of the community for neutral meeting space and present and emerging technology
- Increase hours of operation to remove that barrier to access.

The Library also created a survey asking respondents how they learn about Library services and what they would like the Library to do that it was not already doing. The staff of the Library was consulted in depth about needs that they saw, both met and unmet.

In addition to influencing ongoing changes in Library services and space planning, this information was utilized for the present Five Year Plan of Service which was adopted in 2012 for the years 2013 - 2017. The full Plan of Service is available here.

C. The Friends of the Woodstock Library

The Friends of the Woodstock Library (FoL) is a non-profit membership organization governed by a nine member Board. The mission of the FoL is to support the Library. Not only do the Friends raise
funds through the annual Library Fair, occasional book sales and other projects, but they also sponsor the long-running Library Forum and they represent the Library in the community. More information about the FoL and what they are doing is available here.

D. The Annex

In late 2011 the laundromat across Library Lane was seized by the County for back taxes. After reviewing the 2007 Feasibility Study and the recent work with the community establishing what services it wanted, the Library decided it could meet its space needs in phases, beginning with the “Community Services” space identified by Architecture+, if it could purchase the property, 6 Library Lane, and build an annex there.

The Library planned to undertake this project with a capital campaign and grants from county, state and/or federal sources. To test the feasibility of this approach the Library asked the public to make sufficient gifts to the project to allow the Library to bid at least the minimum bid at the Tax Auction; some $170,000. In three months, with considerable help from the FoL, the Library raised that amount. The Library was able to acquire the property for just $71,000.

After reviewing seventeen Architects' proposals to its RFP, the Library selected JSA to design the Annex because of his Library design experience and the passion he demonstrated for the Annex project. His firm had designed library multi-use spaces for Yale, the University of Pennsylvania and, most recently Princeton, for which the firm received an American Library Association award for design excellence. The Library Board was impressed that he took this relatively modest job so seriously that he was willing to travel from New York to do it, even though it was a smaller building than most houses. He set about designing a building that would meet the pressing public space needs of the Library and would just fit on the small lot.

As a special district library the Library is eligible to claim immunity from the Zoning Law of the Town. The elected Library Board considered that it was as representative of Woodstock values as the Town Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals and Commission on Civic Design, so it decided to raise its claim of immunity with the Town Board. The main considerations for this were to save many thousands of dollars and months of time, providing the needed services as soon as possible. The Town Board agreed with the Library, and in July 2013 a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to that effect was signed between the Library and the Town.

However, before the Library could begin the capital campaign to build the Annex, vocal opposition to the project arose. One particular area of dispute concerned the MOU. The JSA design/development concept (details on Library web site) that was delivered after the MOU was signed, considerably exceeded the laundromat footprint. In 2014 the Town Board clarified that it was not the "small" building they had agreed to in the MOU. The Town Supervisor has since asserted that the MOU applies only to a building with a footprint similar to the laundromat. In response to this controversy and numerous other objections from various citizens, the Library Board halted further work on the Annex and sought additional community consultation.

The Library began by organizing an open meeting for exchanging ideas between Board members and the community. Over 80 people met on June 8, 2014. As a result of the public’s concerns about the Library’s decision to address its space needs in phases, beginning with the Annex, the Library
appointed a Facilities Task Force to restudy the issue and make a recommendation to the Library about how to proceed.

E. The Facilities Task Force

In July the Library convened The Facilities Task Force (FTF), a group of twelve people\(^1\) with concerns for how to make the most of the Woodstock Library. The FTF includes professionals from Library Sciences, Architecture, Engineering and Building, Law, Marketing, and Publishing. The Library Director and three other current Library Board members serve on the FTF. The Library asked the FTF to recommend to the Library “the best way to meet the Library’s physical facility needs.” The full charge to the FTF can be found here. (Page 30) The FTF has met over twenty times and considered many aspects of the Library campus and its needs for space. On two occasions the FTF has sought comments from the community on its progress. Both public meetings were well attended and resulted in a lively exchange of views. The FTF also met with two leaders of the successful Saugerties Library major renovation of 2008. This is the FTF’s report to the Library Board.

\(^1\) Members of the Facilities Task Force: Maria DeFranco and Stuart Auchincloss, co-chairs; Elaine Hammond; Eliza Kunkel; Joe Mangan; Barry Miller; Tim Moore; Martin Nystrom; Amy Raff (non-voting member); Esther Ratner; Sean Ritchey; Jerry Washington.
III. ASSETS

A. A Review of the Library Campus

1. The Library Green

The Library Green is defined as the lawn between Rte 212 and the existing Library building, bordered by Library Lane and the Lasher property. It is the site of the annual Library Fair. This area is in the 100 year flood plain. The majority of the Library's parking spaces abut the eastern edge of the Green. Considering its value as an open public space, its use during Library Fairs, its mature trees, and the current parking configuration, building on the Green would be problematic.

The FTF assumes that this lawn area is precious to the Town and the Library and recommends this area be preserved as an open space and not used as a potential building site at this time. This recommendation does not limit the option to build onto the front of the building in the setback area along the west property line. Nor does it proscribe an expansion of the southern edge of the Library footprint, in order to bring the main Library entrance up to current ADA compliance standards. Any additions to the south elevation of the Library would likely be secondary in square footage to the North Wing, as the northern elevation is the largest (and thus most cost-effective) site available. The southern elevation, however, provides an opportunity for architectural expression as well as some program space fulfillment. These are all options which the Architect of the updated Master Plan will address.

2. The Book Barn

The Book Barn (including Book Sale and Storage) is a one story structure of approximately 1,800 SF (the Book Barn alone is 1,173 SF). Per the 2007 report, it has inadequate HVAC, insulation, lighting and has significant water table problems. (Current conditions are unchanged.) The Book Barn occupies the most developable portion of the entire campus and this area could be the location of a much larger building. The Book Barn's 1,173 SF footprint lies on 2,500 SF of land, and there is another 950 SF available for expansion in the Northeast corner of the property.

The FoL uses the Book Barn as the physical location for most of its operations and storage. If the Book Barn were to be moved or demolished, the FoL would have no physical base of operations. The FTF is well aware of the vital importance of this building to the Friends of the Library (FoL) and the Library itself.

3. The Main Library Building

In 2007 the Woodstock Library Board commissioned a feasibility study which was done by Architecture+ of Troy NY. That study noted the following physical plant deficiencies in the Library:

- The building electrical distribution system is not adequate to support the use of computers in the modern library environment. A service upgrade and additional electrical distribution circuits would be required. At present the main disconnect is readily accessible due to placement of the furnace in the basement. This code violation needs to be corrected. In addition, the basement has standing water and is subject to flooding, if the sump pumps fail. The electrical panels should be relocated out of the basement area.
• The building does not meet the minimum requirements for library floor loading.
• Standing water and occasional flooding of basement create potential for mold growth and wood deterioration.
• The main entrance, the rest room, and the book stacks do not meet current ADA standards. The Book Barn is ADA inaccessible.

Joe Mangan and Sean Ritchey conducted a walk thru of the existing building and noted the following:

• Electrical code violations remain on main service.
• Structurally the floor loading does not meet library requirements; book stacks have been relocated to the perimeter of rooms to help mitigate the situation in some areas.
• Mold is present in the basement and may constitute a public health issue.
• Lack of ventilation in cooling season will contribute to indoor air quality issues.
• Non-ADA accessible conditions existing in stack areas, entrances/exits, restroom, 2nd floor children's area, and Book Barn.

For more information, here is their inspection report and matrix [Link to Existing Conditions Report](Page31)

4. 6 Library Lane (The Laundromat Lot)

The 6 Library Lane lot is bisected by Tannery Brook. Utility lines cross the property; they would need to be relocated in order to construct a building taller than the present laundromat. Currently, there is room for about five parking spaces in front of the laundromat (inhibited by the utility pole). Much of the lot, and a portion of the proposed Annex, is within the 100 year flood line, as established by FEMA. A portion of the proposed Annex is also within the 40 foot wetland buffer zone of the Tannery Brook stream bank. While all of the Library campus faces water table mediation challenges, only 6 Library Lane is subject to FEMAs more stringent building requirements.

B. Environmental/Regulatory Requirements

FTF members Maria DeFranco and Jerry Washington undertook a review of the environmental issues affecting 6 Library Lane. Their report can be found here [Link to Environmental Report](Page 31)

The 6 Library Lane lot is largely located within the 40’ buffer zone in relation to the stream and is in the 1% Flood Line (100 year flood line) Regulated Area, according to the recently updated FEMA maps. Because of this, the following restrictions apply (there are other restrictions not noted here):

1. Buildings constructed must have the base floor at least 3 feet above grade with flow-thru foundations or pier footings.
2. There is no feasible or practical alternative to the proposed regulated activity, or related site planning considerations, that could accomplish the basic objectives of the proposal.
3. There is no practicable alternative to the proposed regulated activity on another portion of the subject property that is not within a wetland, watercourse or wetland/watercourse buffer area.

Points #2 and 3, above, are regulations taken from the Woodstock Wetlands and Watercourse Law.
Since there is a buildable location in the rear of the Library that is not regulated by points #2 and 3, the Annex design does not appear to meet those criteria to build beyond the existing Laundromat footprint. There is also the added expense of stabilizing the stream bed and mitigating the detrimental impact of the proposed pier footings themselves; these costs could be avoided if the Library chose to build outside the 1% flood line. Additional reasons, besides the actual Wetland and Watercourse Law, make 6 Library Lane appear difficult for any construction that extends beyond the pre-existing foundation. The Library Board could overcome these restrictions, but doing so might require lengthy and expensive engineering and legal action that might hamper fundraising efforts and worsen relations with the Town Board and the Town's regulatory agencies.

The conclusion of the FTF is that the stream side site is a challenging, but buildable site. Nevertheless, we believe that construction of a North Wing attached to the rear of the existing Library building would be more in line with sound environmental principals.

C. **Zoning**

FTF member Martin Nystrom researched the Zoning issues relevant to the Library campus. [His report can be found here.](Page 37)

The Library campus is site-constrained, with limited areas available for expansion. Analysis of the Zoning Resolution (Code) for the main campus shows that the existing structures have, for the most part, built out all the space available under the Code. At least three of the four yard setbacks and the parking layout and the quantity of parking are not in compliance. The Code was enacted after all present construction occurred. Grandfathering, an increase in the Floor Area allowance and use of the existing yard conditions is required.

We believe that the Laundromat site is in full compliance, with the exception of the side yard (2' instead of required 10') and the parking layout. We believe that the replacement of the existing footprint at grade is allowable by grandfathering, and a second story (an option unaddressed by the MOU) may be possible.

This analysis of Zoning leads the FTF to conclude that the site of the Book Barn is the most logical expansion site. Any additions should make the most efficient use of the available land, and one-story buildings are not an efficient use of limited space.
IV ASSESSMENT OF LIBRARY NEEDS

A. Methodology Used to Determine Space Needs

The FTF sought to establish a rough estimate of the additional program space needs of the Library. Actual program space (net) is converted into actual building square footage by using a multiplier of 1.3 (130%), which is a standard of the Design industry. This conversion from net to gross takes into account circulation, rest rooms, elevators, mechanical/electrical spaces, etc. required for a functional building.

1. Review of the 2007 Architecture+ Plan

In 2007 the Woodstock Library Board commissioned a feasibility study which was done by Architecture+ of Troy NY. This document had two parts, Part A: Needs Analysis and Part B: Conceptual Design. Although seven years old, this document proved an excellent basis for determining the library’s needs, with some updating required. A good overview of the building needs is articulated in the 2007 Study as follows: “Normal aging and wear have taken their toll on many of the building systems, finishes and furnishings. The volume of books and other non-print materials in the library has also outgrown the building. Patrons and staff are plagued with overcrowded conditions leaving no room for expansion.”

The 2007 Report tabulated the additional net program space required to be 4,012 square feet (SF). This translates to 5,216 SF of additional building space (gross SF) required.

2. 2014 Estimated Additional Space Needs

At the request of the FTF, Amy Raff updated the 2007 figures using her own 'back-of-the-envelope' estimates for current additional program space needs. Her 2014 estimate is 4,619 SF net, 6,005 SF gross. Amy will need to work with a library specialist and/or Master Plan Architect to validate these numbers; the result will be a more accurate updated estimate to be used as the basis for space planning. Considerable community input will be essential to this process, including but not limited to outreach to both user and non-user groups, as well as other stakeholders, Library staff, and the FoL.
Here is a tabulation of our efforts to establish a realistic estimate of the Library's additional program space needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW PROGRAM SPACE REQUIRED</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>2007 PROGRAM</th>
<th>ESTIMATED 2014 FIGURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTERS</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATALOG COMPUTERS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICTION</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONFICTION</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIODICALS/REF</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL COLLECTION</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SERVICES</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEATING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT SERVICES</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOK BARN LIBRARY FAIR STORAGE</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL NET SQ FT</td>
<td>7841</td>
<td>11,853</td>
<td>12,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SQ FT (1.3 MULTIPLIER) BUILDING SF NEEDED</td>
<td>10,193</td>
<td>15,409</td>
<td>16,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 12,460 - 7,841 = 4,619 SF Program Space Shortage

4,500 SF used for planning purposes

a.) The Library's Need for On-Site Meeting and Maker Space

The FTF agrees that the Library has a pressing need for on-site flexible meeting and maker space. The Library has no accessible on-site meeting space to use for Library programs during Library hours. Children's programs are held upstairs, and while that area is an adequate size, it is not ADA accessible and lacks certain features. Last year, three Library program groups regularly used the Director's office for their meetings, thereby displacing the Director from her office. A shortage of on-site meeting space and maker space limits the quantity and variety of programs and services the Library can offer.

One of the three priorities identified in the most recent Library planning process was to “ensure the facility meets the needs of the community for neutral meeting space and present and emerging technology.” The Library believes that offering space for community connections and creativity fulfills its mission “to facilitate learning and self-education.” With the renovation of the Community Center, and the occasional availability of the Christian Science Reading Room, some have suggested the Library no longer requires its own on-site meeting space. This is clearly not so. The Library needs its own spaces for its own programs and services: instruction, construction, classes, seminars, workshops,
and collaboration of all sorts. Such space will be used for cooperative work that the Library can facilitate, by providing equipment and other resources, by organization and by instruction.

When the Library or Library users aren't using the Library's meeting and maker space, other community groups will be able to. Providing free, neutral meeting space in the public library is a standard service in modern libraries. The Woodstock Library is simply unable to meet the community's current demand for meeting rooms; frequently requests for use of a meeting room must be denied for lack of space. There are groups meeting after-hours at the Library six days a week, which represents a security risk.

Two of the three primary goals of the Library's current 5-year Plan of Service concern the need for additional flexible meeting space:

- **Goal #1:** “Maintain and enhance the library as a cultural and educational center and public gathering place for the community.” Having meeting space obviously supports this goal, both for library organized training and workshops, and as a place for the community to gather.

- **Goal #2:** “Create, operate and maintain a facility based on the changing role of the Library and the needs of the community.” Having a training facility, maker space and technology laboratory will allow the Library to respond to the changes to the role of the Library in the age of technology. It will meet demonstrated community needs.

The FTF concurs with the Library Board that any Library expansion must include the creation of flexible on-site meeting and maker space.

### 3. Library Parking Needs

The Library has limited parking available on its campus. The Library's attendance figures continue to rise, but the number of on-site parking spots cannot keep pace. For major events such as Library Forums and Book Sales, and during peak-usage hours, demand often exceeds supply and some Library patrons must park off site in one of the nearby lots or on-street village parking. It should be noted that other towns have no parking requirements for their village libraries.

The purchase of the 6 Library Lane secured some much-needed additional parking spaces. Though the RFP for the Annex specified that the design should continue to offer parking, the JSA plan eliminated the parking spots on 6 Library Lane.

The ’07 report recommended that there be an improvement in access to the lower parking lot at the Comeau property. This would include a proper paved right of way, access to the lot, road markings and signage on rt. 212, and lighting. The FTF recommends that the Board pursue this course. Any remedies (such as bike racks) which encourage alternative means of transportation should also be encouraged.

### B. Library Campus Needs Not Addressed by a Separate Building on 6 Library Lane

1. **Program Square Footage Provided**

The Annex, as depicted in the design/development stage by JSA provides 1190 SF of program space. JSA met the design requirements for flexible program and maker space, as defined for the goals of the
Annex. However, the Library needs a total of approximately 4,500 SF of additional program space. If the JSA Annex were completed, the Library would still have a program space shortfall of 3,310 SF (which equals 4,303 SF of building). The JSA design provides only 26% of the estimated program space the library requires.

The small amount of program space that the Annex provides is not a shortcoming of the JSA design; rather, it is a reflection of the limited size of the 6 Library Lane lot and its location across the street from the existing Library building.

- Due to the requirement of the raised foundation adjacent to the stream (3 foot to grade), extensive ramps and landings are required, which take up considerable space and may be expensive to maintain (a lot of shoveling in winter). In theory, a mechanical lift alone could be used in lieu of a ramp, but any mechanical glitches would render the building temporarily inaccessible to some patrons.

- A separate building requires rest rooms, mechanical/electric space, storage etc., all of which contribute to making a separate, small building space-inefficient. If the Annex design were revised to include a second-story, stairs and an elevator would further reduce the useable program space per floor.

- Even if the Annex could be made larger, there are few program functions (other than the multipurpose meeting, computing, and maker space presently envisioned) that could logically be relocated into the Annex to alleviate the overcrowding in the main building. Relocating additional program functions to the Annex site would require splitting up key Library functions.

- The current Library building requires considerable additional space in order to decompress the stacks, and allow more seating etc. Other than archival storage, one of the few existing functions that could logically be relocated entirely to the Annex and away from the main library building would be the computer terminals. However, even if all of the terminals were relocated, the space freed up would not significantly alleviate the overcrowding of the main building.

C. Summary of the FTF's Needs Assessment

- The library needs more space -- probably about 4,500 SF of program space -- which equals 6,000 SF of actual building square footage.

- The Annex provides 1,190 SF of flexible program space for meetings, events, media, maker space and technology training.

- The need for more program space is not restricted to a single library function; all areas need additional space.

- Without providing the additional square footage of program space required, the library will remain overcrowded, overloaded, and not fully ADA compliant.
V. FTF APPROACH/ANALYSIS USED AS BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Options to Attain Additional 4500 SF of Program Space

As noted earlier, to arrive at the gross building square footage required from the net program square footage a multiplier of 1.3 is used, which is the standard of the industry. This multiplier is for circulation, stairs, utility support spaces, etc. The figures used below are for gross building square footage, unless specifically stated otherwise.

1. An Analysis of the 2007 Project Cost

The project costs presented in the 2007 Study reflected a major rehab and reconfiguration of the existing building as well as combining new construction with the older building into a single structure. This degree of remodeling can be very expensive and has many unknowns which drive up contingency costs. The following are examples of costs in that 2007 study that could be totally eliminated or greatly reduced with a stand-alone addition with connector(s).

- Design Contingency $404,066: this is related to unknowns when doing a major reconfiguration of an old building.
- Construction Contingency $534,378: again very high for the reason stated above.
- Leeds Certification $819,379: energy efficient systems and building envelope should be a given, however the documentation to obtain Leeds Certification is very expensive. For example, Saugerties chose to construct their new Library to Leeds Certification standards, but not spend the additional money for formal certification.

The potential reductions noted above total $1,757,823, before taking into consideration the reduction in construction cost if a major rehab and reconfiguration is not done on the existing building. For these reasons, we feel that the costs of the 2007 concept design should not be used as a budget estimate for the type of addition in the rear of the library we are proposing. As we have noted before, the Master Plan Architect will be able to offer more specific and accurate cost estimates for available options.

2. Our Cost Per SF Estimates for New Construction.

The FTF attempted to establish a reasonable estimated cost per square foot for library construction in order to make objective comparisons.

A review of the costs of several recently constructed libraries in the area as well as and discussions with local Architects resulted in an average estimated cost of $350/SF for library construction.

To validate this assumption, the cost data (provided by Library Journal) from all new libraries and library additions completed in 2013 was tabulated. Library additions averaged $137/SF and new libraries averaged $312/SF. Since library additions can include very minor projects/scope, the higher figure of $312/SF was used to validate that assumption of $350/SF for the addition. The Library Journal figures included all construction costs of a finished library. Fees, land acquisition, furniture and equipment were not included in the construction costs. All costs of plumbing, electrical, heating, air-conditioning, site work, ramps etc. are included.

Based on the sources of information detailed above, we believe that $350/SF is a reasonable estimate for the construction of a large single addition to the existing Library, or for an entirely new Library.
building.

3. **Our Cost Per SF Estimates for Updates to the Existing Library Building if an Addition is Constructed**

We made an assumption regarding the cost per SF needed to do minor renovations to the existing building after an addition is constructed and book stacks etc. are relocated to the addition. Some areas will require no work; some areas, such as the basement and entrance, may need considerable work. On the following graphs, all options that show an addition to the existing library building include an additional $25/SF for upgrades to the existing building. ($222,200). We acknowledge that this number is less reliable than the $350/SF estimate for new construction detailed above. It is possible that upgrading the existing Library building will cost more than $25/SF. This is an area where the Master Plan Architect will have considerably more specific estimates.

Another area for consideration by the Library Board and the Master Plan Architect would be whether some upgrades to the existing building can or should be phased over future years. A complete renovation of the existing building is not included in our estimates. This $25/SF is limited to the required elect/mech upgrades, ADA accessibility and minor repair of floors and finishes after book stacks etc. are relocated to the addition. $25/SF would not cover possible costs such as addressing the poor concave roof design of the existing building.

4. **Our Cost Per SF Estimates for an Addition to the Existing Library Building Plus the Annex**

Our third step was to quantify the amount of program space located in the Annex, as well as the Annex's estimated construction costs. Per the 5/30/13 JSA's schematic design submission, the Annex has 1,190 SF of program space. The construction cost used for the Annex is $1,437,100; it is based on JSA's 11/11/2013 final cost estimate. This figure does not include architectural fees, permits, furniture, equipment etc. This is the figure to construct the basic building with stairs, ramp etc.

By our calculations, each SF of program space in the Annex costs $1,208. ($1,437,400 divided by 1190 SF). By comparison, program space in an addition would cost $350/SF times the 1.3 multiplier or $455/SF. See Graph #1 on following page.
Our analysis leads us to conclude that the Annex carries a very high premium for program space per SF. Housing program space in a larger addition or additions to the existing building would be far less expensive per SF.

5. Our Conclusions

In Graph #2 on the following page, the cost of building a single 6,000 SF addition with 4,500 SF of program space is compared to the costs of building the Annex as well as an addition containing the remaining 3,310 SF of program space (4,500 minus 1,190) required by the Library. The cost of a single, entirely new Library building is also included for reference.
It is helpful to see the cost of an entirely new main Library building, compared to the other options. More details on the possible cost of an entirely new Library building can be found in the FAQ section of this report. If the updated Master Plan proposes a long term plan to demolish the existing Library building and build and create a new library complex, the North Wing addition we propose could be the first phase of that effort. Such an addition could provide the needed additional program space now, and defer replacement of the main building to a later date, when more funds may become available. If this approach is recommended by the Master Plan, the improvements in the existing Library building can be limited to those necessary for a safe and pleasant environment until such time as the new main building replaces the existing library building.

To summarize, we believe that a single, large addition is the most cost-effective expansion approach. Such a building could provide the Library with most or all of the estimated necessary additional space to meet its foreseeable program needs.
VI. FUNDING

A. Analysis of Annex Fund Raising Effort

Whatever steps the Library takes to bring its facilities up to modern library standards for a community like ours will cost money. While the Library’s budget covers the expense of maintaining its present building along with all its services, it will need a capital campaign to pay for major upgrades or new construction.

The Library began its Annex Project with a completely volunteer led goal to raise at least $170,000 to purchase the 6 Library Lane property at the tax auction on April 11. Beginning in mid-January the Library was able to achieve this goal.

Encouraged by this success the Library retained a fundraising consultant named Kim Alderman to create and coordinate a capital campaign to design and build the annex. Working with volunteers she created donor tracking software for the Library and began identifying and cultivating potential major donors while at the same time helping create descriptive materials about the project. She also led planning for events that would part of the capital campaign. During this time, with her leadership the Library raised almost $100,000 more for the Annex project.

1. Hartley Report

When the Annex cost estimate came in well over the Library Board's initial expectations, the Board sensibly commissioned the Hartley Consulting Firm to address whether the design was financially feasible. The FTF reviewed the Pre-Campaign Outreach Study produced by Harley Consulting on 4/17/14.

The main goal of the Hartley Report was to assess the Library's readiness and community support for a $1.5 million building campaign for the JSA Annex.

The report concludes that "On its own the Library does not yet have the financial support, infrastructure or internal resources to successfully conduct a $1.5 million capital campaign in the next 2-3 years. However...a targeted public-private major gifts campaign is possible with county and state funding comprising 50% of the funds required. The remaining funds would be secured with support from private sources identified during and prior to this study, primarily from individuals (local second-home owners and residents) as well as corporations and foundations." The report proposes a timetable of 3 years and a "conservative" estimate of $225,000 in costs to raise $1.5 million through public grants and private gifts.

The Hartley Report observes "The Library has a limited budget, no development staff, nor Board-led development committee." In light of the Report's conclusions, the FTF recommends the Library add bond funding to its plan for a capital campaign and government grants. We think that if the town is fully included in the process of planning the Library's expansion, it will support a reasonable bond to help fund it.
B. Fundraising for the FTF's Proposed Larger Addition Project

Hartley Consulting, Inc. was retained to analyze a capital campaign that did not include a local bond issue. We believe the concepts of the Hartley Plan could be applied to a different Library expansion project. A combination of private donations, grants and additional public financing in the form of a bond will be necessary for a project as ambitious as the FTF proposes. Each of these three sources of funds will likely be critical. Our funding recommendations are as follows:

1. Private Donations

The rancor over the Annex plan has put a damper on fundraising. Resolving that rancor and resuming cultivation of donors is critical. Since the Library has no development department, organizing the outreach to major donors may require a consultant, but the FTF recommends that as much as possible this be carried out by local volunteers.

2. Grants

The Hartley Report notes that the Library has no ongoing grant-writing infrastructure. The FTF recommends the Library engage a few volunteers to focus on obtaining grants. The Library leadership should also be prepared to explain the project to county, state and federal level representatives who can help with this process. Different phases of the project may be eligible for specific grants such as the NYSERDA grants for energy-saving features.

3. Bonding

With interest rates at historic lows, there may never be a more opportune time for the Library to borrow money. Outreach, education and a well-reasoned and realistic plan are all necessary for a successful bonding support campaign. Before asking the community to support a bond the Board will have to have a clear description of its building plan and of the library services it will provide. This should provide everyone with a clear idea of the value of the improvements – to the individual and to the community. The Board should also provide an explanation of what bond repayment will cost a homeowner, with some estimate of the cost per $1,000 of assessed valuation. The Board should also prepare a campaign plan for reaching out to all people who are likely to support the bond to encourage them to vote for it on election day.

4. Use of Local Resources

The FTF concurs with the Harley Report's observation that "People support what they help to create." The Report encourages the Library to engage with those who oppose the Library Annex and respond to their concerns. We recognize that the creation of the FTF was a step in this direction by the Library Board.

The Hartley Report also counsels the Library to “Secure from the local and regional community greater support of its vision for best serving the Town of Woodstock now and in the future.” The FTF recommends that the Library undertake an intense outreach to the whole community about the need for more space to provide more and better services to the town. In these conversations the Library should listen carefully to what people say they would like the Library to provide, what programs and services
people would value. At the same time it should provide a description of programs and services the Library provides now and that it could provide if it had suitable space.

We encourage the Library Board to utilize the expertise of local people to the extent possible. We recognize that the Library Board has already established a Community Outreach Task Force to begin this work. Of course the community conversations about the Library’s value will be much clearer when they include a Library-savvy Architect who is reviewing the Library’s program needs and searching for the best way to meet them; at that point there will be sketches, and ideas will flow.

C. Lessons to be Learned from the Saugerties Library Renovation & Addition

In looking for success stories, the FTF was encouraged by the experience of the Saugerties Library, which gained outstanding community support for its major Library project, completed in 2011. The FTF met with the current president of the Saugerties Library Board, Elizabeth Hernandez, and one of her predecessors, Sally Colclough. They described the many steps in their successful effort to plan, fund, design, and build the Saugerties Library renovation and addition. They reported that an important element in passing their bond issue was intense engagement with their community for more than a year before their bond vote. They said that the advice they received from Libby Post, at Communication Services, was invaluable in organizing this outreach. Here's a review of their process, as compiled by FTF member Tim Moore:

1. Architects

The Saugerties Library Board hired Butler, Rowland & Mays (BRM) a firm with in-depth experience in designing municipal libraries. Although they did not call it a Master Plan, BRM was hired to perform a pre-design study which:

- Reviewed prior library studies and site recommendations.
- Performed a professional evaluation of Library services.
- Met with Library staff to create a 'wish list.'
- Met with a design committee created by the Library Board.
- Conducted numerous community outreach meetings to gather public input and present ideas.
- Reduced the 'wish list' to a scope that could potentially be funded.
- Produced rough sketches of each design alternative with recommendations.

BRM was subsequently hired to perform the actual design of the selected option and assist the library in the selection of a construction manager.

D. Funding and Capital Campaign

Early in the process, the Board hired a consultant to determine whether the project could be privately funded by local donors. When that consultant determined that private donations alone would prove insufficient, the Board hired Libby Post to design a bond campaign to help win community support. Ms. Post led focus groups to gather information and sentiments from every important constituency in the Town before planning the campaign. She did not direct the fundraising; rather she engaged and organized volunteer groups to accomplish the task. The Library Board Presidents credited her for much
of the success for getting their bond issue approved. For 18 months, she did the following:

- Led separate, service-oriented focus groups on important issues such as parking, children's programs, computers, etc.
- Organized Board and Community members to give interest-group presentations using sketches from the architect, BRM.
- Created a Saugerties-appropriate "sports" theme for the campaign: "Recreation for the Mind."
- Created a poster campaign and mail campaign with that theme, to re-brand the Library and get out the vote for the bond referendum.

The Friends of the Saugerties Library were instrumental in assisting this massive campaign effort. They had been raising private funds, until the consultant determined a bond would be necessary to cover the scale of renovation and expansion needed. The Friends then threw their energies behind campaigning wholeheartedly for public support of the bond vote, while continuing to raise private funds.

In addition to the large bond measure, the Saugerties Library used grants and private donations to fund their project; all three proved necessary.

3. The Bond Vote

Talking to the two Saugerties Library Board presidents, we were impressed by the "don’t look-back" confidence they felt about their bond measure passing, once the design option was selected and the marketing and PR campaign was underway.

The Saugerties bond issue passed by a two-to-one margin; 2400 voters showed up to vote. (A typical Library budget vote turn-out was 300.)

4. Our Conclusions

The FTF encourages the Woodstock Library Board to consider the example of the successful Saugerties Library expansion project. We urge the Board to have confidence that the right community outreach, the right facility plan, the right voter research, and the right campaign can and will win approval in our town.
VII. FEASIBILITY OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

A. Laydown Area

Every construction project requires laydown area to store tools, materials and machinery for contractors use. In the present Sander’s Annex concept, the building occupies almost the entire site. This leaves little room for laydown area and will add both cost and congestion to the construction project.

If an addition is added to the rear of the library, and the laundromat is demolished prior to construction beginning, the streamside lot could be used as a laydown area. Pallets and platforms can be used to mitigate any issues dealing with loading on grade in regards to the stream side site. If the Library chooses to move the Book Barn to the laundromat site, to afford the FoL a place to continue their good work, then the parking area in front of the laundry could be used as a laydown area.

B. Disruption of Multiple Projects

If the Annex (or other small building) is built on the streamside site, only 26% of the estimated additional program space needed would be built, and no progress would have been made on the needed improvements to the main library building. This would hasten the need to construct an addition to the Library (or an entirely new Library) soon after the stream side building is completed. Two construction projects, one on each side of Library Lane, either simultaneous or sequential with little time in between will be very disruptive and inconvenient for both the Library and the town.

On the other hand, if our proposed North Wing is built first, it would satisfy most or all of the Library's estimated current program needs, including meeting space. In the future, if and when further program needs arise, a new main Library building could be built to satisfy those future needs. Or, if program needs emerge that are better fulfilled in a building separate from the main Library (because of noise or odor, for instance) then a separate building on the site of 6 Library Lane could be constructed, in keeping with the Master Site Plan. This would facilitate one construction project in the near future, with a second potential project taking place many years from now.

C. Ongoing Library Operations

The 2007 Study recommended temporary relocation of the Library during renovation of the existing Library building. The allotted cost for this effort was $40,000 (which seems insufficient). Finding a temporary location, packing up and moving into a new location and then back again at the completion of construction is very disruptive and expensive.

If a stand-alone addition is built in the rear of the library, sound barriers could be erected to mitigate construction noise and allow the library to continue operations in place until the new addition is completed and the connecting completed. Modern construction techniques and temporary sound barriers (which can be leased) have made this type of approach relatively common.

After the construction project has been completed and the existing library building decompressed with extra space available, future projects, such as the insulation of outside walls can take place periodically,
by isolating the work areas from the remainder of the library, and/or doing the work when the Library is closed. This type of phased upgrade approach to the existing building cannot be accomplished now due to lack of space and crowded conditions.
VIII FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Lastly, we thought we'd tackle some of the most frequently asked questions (FAQs) we've heard over the past six months:

1. Q: Why not just build an entirely new Library?
   A: We looked into it and we all agree that if money was no object, building an entirely new Library would be the best approach to solving the Library's program space needs. But it would be very expensive. Here's a link to our analysis. (Page 44)

2. Q: Isn't pouring more money into the existing Library building just throwing good money after bad? Won't that building need to be replaced soon regardless?
   A: With a stand-alone building, you know your costs; with a renovation of an old building, it's a guess (just look at the cost overruns associated with the recent renovations of our Community Center and Town Hall). If you want to make the existing building into a fully modern Library, then the existing building is probably a liability. But if you want to build a large addition (say 6,000 SF) now, then the existing building is an asset. We can keep using it, with minor, relatively inexpensive upgrades, until the time comes to demolish it and start over. Then the North Wing we are proposing can be used to house many of the Library's functions during construction of the new main Library building. The existing building is an asset because it allows phasing of that final project. If it takes 10 or 20 or 40 years to raise the money for the new main Library building, we will still have about 16,000 SF of space to support Library functions during that time.
   The question for the whole community and the Library Board is how much effort should be put into the existing structure and what is cost-effective?

3. Q: What is involved in updating a Master Plan? How will that help fund-raising and a bond campaign?
   A: We envision an Architectural team with substantial municipal Library experience working with the Library to:
   • Review and update the 2007 Library Study.
   • Solicit input from the Library Director, Library staff, and the Library Board regarding their expectations for the expanded library.
   • Conduct public meetings to solicit input from the FoL and the community on their expectations for the expanded Library.
   • Work with the Library Director to update the program space requirements.
   • Evaluate the existing Library building and the entire Library campus, including 6 Library Lane.
   • Provide insight into current Library trends based on the Architectural firm’s experience.
   • Develop a long-term Master Plan that includes multiple realistic (fundable) options for the first phase of the Master Plan, with conceptual cost estimates.
   • Work with the Library Board to select the best First Phase Expansion Plan.

Once the Library Board selects its First Phase Library Expansion Plan from those options, the Master Plan Architects will assist the marketing and fundraising effort. They will provide sketches of the Plan with supporting information to raise the level of enthusiasm and interest. They will explain the cost-effectiveness and value of the Plan to show how the Library, and therefore the community, will benefit.
4. **Q:** Should the Library Board use a local Architect to update their Master Plan and design a new building?

**A:** "Buying Local" is preferable, but it is the opinion of the FTF that it is more important to find the right Architect than the closest Architect. Building a library of the 21st century is a specialized field. The Woodstock Library campus is challenging. While a local firm might have a head start understanding the nuances of local politics and personalities, we suggest the Library Board seek out an experienced firm with a proven history of on-time and on-budget Library projects. A local Architect could prove to be a valuable member of the team selected; possibly providing more opportunities for meetings with the public to gain support for the project. A local presence during construction could result in considerable cost savings.

5. **Q:** How is 2015 going to be any different than 2007?

**A:** We are recommending a far less-expensive plan than the one proposed in 2007. And we are not proposing the Library fund the entire project with a bond; rather, we propose that the substantial funding be raised through private donations and public grants. We urge the Library to make a more concerted effort to gather input and communicate its plans with the public than it did in 2007.

6. **Q:** Why didn't the FTF speak to Joel Sanders directly? How much time did you actually spend analyzing the Annex project?

**A:** We decided we didn't need to speak to Joel Sanders or anyone at JSA directly. The FTF's main goal was to recommend how to gain 4,500 SF of program space. No modifications to the JSA design could provide that much space. Since the 6 Library Lane lot is too small to provide all of the estimated additional square footage required, we looked to the rear of the existing Library, which can accommodate such a larger structure.

We felt we had enough information about the planned Annex to make an accurate assessment of how the JSA's proposed design met the estimated space and program needs of the Library. We are proposing a larger scope for the work we recommend. We looked at the Annex in numerous ways, over the course of our six months of meetings. [Here's a list of things we considered](Page 45).

7. **Q:** If parking is such an issue for the JSA Annex, then what about the parking needed for a structure 3 times its size, like you're proposing?

**A:** Parking is and will continue to be a challenge for the Library. Not building the Annex now will preserve five parking spots. [Martin Nystrom has some suggestions for the Board on this topic](Page 46).

8. **Q:** Wouldn't the JSA Annex have lower ongoing operational costs than a big addition attached to the old, energy-inefficient Library building? And won't higher operational costs result in an increase in the Library's annual budget?

**A:** Unless other areas of the Library budget are trimmed, the expenses related to maintaining additional space will require an increase in the annual library budget. But in terms of ongoing operational costs per square foot, the FTF believes the North Wing is the better option. You can't compare apples (the 4,500 SF of program space in our North Wing proposal) to oranges (the 1,190 SF of program space in the JSA Annex). You must compare the operating costs of the North Wing to the operating costs of the JSA Annex and a medium-sized addition to the Library which provides the other 3,310 SF of needed program space. Once you look at it that way, a single North Wing would be more efficient to operate and maintain than an addition and the Annex.
9. **Q:** Why not improve the Book Barn instead of replacing it?
**A:** It is a dilapidated one story building on a site-constrained campus that needs a two-story solution to meet its space needs. It has a slab floor, no insulation, and no heat. Water seeps up through the floor whenever it rains heavily. It is cheaper to replace than to fix.

10. **Q:** What will happen to the FoL if your North Wing addition is realized? Why didn't you meet with them and address their space needs?
**A:** We recognize that our recommendation to build on the site of the existing book barn will impact the FoL. We are aware of the importance of the FoL to the Library. The FoL book sales, Library Forum series, and annual Library Fair are popular and they raise needed funds. The FTF does not have a firm recommendation on how to proceed with the FoL, because we are unclear as to the legal issues surrounding what the Library may or may not build for the FoL, given their status as a separate 501(c)3 organization.

   In our one meeting with them, the FoL indicated a desire for better quarters—a dry floor, heat, insulation, and a separate intake/workroom, but they chose not to engage further with the FTF. We wish we could have spoken to them again. We encourage the Library Board to include the FoL in any Master Plan update and to partner with the FoL and address the FoL's needs and goals as they are, obviously, inextricably linked with those of the Library.

11. **Q:** Could the Book Barn be relocated to 6 Library Lane?
**A:** Yes, although this normally would not be considered; but there are a host of problems the book barn relocation would solve. It would give FOL a place to continue their work during the construction of the North Wing (at the cost of losing some of a convenient staging area for construction), be grandfathered into the stream side site (using the laundromat footprint), and resolve the issue of the library funding new construction for FoL, which is a separate legal entity.

12. **Q:** If the Library tears down the Laundromat and doesn't build something on the site soon after, won't they lose their "grandfather" rights to rebuild on the laundromat footprint?
**A:** We believe so, and we see this as an important issue for the Library Board to address. Perhaps they could negotiate an extension of the grandfathering of the footprint with the Town. Perhaps they could construct an inexpensive temporary structure on the footprint, to preserve their footprint rights and provide storage.

13. **Q:** The Library received several grants from the New York State Public Library Construction Fund. Those grants (for buying 6 Library Lane and for asbestos abatement during demolition of the laundromat) were contingent on the building of the Annex. If the Annex isn't built, doesn't the Library risk having to return those grants? And won't the Library be jeopardizing any possible future grants from this Fund?
**A:** It is impossible to answer these questions now. The answer will depend on what the Library Board ultimately decides to do and on how that relates to the original purposes described in the grant applications. The Library Director has been in contact with the granting authorities ever since last Spring, when the Library Board paused its Annex project to consult with the community about its plans. It is possible that not proceeding with the funded project (the Annex) could negatively impact the Library's likelihood of receiving more grants from this source in the future. There are simply too many unknowns for us to resolve this issue.

14. **Q:** Why do you recommend walking away from the Annex project? What about the
estimated $200,000 + the Library has already spent on its Annex plan? What does that say to the donors who gave in support of the Annex?

A: We believe a larger expansion plan will be appealing to past and future donors. The FTF estimates that with a North Wing, the Library could get a lot more value for each donated dollar -- almost four times the program space of the proposed Annex, for less than twice as much money. Furthermore, changing course now would not "waste" all the money spent to date on the Annex: 6 Library Lane is still a valuable addition to the Library Campus; the Hartley Report is still a useful roadmap for any Library expansion project; and Kim Alderman has still helped the Library develop the ability to conduct a major donor capital campaign. Other costs, such as the survey and some of the legal fees, would have been spent regardless of the Library's expansion plans.

15. Q: What should be done with 6 Library Lane if the Annex isn't built?
   A: As mentioned earlier, the Book Barn could be moved there, to preserve the laundromat footprint. We've heard other suggestions, such as a park for readers or an outdoor community art space. We don't think it should be only a parking lot. The Architect who creates the Master Plan will address this issue, with extensive input from the community.

16. Q: Why didn't you settle the issue of the MOU?
   A: We aren't legal experts. And we noticed that even legal experts seem conflicted about the relevant statute. We felt it was enough for us to be aware that the Town Board and the Library Board were at odds as to the meaning of the MOU (or as we came to call it, the Memorandum of Misunderstanding) and to acknowledge the problem.

17. Q: Do you think the Library should go through the regular town Zoning and Planning Board process if they choose to build elsewhere on the Library Campus? Or should they seek another MOU?
   A: That's not for us to say. Submitting to the normal regulatory process might engender community goodwill, but it will cost the Library both time and money. That is a decision for the Library Board to make.

18. Q: If the Library goes forward with an updated Master Plan, and chooses not to seek another MOU, should Design professionals assist the Library Board in dealing with environmental, zoning, building and planning boards?
   A: We think knowledgeable professionals would be of considerable assistance to the Library Board to help get through the various processes. As mentioned earlier, it could be particularly helpful if at least one member of the team were local to the area, not only to help facilitate the process, but to keep costs to a minimum by avoiding travel etc.

19. Q: Can anything be done about Library Lake?
   A: Yes, as a matter of fact, Jerry Washington has some thoughts on that which can be found here. (Page 47)

20. Q: How do we know how much space the Library will need in the future? Aren't all books going to be digital? So won't that free up a lot of space?
   A: Our Library offers books, large-print books, audio books on CD, digital books, digital audio books, as well as various e-readers for people to check out; multiple platforms, none of which are going away soon. No one knows exactly what the future of the public library will be, but there is no
sign of a shortage of demand for Library space. The trend is towards user-generated content and information; and people and their meeting and maker spaces take up a lot more space than books, so experts forecast no decline in space needs. [Here's a link to an excellent essay about the need for maker spaces in modern Libraries.]

21. **Q:** Why should anyone take your recommendations seriously? Who elected you?
**A:** No one voted for us to be on the FTF. Three of our members are currently elected to the Library Board. We were appointed by the Library Board and asked to make a recommendation as to what we view as “the best way” to meet the Library’s physical facility needs. The FTF has met almost every week since late July, 2014. Our meetings have been collegial and productive. All of them have been open to the public. We have also held two public-input meetings on September 30th and December 8th.

We sincerely believe we have looked at every aspect of the Library’s facility needs. We are fortunate to have had a well-rounded group that allowed us many windows of insight into the issues we were appointed to address. Very early on, we resolved to make recommendations that would be program-centric and provide a comprehensive solution to most or all of the Library’s foreseeable needs. We have focused on the Library as a free, access-to-all “community hub” for knowledge exchange and civic engagement. We hope the new public spaces that may eventually develop from our recommendations will provide Woodstockers of all ages, present and future, with everything they need to learn, share, grow, and function together as a unique and innovative 21st-century community.
Facilities task force Background

The Library’s Five year Plan of Service describes the Vision, Mission and Values of the Library. It goes on to list three Goals which are broad general statements describing a future toward which the Library is working now. These elements inform our budget and programs during the plan and they can inform our consideration of the best way for the Library to meet its need for facilities.

Several years ago the Library retained architecture+ to prepare a needs analysis that would consider what facilities would be required to provide modern library services to Woodstock. The “2007 Revised Feasibility Study” is their report. In 2012 the Library combined and elaborated on that study to prepare the RFP for the annex project. This RFP is the most recent thinking of the Library on what its facility requirements are.

Charge to Facilities Task Force

To review the Library’s 2007 Revised Feasibility Study,
To review the Library’s Plan of Service 2013 - 2017,
To review the RFP for the Annex and the Joel Sanders Architect design,
To consider other ways to meet the Library’s facility needs,
To make a written report to the Library Board of Trustees recommending the best way to meet the Library’s physical facility needs as described in the documents reviewed.

The “best way to meet” the Library’s physical facility needs will include consideration of the entire Library campus. It will also include consideration of the Library’s place and role in the community. Some specific items for consideration are:
Functionality — Library program and services
Appearance
Environmental footprint
Timing
Financing of design and construction
Town zoning issues
Future operating costs and savings
Staff
Utilities
Existing Conditions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of Space</td>
<td>Lack of space to sit and relax for public, lack of staff space</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Basement Floods</td>
<td>Potential damage to Mech/ Clint Systems, mold wood deterioration</td>
<td>13,19</td>
<td>SAME, MOLD PRESENT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Standing Water Under Front Room</td>
<td>Potential mold and wood deterioration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NOT PRESENT AT VISIT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Front Room Wood Drier Placement</td>
<td>Gliders need to be reinforced to min. 300 psi per 1989 engineering report</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>LOOKING FOR REPORT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Children’s Room Roof Framing</td>
<td>Roof framing may be deficient per 2003 engineering report</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>LOOKING FOR REPORT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Children’s Room Floor Joists</td>
<td>Floor joists not reinforced per 1989 engineering study</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>STACKS MOVED TO PERIMETER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Original Building Insulation</td>
<td>Likely to insulation in exterior walls of exterior walls</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SAME, INSULATE WALT (during renovation)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unheat Heating</td>
<td>Heating system delivers uneven heat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>SAME, HEAT/HEAT INSTALLATION PENNANING</td>
<td>CHECK BALANCING (IM)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of Outside Air in Cooling Zones</td>
<td>Split A/C systems do not deliver outside air as required by code, grandfather to but could add to potential mold issue</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fire Alarm System</td>
<td>Needs to be expanded to meet code</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Exit Signage</td>
<td>Not illuminated or lacking battery backup</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Exit Signage</td>
<td>Not illuminated or lacking battery backup</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ADA Compliance issues</td>
<td>ADA compliance issues</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Main Entrance Not ADA Compliant</td>
<td>Not per ADA requirements for clearance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Exit Landings Not ADA Compliant</td>
<td>Not per ADA requirements for clearance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ADA Compliance issues</td>
<td>ADA compliance issues</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Public Restroom Not ADA Compliant</td>
<td>Not per ADA requirements for clearance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hazardous Material Study Needed</td>
<td>NOT DONE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Library Lane Environmental Analysis

Woodstock is a community that participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and must adopt and enforce the floodplain management regulations that meet or exceed the minimum NFIP standards and requirements. These standards are intended to prevent loss of life and property as well as economic and social hardships that result from flooding.

6 Library Lane is a parcel of land that is .12 acres in size proposed for the building of the Sanders Annex. This parcel of land is adjacent to the Tannery Brook stream that courses through the Town of Woodstock. The Tannery Brook stream is classified as a Class C(t) stream and must adhere to a rigid and specific set of requirements that come not only from the NFIP but from the zoning ordinances promulgated by the Town of Woodstock. A Class C(t) stream is expected to have water of a quality and purity that can sustain a trout population.

Because of the classification of the Tannery Brook, the stream is protected by a 40 foot buffer zone that is measured from each edge of the stream. The map entitled “Location Perspective of the Library Annex” (next page) illustrates this buffer zone as well as the 1% line and floodway fringe line that define restrictions issued by the NFIP. This map also identifies the physical location proposed for the building of the Sanders Annex.
The map entitled “Laundromat Parcel Overlaid with the Brinner and Larios Topographic Map Showing Piling Plan” (next page) illustrates more clearly the critical elements of the area into which the Annex is proposed to be built. The 1% flood line is what was historically referred to as the 100 year flood line. This line is at an altitude above sea level (ASL) of 565.2 feet. Because this line transects the Annex parcel the building must be built such that the base of the Annex floor is at least 2 feet above the 1% line and the foundation must not alter the direction of the water flow. Further, there must be a staging of materials in the event of construction.
It is important to note on this map the existence and location of the pilings that are required to support the proposed Sanders Annex. These pilings will need to be formed into holes drilled into the ground in areas within both the 1% line and the 40 foot buffer area.

It is also important to note that the altitudes within the parcel boundaries vary only by fractions of an inch indicating that if a storm were to produce water sufficient to approach the 1% flood line it could very likely spread further and envelop more of the Annex property.

Because the proposed Annex would be built within the 40 foot buffer a permit would be required and issued only if the project satisfied all of the following criteria: (Woodstock Wetlands and Watercourse Protection Standards, Section 260-34 H)

(a) The proposed regulated activity is compatible with the public health, safety, and general welfare.

(b) There is no feasible or practical alternative to the proposed regulated activity, including, but not limited to, reduction in density, change in use, revision of road and lot layout, and/or related site planning considerations, that could accomplish the basic objectives of the proposal.
(c) There is no practicable alternative to the proposed regulated activity on another portion of the subject property that is not within a wetland, watercourse or wetland/watercourse buffer area.

Unfortunately, the proposed Annex plan could not fully satisfy criteria (b) or (c). The law applies to the “Applicant” who owns reasonable parcels and not to the parcel itself. The head of the Planning Board and the Water Course Inspector support this conclusion. To argue this interpretation would entail a legal encounter that could be lengthy and expensive. On the positive side of this predicament, construction of a building on the existing foundation of the Laundromat would be permitted, and a building would be issued with the following restrictions. (Wetlands and Watercourse Protection Standards Section 260-34 D)

Any form of mining, dredging or excavation and any grading or removal of soil, mud, sand, gravel, peat, silt or any other earth material, either directly or indirectly.

1. Any form of dumping, filling or depositing of any soil, stones, sand, gravel, mud, rubbish or fill of any kind, either directly or indirectly.

3. Construction or enlargement of any building or structure except as allowed by § 260-34D (13) and (14), whether or not the same affects the ebb and flow of water.

4. Construction of any road, driveway or parking facility, or paving, or establishment of trails consisting of impervious surfaces for vehicles, whether or not the same affects the ebb and flow of water.

5. Placement of any obstructions within a wetland, water body and/or watercourse, whether or not the same affect the ebb and flow of water.

6. Draining or ditching with the intent of mosquito control.

7. Creation of a diversion of water flow on any watercourse, including but not limited to constructing dams, docks (pilings), or bridges.

8. Timber harvesting or clearing of vegetation, except as allowed without a wetland and watercourse permit pursuant to § 260-34D of this chapter.

9. Commercial use or storage of any chemicals, dyes, fertilizers, fuels, herbicides, pesticides, petroleum products, de-icing materials, or similar materials in any regulated area, such that the same may cause pollution of waters.

10. Introduction of any influents of high thermal content to a wetland, water body or watercourse, as may be capable of causing deleterious ecological effect. Deleterious effects shall be defined in accordance with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Chapter X, Division of Water, Part 704 regulations, or its successor.

11. Installation of septic disposal systems or swimming pool drainage systems; discharging sewage treatment effluent or other liquid wastes; construction of wells; or installation of any pipe or other
conduit in a regulated area; whether or not said activities affect the ebb and flow of water.

(12) Withdrawal of ground- or surface water in excess of 2,500 gallons per day for more than seven days in the course of one year which may cause an increase or decrease in the flow, velocity or volume of water in any watercourse or water body (excluding the natural seasonal fluctuations of said watercourse or water body and controlled dam releases);

(13) Interbasin transfers of water (such as water supply distribution systems and sewer systems) of more than 10,000 gallons per day from one watershed to another watershed.

(14) Any other activity which impairs the function of a wetland, water body or watercourse as defined in § 260-34B of this chapter, unless said activity is allowed without a wetland permit under § 260-34D.

Additional reasons, besides the actual Wetland and Watercourse Law make this location appear unfeasible for construction on other than the existing foundation

1. The ground water table, next to the stream, as stated by the Water Course Inspector, is approximately 2 to 5 feet below grade, depending on the season. During construction or any type of digging would cause water to seep into the hole. The DEC does not allow this water to be put back into the stream. Ground water is a different temperature from the stream and you can’t affect the temperature in a protected trout stream. It is unfeasible to truck that water away during construction and even if you could, where could you legally dispose of it?

2. Turbid water and diverted water is also not allowed in the stream by DEC regulation.

3. It is approximately 30 feet down to bedrock. The stream bank and protected area is clay and boulders, not inexpensive conditions to build pier footings in. It can be done. Bridges are built in water all the time. But the expense would be considerably higher than in an unregulated location.

4. You cannot get a permit to build a concrete retaining wall, nor rip rap if it is in the stream bed, or any other device which canalizes the stream. If canalizing occurs, it increases the flow and velocity downstream, which could cause damage to the safety, public health and properties affected by the rapid current. The Library and the Town would be liable for stream canalization.

5. The ongoing maintenance through the years of the stream control devices would be additional expense that the library would incur.

6. The Sanders plan has pier footings and other elements such as the ramp, deck, and exterior stair, which are outside of the Laundromat foundation.
As stated above, it is possible to construct an Annex/building at 6 Library lane on the Laundromat foundation.

1. The Laundromat building and zone foundation exist (mostly) in the buffer.  
   Law states: Construction of an addition to an existing single-family residence or existing customary detached accessory structure within a wetland buffer area or watercourse buffer area, which addition shall be no greater than 300 square feet in structure coverage, and provided that such addition shall be constructed no closer than the existing structure to the top of bank of a regulated watercourse or the delineated wetland or water body boundary.

2. The inspector has said that even though this is not a single family residence, he can allow the addition to the existing building, because, like a house it is existing.

3. The 300 sf. addition cannot be any closer to the top of bank than the existing structure is already. That actual location is up to some interpretation of the code.

4. Any foundation dug has to be minimal… no heavy equipment within 20 ft. of the buffer zone. This means hand dug piers. It sounds impractical but this technique was also used at Woodstock Commons, also in a flood zone.

The Sanders plan for the Annex, along with preliminary engineering reports has not been formally reviewed by the Town regulatory agencies.

Wetland’s inspector. He has seen some if the drawings and reports informally. Informally, he has said that the mitigation construction proposed by the Engineer do not meet the standards of the law.

If the Board decides to continue with the Sanders Annex Plan, any final decision should occur in an actual submission for this permit. It is our recommendation that the Architect or his engineer make the actual submittal and not the Library Board. In this way, the building professionals are getting actual contact with the regulatory agencies.

In conclusion, we have dealt with some of the environmental concerns and the existing regulations. We have not studied in depth the other 2 lots, nor the interior environment of any of the buildings. Also lacking are any requirements from the DEC.

However, based upon the environmental impact upon Tannery Brook and the buffer zone and the added expense of any foundation built in this area, plus the liability to the Library and Town in the event of a strong weather event, our conclusion is that construction across the street from 6 Library Lane will be more in keeping with sound environmental principles.

<BACK>
Preliminary Zoning Study

From the Zoning Ordinance-

260-4 Authority and Purposes (of the 1989 Zoning Ordinance)-

“This chapter is enacted pursuant to the enabling provision of Articles 2 and 3 of the Municipal Home Rule Law of the State of New York and Article 16 of the Town Law to protect and enhance the physical and visual environment of the Town of Woodstock, to promote and protect the public health, safety, comfort, convenience, economy, aesthetics, and general welfare, and for the following purposes:

A. To promote and effectuate the orderly physical development of the Town of Woodstock in accordance with the Town of Woodstock Comprehensive Plan.

B. To encourage the most appropriate use of land in the Town in order to conserve and enhance the value of property.

C. To regulate business development consistent with the character and environmental resources of the Town, to eliminate the spread of strip business developments, and to provide for adequate and suitably located commercial facilities.

D. To create a suitable system of open spaces and to protect and enhance existing wooded areas, scenic areas and waterways.

E. To regulate building densities in order to ensure access of light and circulation of air, to facilitate the prevention and fighting of fires, to prevent undue concentration of population, to lessen congestion on streets and highways, and to facilitate the adequate provision of water and sewerage.

F. To improve transportation facilities and traffic circulation and to provide adequate off-street parking and loading facilities.

G. To realize a development plan properly designed to conserve the use of land and to keep down the cost of municipal services.

H. To encourage privacy for residences and freedom from nuisances.

I. To protect the Town against unsightly, obtrusive and objectionable land uses and operations.

J. To enhance Town aesthetics and to maintain the Town's present character and natural beauty.

K. To enhance the Town as an arts colony and cultural center.”

ZONING MAP/ Zoning District:
There are three lots owned by the Library.

Library Lake, Lot 9 is in the Hamlet Commercial District (HC). Lot 9 is a corner lot and could be combined with interior lot 8, making both lots Corner Lots. This is the assumption taken but it needs clarification as the two lots are in different Zoning Districts.

Note that this preliminary Zoning Analysis has not been reviewed with the Zoning Officer.

The other two sites- the Existing Library, Lot 8, and the Laundromat site, Lot 26, are in the Hamlet Residential (HR) district.

The main difference in the two Zones (HC and HR), as far as Area and Bulk, is in the Front yard requirements. HR, with sewer and central water (as lot 8 has and Lot 26 COULD have),
has a 20' front yard and the HC district has a 15' front yard.

260-19 Maximum FAR is set forth in Schedule of Area and Bulk Regulations

Schedule of Area and Bulk Regulations- HC and HR Zones

Min. Lot area- 10,000 sf
Max. Structure Coverage- 25%
Minimum Open Space 25%

Open Space per Code definition is lawns, playgrounds, watercourses etc. Not covered and not parking lots or driveways. Parking is Lot Coverage, subtracted from Lot Area for calculation

Minimum lot width- 60'
Front yard- 15' in HC, 20' in HR as noted above
Side yard- 10'
Rear yard- 25'
Floor Area Ratio- .63

Determination of what is the front and what are the required yards (see Corner Lot discussion below):

260-26 A- “On streets, roads or highways with less than a fifty-foot right-of-way, the front setback in all districts shall be measured perpendicularly from the center line of the existing right-of-way with 25 feet added to the required front yard setback to establish the building line.”

Ellen Casciaro, Zoning Officer, has determined that 212 and Library Lane are Front Yards, Lasher strip (to the north) is the Rear Yard and the side abutting the Lasher funeral home is the Side Yard. This confirms the assumption that Lots 8 and 9 may be combined but front yard, especially relating to parking, is to be determined. An argument could be made that the North is the side yard and the funeral side is the rear yard but it is moot as we are well within the setbacks as it is and the difference between side (10’) and rear (25’) is all part of a ZBA variance anyway.

Bear in mind that all Library buildings were built before the Zoning Resolution and therefore grandfathered. It is believed that this grandfathering includes any extension of a non-complying condition (e.g.- extending the book barn along Lasher Lane).

More important is the determination of Yard requirements.

260-27 Corner Lots (This relates only to the Main site- not the Stream side)

260-27A- No lot shall have more than two front yards. The Zoning Officer shall determine which of the remaining yards shall be the side and which the rear yard. Ellen has determined that 212 and Library Lane are the Front, the Lasher access right of way to the north is the rear and the abutment with the Lasher funeral home is the side yard - as noted above.

260-26 A- Modification of required yards- (relates to all 3 lots)- “On streets, roads or highways with less than a fifty-foot right-of-way, (Library Lane and Lasher Lane), the front setback in all districts shall be measured perpendicularly from the center line of the existing right-of-way
with 25 feet added to the required front yard setback to establish the building line."
Note that both Library Lane and Lasher Lane are only 20’ wide rights of way.

The two main sites:
   Front Yards-
   212 is a 50’ right of way and, as noted above, Library Lane and the Lasher Lane are 20’ rights of way.

Therefore, the Front Yard on 212 is clearly 25’.

The Front Yard on the two combined lots along Library Lane (clarification needed) -
The Front Yard for the front parcel, Lot 9, is (25’ to start + 15’ HC Front Yard) 40’ from the center of Library lane.
The Front Yard for the rear parcel, Lot 8- on which the library stands, is (25’ to start + 20’ HR Front Yard) 45’. So the Reading room and Directors office may be in the Front Yard.

   Side yard-
The Side yard, bordering Lasher’s Funeral Home is 10’. We are within that dimension (to be confirmed by Survey).

   Rear yard-
The Rear Yard along the 20’ wide Lasher Lane is (25’ from center line + 20’ Rear Yard) - 45’ from the center of the road. So a portion of our Reading Room is in the front setback as well as the whole book barn, also perhaps the north face of the Reading Room, which is about 36’ further from Lasher than the Book Barn face.

In all aspects, other than the Front yard along 212, the existing library intrudes on the set backs required- again grandfathered.

The Laundromat site:
This, Lot 26 is an interior lot- not a corner.
   Front yard-
The Front yard requirement is 40’ from the center of Library lane. Note that the existing structure complies but it is believed that the Sanders design may not comply- stairs.
   Side yard-
Side yard- 10’. The existing Laundromat is about 2’ from the side Lot Line. A determination would be needed on the ramps and stairs to the roof shown in the Sanders design. The building is at the 10’ Wide Yard requirement but the stairs are about 5’ from the line and the Ramp is on the line. Refer to ZR 260-24 C (3) for further interpretation. The wording is not clear to the writer.
   Rear yard-
Rear yard- 25’. All comply

**260-22 Height Additions:**
“That portion of a structure which encroaches on any required yard may not be increased in height, regardless of whether the encroachment existed at the time of the adoption of this
chapter or was permitted by variance.”
*(This effects both sites- a second floor is a Height Addition).*

**26-30- Parking and loading standards**

26-30A- Required number of off-street parking spaces:
One car per 400 gross so and one space for each employee for “Cultural facility”
(“Museum, Library, art gallery or philanthropic and institutional use”).
*(Note that the Village of New Paltz Zoning Regulation has no parking requirement for the Village library.)*

26-30B- Design Standards for off street parking spaces.

“(2) No parking area shall encroach on any portion of a required front yard or within 15 feet of any public right-of-way. --“
“(6) All off-street parking areas shall be designed to eliminate the need to back out onto any public street, road or highway.”
*(This means that all the existing parking along Library Lane is not per code- no backing out onto Library Lane and that the start of off street parking must start beyond the Required Front Yard (25’)), which very adversely effects the potential of parking on any of the 3 sites. It is noted that the perpendicular parking arrangement in place allows for cars to enter Library lane, park, back out and return to 212. Parallel or angled parking would force exiting traffic to continue along Library Lane, impacting the community. Perpendicular parking is not desirable but may be the lesser of evils.)*

**260-30C- Cash payment in lieu of on-site provision of required Off- Street parking places**

Provides, in HC and HR Districts, “--where Planning Board has determined that parking cannot be sufficiently and / or safely accommodated on site, provision of the minimum required number of off-street parking places—may be alternatively satisfied for any commercial used, -- by payment to a special Town Parking Fund of an initial charge followed by an annual maintenance fee---.”

There is no way, other than paving Library Lake, with a required variance on Minimum Open Space, to satisfy the parking requirement in part or in full. It is recommended that cash payment of variance is the correct route to pursue if required.

On another note, The Town parking lot at the south of 212 is 86 steps from 212 via the area between what is now Euphoria Yoga and The Gilded Carriage. It is an area that a cross walk could be installed- with curb on both sides. An easement would be needed. It should be pursued by the Town- not only for the Library, but for the Town Hall. Proper access to that parking lot was suggested in the 2007 report.

**ANALYSIS OF THE TWO SITES WITH REGARD TO AREA AND BULK REGULATION.**

**EXISTING LIBRARY SITE:**
No full survey is available at this time so all information is subject to verification. We did measure the footprint of the building. Building footprint is approximately 7,200 sf which is
used herein below.

Lot 8- 15,000 sf (present Library tax lot)
  Max. Structure Coverage- Not in compliance (Lot 8 alone).
Max. Coverage (15,000 x .25) is 3,750 sf. We have a footprint of 7,200 so, so we cannot consider Lot 8 as enough. We must combine Lots 8 and 9 to continue the analysis.

(Note: Lot 9 is Library Lake, transferred to the Library by good Lashers in 1957. The site, by tax map is the same 100’ depth as the existing Lib. site and 112’ along Library Lane where the parking is.
There is an undefined 10’ drainage easement from Lashers to the SE corner of the site. No structure may be erected on this easement.)

Combined Lots 8 and 9- 27,450 sf of land

  Max. Structure Coverage (25% allowed)- Not in compliance-
Allowed: (27,450 x .25) is 6,863 sf.
We have a 7,200 sf foot print so we are already in noncompliance, having over covered by (7,200 - 6,863) or about 337 sf.
(So any additional building coverage will be a further noncompliance issue.)

  Minimum Open Space (25% required)- In compliance-
Required Open Space (not covered by parking or building): 6,863 sf (27,450 x .25)
Actual: 17,050 sf
Assume that the existing street parking along Library Lane is 20’ deep by 110’ long and allow another 1,000 sf for paving at the Book Barn- add (110 x 20) 2,200 sf + 1,000 to the 7,200 sf of building footprint and you have 10,400 sf of Lot Coverage.
Open Space is Lot Area minus Lot Coverage. 27,450 – 10,400 = 17,050 sf of Open Space. 17,050 is greater than the required 6,863 sf by 10,187 sf.
So we could “cover” another 10,187 sf with parking. Note the over built Structure Coverage per above.

  Yards- Generally not in Compliance. See the analysis above.
Variances are needed no matter what is planned.

  Floor Area Ratio- In Compliance
Allowed: .63 x lot area. .63 x 27,450 sf = 17,294 sf of floor area.
Actual: 8,600 sf
Gross Floor Area is 7,200 first floor + 1,400 second floor = 8,600 Gross Floor Area +/-.
17,294- 8,600 (existing) is 8,694 sf, which is far below the allowable (17,294).
We can add 8,694 sf of Floor Area on the 2 combined sites to the west of Library Lane. (So, we will never get to a problem on FAR with a substantial additional building.)

THE LAUNDROMAT SITE:
We have a survey but it does not indicate the building area or location/ yards-information is subject to verification. We measured the building footprint at 1,072 sf.
Lot 26 Lot area = 8,276 sf per survey, which states .190 acres. Building area is 1,072 sf. The existing building location scales at 38’ from front property line and 2’ from each side property line. There is full parking in front of about 38’ x 71’ or about 2,600 sf of coverage. 

**Maximum Structure Coverage (25% allowed)** - In compliance.
Allowed: 8,276 x .25= 2,069
Actual: 1,074 sf
We can add 995 sf

**Minimum Open Space (25% required)** - In compliance-
Required Open Space (not covered by parking or building): 2,069 sf (8,276 x .25)
Actual: 3,141 sf
1,072 sf building + 2,069 parking = 3,141 sf
Open Space is Lot Area minus Lot Coverage. 8,276 – 3,141 = 5,135 sf of Open Space.
5,135 sf is greater than the required 2,069 sf by 3,066 sf.

**Front yard** In compliance-
The building location scales at about 38’ from Library Lane.

**Side yard** - Not in compliance.
Survey scales at 2’ to the side yard - 10’ required.

**Rear yard** (across the brook) In compliance-
The building location scales on the survey as 108’ from the rear line. 25’ required.
*Note that the south corner of the existing building scales at 2’ from the “Top of Bank and 17’-6” at the centerline of the building. This is noted as it may/ could be the controlling factor on rear yard requirements.*

**Floor Area Ratio** - In Compliance
Allowed: .63 x lot area. .63 x 8,276 sf = 5,214 sf of floor area.
Actual: 1,072 sf
We can add (5,214sf – 1,072 sf) 4,142 sf of Floor area.
(So, we will never get to a problem on FAR.)

**COMBINING ALL THREE LOTS INTO ONE ZONING LOT:**
Ellen has said that there is precedent in the Town to combine lots not only adjacent but across the street. Not desirable but of interest.
So, combine the 3 lots and it is estimated that we can build IN ADDITION TO WHAT WE HAVE as follows:
Structure coverage: Add 658 sf of Structure coverage on either site or divide it as needed.
Minimum Open Space: We can add another (10,187 + 3,066) 13,254 sf of lot coverage for paving or building.
Additional floor area- We can add (8,694 + 4,142) 12,836 sf of floor area.
Combining the lots may bring us into a viable position with regard to the above three items, but will still require a variance for Yards, UNLESS the Zoning Official allows an extension of a non complying yard, which is not a deeper intrusion. We may appear before ZBA.
As we may expect, the Planning Board would probably refer any application requiring a Variance to the ZBA. For your reference, the 5 criteria used for Area (not Use) Variances are, per 260-103(b)-are:

“In making its determination, the Zoning Board of Appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination the Board shall also consider the following five factors in balancing these interests:

(a) Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance.
(b) Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance.
(c) Whether the requested area variance is substantial.
(d) Whether the proposed area variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.
(e) Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created. (The consideration of whether the alleged difficulty was self-created shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance.)

(2) The Zoning Board of Appeals, in the granting of area variances, shall grant the minimum variance that it shall deem necessary and adequate and at the same time preserve and protect the character of the neighborhood and the health, safety and welfare of the community.”

(We could expect a variance for almost all items based on the above. Perhaps height might be an exemption but we will not go up that high as we can go to 35’ or about three stories. Parking may be included as an exemption.)

EDITORS NOTE: THE ABOVE INFORMATION MAY NOT BE CORRECT AND NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED IN DETAIL BY THE ZONING ENFORCEMENT OFFICIAL. IT IS A STUDY IN PROGRESS AND NEEDS CONFIRMATION.

MARTIN NYSTROM
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Estimated Cost of an Entirely New Library
Building on the existing site would save the cost of acquiring new land, although costs would be incurred for relocating the Library to a temporary site during construction.

For a 'Quality' Building
16,000 SF @ $350/SF: $5,600,000
Demolition of existing building: $100,000
Site Work (estimate taken from 2007 report with 15% added for inflation): $371,450
Fixtures, Furnishings, and Equipment (from 2007 report): $212,000
Moving and Temporary Library Expenses: $100,000
Architectural/Engineering fees (10% of construction, demo & site work): $607,000
Clerk of the Works (from 2007 report): $57,000
Permits (a percentage of construction): $75,000
Estimated Total: $7,122,450

For an 'Architecturally Inspirational' Building (50% premium)
16,000 SF @ 525/SF: $8,400,000.
Demolition of existing building: $100,000
Site Work (estimate taken from 2007 report with 15% added for inflation): $371,450
Fixtures, Furnishings, and Equipment (from 2007 report): $212,000
Moving and Temporary Library Expenses: $100,000
Architectural/Engineering fees (10% of construction, demo & site work): $887,000
Clerk of the Works (from 2007 report): $57,000
Permits (a percentage of construction): $100,000
Estimated Total: $10,227,450
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A look at the Joel Sanders Architect Annex Design

The Facilities Task Force has considered the Annex Proposal by Joel Sanders in the following ways:

I. The environment. We have reviewed the mitigation proposed in the Feltzner Engineering Preliminary Plan and have noted his firm’s preliminary design for stream bank stabilization. We have looked at the landscaping and vegetation plan. The site itself is buildable.

II. The footings. We have examined how the piers relate to the site. We have noted the frequency of the footings and where they are in relation to the flood plain and the area subject to the Watercourse and Wetlands requirements.

III. The interior floor plan. We have discussed the layout of the interior stairs, the toilet and kitchen facilities.

IV. We have discussed also the equipment, furniture and programming of this space.

V. Accessibility. We have discussed the access from the ramp and from the monumental entry stairs and access to the roof. We understand how Sanders arrived at the amount of ramp due to the necessity of the building being raised above the base flood elevation. We also looked at the Sanders design with the option for no ramp and using a mechanical lift or an elevator with an exterior entrance. We applied this concept to the initial idea of the Annex being no larger than the Laundromat footprint.

VI. Privacy. We have discussed the amount of glass and the type of users in the building who may want anonymity. We discussed the how a glass wall could interfere with computer and A/V use in terms of viewing the screens. We discussed the glass walls in terms of energy efficiency.

VII. Parking. We have discussed the parking places that will be removed if the Annex is built as designed. We also considered the amount of parking places that could be laid out on this site if no building was there at all.

In our layout for legal parking, there were 5 parking places possible.

This is the same amount that is there presently. dc

We have discussed the parking in terms impact on the hardware store parking.

VIII. We have explored the telephone pole placement in regards to any building on the site.

IX. We examined Joel Sander’s preliminary layout for the Annex, Dated May 20th, 2013 which fit the Laundromat footprint as opposed the larger current
design.

X. We have examined the cost effectiveness of construction of the Annex as designed, alone and in comparison to other location options. We have looked at the cost of a generic building on the Laundromat footprint which gave us a basic understanding of the potential costs if Joel Sanders current design was downsized to the Laundromat footprint.

XI. We have discussed alternative uses for the Laundromat site such as Friends of the Library use, storage, potential programming of the space that you would want isolated from the main library because of conflicts…IE, ceramic kiln, uses that needs environmental isolation, etc.,

XII. We have discussed the implications of programming, staffing, life cycle costing in an annex which is not connected physically to the Existing Library compares to an annex that is physically connected.

XIII. The Annex has been discussed in terms of the politics of the town.

XIV. The Annex has been discussed in terms of funding through private sources, grants and bonding potential for success.

An Analysis of Library Parking, by Martin Nystrom

All existing parking requires backing into a public road, which is not a safe or permitted layout. The situation is exacerbated by the narrow width of Library Lane. Parallel street parking is safer but we would lose half the spots. Perpendicular parking could be provided on the north property line (Lasher Lane) but that would use up half of the developable square footage and add only eight spots.

Proper parking standards would consist of central exit and turning radius’ from Library lane to stalls parallel with the Lane - a ‘hammerhead’ layout. With these standards there would be no appreciable increase in parking available even if both the Library Green and 6 Library Lane were completely paved over.

The existing "back-into-traffic" grandfathered parking arrangement, while not up to current standards, is probably the best solution; it allows exiting traffic to go to 212 along Library Lane so traffic doesn’t have to go back into the residential area behind the Library.

The only adequate solution I see for the Library (and Town Hall, for that matter) is to create a path that leads to and from the large parking lot on the Lower Comeau. Picture a paved, well-lit, clearly marked pedestrian crossing of 212, that links to a sidewalk to the Library Entrance. This Comeau tie-in was the solution recommended by Architecture + in 2007. It remains the best available option, although it will require a great deal of cooperation between various parties, including the State (rt. 212).
The Library Green and Lake

The front lawn of the Library is a peaceful place for the community and events that are sponsored by the Library. With one exception, The Lake. Many events have been affected by the flooding that occurs in the center of the front lawn. It would take only a short time to remedy the problem and it can be done with a small expenditure. Relief from the flooding can be solved by installing a small catch basin in the center of the flood area and diverting the collection of water to the Tannery Brook. Currently there are two solutions to accomplish this. One is to connect the catch basin to the 24 inch steel pipe that is buried underground and runs from the Funeral Home pond across the Library front lawn directly to the Brook. The second solution would be to connect the catch basin to one of the two existing catch basins that the Town has installed to collect surface water from Library Lane. These two catch basins are directly draining water to the Tannery Brook. Management from the Funeral Home has no objection to the Library connecting to the steel pipe and the Town Highway Superintendent has indicated that he would be agreeable to such a solution and has indicated that he has the equipment to help find the proper location for the Library catch basin. Spring time would be a good time to take this action so there would be time for the reseeded grass area to recover before the summer activity.
ADDENDUM #1: Additional Thoughts From Various FTF Members

Over the last six months, various members of the FTF addressed several issues related to the Library and its expansion plans. Here are some additional thoughts/ideas/suggestions/comments they would like to share with the Library Board:

• Jerry Washington believes the Library should consider the changing demographics of Woodstock as it plans its future programs. He has some concrete suggestions about Library services that would be useful to both full time residents and second homeowners: [Link to Golden Opportunity]

• Amy Raff has some erudite words to say about the future of public libraries, and why the internet and e-books are not reducing the space needs of libraries: [Link to Future of Public Libraries]

• Barry Miller believes in the importance of Placemaking and Stakeholders, and he wants to share his thoughts on those subjects as the Board considers a new campus-wide Master Plan: [Links to Placemaking and Link to Identify Key Stakeholders]

• Maria DeFranco hopes the Architect of the Master Plan will show the community an exciting schematic design and renderings that will provide a road map to creating a civic structure of which we can all be proud. She is encouraged by the passion of the Woodstock community, the FoL, the Library Board and the FTF. She hopes we can all get energized by a dynamic building design and that together we can create an atmosphere that will unleash private donations and fulfill the Library's expansion plans sooner rather than later. She has some powerful words to share about how Architecture can inspire us: [Link to Subtle Importance of Architecture]

• Joe Mangan agrees with Maria that architecture can be and should strive to be inspirational. However, he notes that a two-story North Wing to the Library would be largely shielded from view by the existing Library building, so he urges the Library Board to focus more on an inspirational interior, along with cost-effectiveness and value. He believes the Library should strive for inspirational exterior architecture when building in a more visible location.

• Maria agrees with Joe that a North Wing, when viewed from the outside will probably be more functional than inspirational. She sees more possibility for an 'appealing architectural statement' in an upgrade/addition to the front of the existing Library building. She suggests that those wanting inspirational architectural may have to be patient. She envisions a phased project that may not provide instant gratification, but will ultimately deliver true satisfaction.

• Martin Nystrom feels the existing Library building's interior is not a desirable nor flexible space; it lacks light and a comfortable environment. He sees the proposed North Wing as a high-ceilinged, open space, flexible for evolving use as an anchor for the next phase of Library expansion, which will be defined by the next generation of Library stewards.
• Tim Moore urges the Library Board to remain positive as they continue their good work on behalf of the Library and our community: Link to Call for Unity and Open Process

• Tim Moore has some advice to the Library Board about communication going forward Link to Thoughts on Communication

• Amy Raff would like to remind everyone that, the Library staff is a committed, non-judgmental team who offer the same level and quality of Library service to all people, regardless of one's views about the Annex or any expansion project. She and the Library staff work hard to create a congenial space and atmosphere. Whether you bring your children in for a story hour or to read to Wadley the dog; come to a Library forum, enjoy music at 'Live at the Library', use the computers or get one-on-one computer assistance, browse the shelves for books or DVDs, read magazines, get help with your new e-reading devices, order books or pickup books, or learn how to download an audiobook, you can always expect a warm welcome from the Library staff.
A Golden Opportunity

According to the 2010 census, the population of Woodstock is now top heavy with nearly 50% over the age of 55. This is a group of citizens that are near or in retirement and have had responsible jobs in their working years. They are a vibrant community with a desire to continue to expand their knowledge.

Colleges and Universities in the United States, and around the world are offering Distance/Remote Education on all sorts of topics and giving course credits for those individuals that successfully complete the course. MOOC, or Massive Open Online Courses is a delivery process that is active in a number of Universities in our area. Pace University in New York City is one whose web site demonstrates the broad spectrum of courses that are offered. https://coursesites.com/mooccatalog

Some of the space that will come available with the FTF proposed expansion could be used to provide a Remote Conference Center that could provide connection to Internet based educational sources for small groups and individuals in our community. This would be an attractive facility for the older community as well as those in the active working segment of our population.

This same facility could very well be an asset that would attract the 2nd Homeowner. Several years ago the Library sponsored a "stone soup" discussion session in the Community Center that explored the question of what we would like Woodstock to be in five years. One common answer was that the Town should strive to have an infrastructure that would allow our 2nd Homeowners have their primary residences in Woodstock.

It would not be beyond reality to envision the Woodstock Library expanding the Distance/Remote Education Center into a business resource/remote conference center that could use the same facilities that support the existing remote college courses. This may seem way-out to some, but think on it a bit, and recognize that it is happening in other remote towns as a way of educating their children in subjects that are needed but not locally available.

We all may feel secure with our lives in Woodstock, with our trees, mountains and quiet streams, but think of what our children and their children are going to need in future years with existing and future technological products and a diminishing work force.
The Future of Public Libraries / 21st Century Library

Digital technology has transformed the services the library provides and the ways in which libraries provide those services. The internet, databases, downloadable content and the growth in the use of mobile devices creates new opportunities for the library to remain relevant and bring value to the community.

Many fear the library of the future is without books. This is already happening in some libraries and may continue, but for now one of the biggest challenges in the 21st century library is having the financial resources and space to provide “traditional” library services while providing space to offer new services and space for other services to reveal themselves. The future is now and in order to accommodate the future the public library must create flexible, multi-purpose spaces that can be reconfigured easily while new community needs emerge.

The modern library does not solely exist to acquire, collect, organize and maintain content, but to offer space for the community to create content. In this vein, it is said the purpose of the library to “improve society by facilitating knowledge creation in the community.” There are a number of ways to facilitate knowledge creation in the community. It can be done through our collections (books, DVDs, database) and programs (computer classes, Library Forums, story hour) and the creation of collaboration space. The 21st century public library should offer collaboration space where people can develop and share skills. Some examples of community created content can take the form of a maker space, podcasting, video-production, and Espresso Book Machine (a print-on-demand for self-published works machine).

The public library has always invested in that new thing that people cannot afford as individuals but can afford as community – it is rooted in a sharing economy where the community is more powerful in the marketplace than the individual. Public libraries have always been the place where people can expect to be exposed to leading technologies – the internet, eReaders, mobile devices, 3-d printers, etc.

The public library needs to create space, not just to increase program attendance, but to also increase creativity for the future. The public library is the people’s university. It is the place to learn about new technology and software programs. The public library is the place where freedom of inquiry is not dependent on consumerism – people do not have to buy anything to be here – presence at the public library is justified by curiosity, desire for knowledge not currency.

The public library has always been the place where people can learn about themselves, each other and the world. The future brings new technologies and ways for this to happen. As the future unfolds the public library will continue to stay relevant and responsive by creating new spaces and environments to bring the community together to create knowledge and make the world a better place.
Placemaking:

Placemaking is a multi-faceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces. Placemaking capitalizes on a local community’s assets, inspiration, and potential, with the intention of creating public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and well-being.

What if we built our communities around places?
Placemaking is a quiet movement that reimagines public spaces as the heart of every community, in every city. It’s a transformative approach that inspires people to create and improve their public places. Placemaking strengthens the connection between people and the places they share.

Placemaking is how we collectively shape our public realm to maximize shared value. Rooted in community-based participation, Placemaking involves the planning, design, management and programming of public spaces. More than just creating better urban design of public spaces, Placemaking facilitates creative patterns of activities and connections (cultural, economic, social, ecological) that define a place and support its ongoing evolution. Placemaking is how people are more collectively and intentionally shaping our world, and our future on this planet.

With the increasing awareness that our human environment is shaping us, Placemaking is how we shape humanity’s future. While environmentalism has challenged human impact on our planet, it is not the planet that is threatened but humanity’s ability to live viably here. Placemaking is building both the settlement patterns, and the communal capacity, for people to thrive with each other and our natural world.

It takes a place to create a community, and a community to create a place
An effective Placemaking process capitalizes on a local community’s assets, inspiration, and potential, ultimately creating good public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and well being. When we asked visitors to pps.org what Placemaking means to them, responses suggested that this process is essential—even sacred—to people who truly care about the places in their lives.

When you focus on place, you do everything differently
Unfortunately the way our communities are built today has become so institutionalized that community stakeholders seldom have a chance to voice ideas and aspirations about the places they inhabit. Placemaking breaks through this by showing planners, designers, and engineers how to move beyond their habit of looking at communities through the narrow lens of single-minded goals or rigid professional disciplines. The first step is listening to best experts in the field—the people who live, work and play in a place.

Placemaking grows into an international movement
As more communities engage in Placemaking and more professionals call their work “Placemaking,” it is now essential to preserve the integrity of Placemaking. A great public space cannot be measured simply by physical attributes; it must serve people as a vital place where function is put ahead of form. PPS encourages everyone—citizens and professionals alike—to focus on places and the people who use them.

Placemaking strikes a balance between the built, the social, the ecological and even the spiritual qualities of a place. Fortunately, we can all be inspired by the examples of many great Placemakers who have worked to promote this vision through the years.
Placemaking belongs to everyone: its message and mission is bigger than any one person or organization. PPS remains dedicated to supporting the Placemaking movement as a “backbone organization”, growing the network and offering our resources and experiences to all the other Placemakers out there.

**What Placemaking Is–and what it isn’t**

**Placemaking IS:**
1. Community-driven
2. Visionary
3. Function before form
4. Adaptable
5. Inclusive
6. Focused on creating destinations
7. Flexible
8. Culturally aware
9. Ever changing
10. Trans-disciplinary
11. Context-led
12. Transformative
13. Inspiring
14. Collaborative
15. Sociable

**Placemaking ISN’T:**
1. Imposed from above
2. Reactive
3. Design-driven
4. A blanket solution
5. Exclusionary
6. Monolithic development
7. Overly accommodating of the car
8. One-size-fits-all
9. Static
10. Discipline-driven
11. Privatized
12. One-dimensional
13. Dependent on regulatory controls
14. A cost/benefit analysis
15. Project-focused
16. A quick fix
Some links
http://www.pps.org/reference/what_is_placemaking/
http://www.placemakingchicago.com/about/
http://www.placemakingchicago.com/about/principles.asp
http://www.createmiplace.org/what-is-placemaking.html
http://www.artplaceamerica.org/articles/principles-of-creative-placemaking/
http://www.pps.org/

here is a quick video on youtube that shows the benefits of Placemaking
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PveKmpyySLE
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Identify Key Stakeholders

Who directly benefits from the library programs and services you provide? Who’s in the background, supporting your efforts and cheering you on at every step? Which individuals or groups share your passion for improving outcomes for youth and families? Take the first steps toward advocacy by identifying these key stakeholders in your library community:

**Primary Stakeholders**

When we hear the term “library stakeholders,” we may think first about the groups and individuals the library reaches directly with its resources, programs, and services. These primary stakeholders include the following individuals and groups:

1. **Children of all ages**;
2. **Parents and their surrogates** (non-parental caregivers, foster parents, etc.);
3. **Educational partners** (schools, teachers, home schools, charter schools, public schools, private schools, parochial schools, preschools, daycare centers, after school programs, tutors); and
4. **Organizations serving youth** (after-school programs, scouts, recreation programs).

Within these general categories, we also recognize our service to distinct communities with unique needs:

1. Immigrant or cultural/religious populations;
2. Children and families coping with disabilities (mental, physical or emotional);
3. Foster children; and
4. LGBT youth and parents.

**Secondary Stakeholders**

Secondary stakeholders are individuals and groups in your community who may not reap the immediate benefits of library programs and services but who share your passion for supporting children and families. We often need to seek these partners out. By cultivating them, we can develop a broader base of support in the community.

Gaining credibility and becoming part of community networks takes time and effort, but becoming a go-to partner is easier than you think! Start small. Talk to people. Keep up on activities in your community. Look for opportunities to make connections. Be realistic about what you can offer and be willing to ask others to provide support in forwarding library goals. Congratulate people for their successes!

Consider these potential partners in your efforts to rally support for library programs and services benefiting youth and families:

**People of influence.** Politicians; policy makers and their staff; religious institutions; local service clubs and organizations including Friends of Library groups; and library commissioners and trustees. Seek them out at all stages of their political lives. Get to know
them personally and attempt to influence their view of the library and its role in the community. Involve them.

**Other local government agencies and departments serving children, youth, and families.** Check your connections. Do you know administrators and staff in the department of parks and recreation? Do they know you? Public Health and Health Department? Department of Family Services? Housing Authority, Probation Department?

When we engage with these agencies, we advance our mutual causes. Are there commissions and interagency collaborations focusing on youth and family issues in the community? We shouldn’t wait to be invited to join. Participate and convey the library’s role in education to the members of these groups. (Be prepared for sitting in meetings and using all of your persuasive techniques over and over again.) Offer help with their local initiatives in support of children and families. Be enthusiastic and effective partners. Ask them to contribute to your projects as well, and celebrate joint successes!

**Local business people.** These community leaders can provide funds or in-kind contributions. They can share their expertise in library activities and programs, help publicize your programs and generally create goodwill.

**Library support groups.** The Junior Friends of the Library; teen advisory boards; parent booster clubs; preschool story hour parent booster clubs; reading groups; and youth volunteers. These groups are all stakeholders, and they can be advocates, too. Develop and cultivate them as allies and supporters, and they will be there in times of need.

**Cultural and special interest organizations.** Museums, arts organizations, science groups and other interest-based groups are also stakeholders and potential advocates. Engage them in efforts to educate and improve the quality of life for the children and families in your community. Sometimes they have resources or can apply for grants when you cannot.

**Funders and philanthropic individuals and groups.** Philanthropists can also be identified and nurtured. They have a stake in the well being of children and families in your community, and they should be educated about the important role of the library in developing healthy children and families.
The Subtle Importance of Architecture

Quantifiable Aspects of Successful Architecture

1. The Architect creates a building that provides shelter from the elements.

2. The building is a structure that responds to and completes the program within budget.

3. The building is in harmony with the surrounding environment. This harmony does not always have to be contextual, but it must be “in a positive conversation” with its neighboring structures. It should also have a responsible carbon footprint, and responsible life cycle costing.

The Art of Architecture

The Art of Architecture goes beyond the act of responsibly enclosing space. There are innate elements to successful architecture. These qualities are often intangible and difficult to quantify. They are the parts of the construction that speak to our psychological needs, though subjective in nature. These spaces, often in a subliminal way, affect our outlook. For instance, … a tight, small room with a low ceiling, poor ventilation and no natural light, does not encourage us to spend time in that uncomfortable place. In contrast, a public meeting taking place in a high ceilinged room with natural light and fresh air encourages the participants to linger and express their minds.

A partial list of these elements that are innate to good architecture include: Beauty, Proportion, Coherence, Rhythm, Balance, and Play of Light

These elements are also hard to quantify as exemplified by the word “beauty”. Just like the rose, beauty, means different things in the eye of each beholder. Yet one knows when these concepts are successful by an internal resonance with the environment created.

Regardless of individual interpretations of these elements, all of them contribute to a “Sense of Place.”

1. “Architecture is about the making of “Place”, and the making of memory. Architecture gives us joy if we are lucky, and it gives satisfaction and comfort, but it also connects us to our neighbors, since the architecture of a town or city is the physical expression of a common ground.” Paul Goldberger

2. “We shape our buildings and afterwards, our buildings shape us.” Sir Winston Churchill

3. “And perhaps most important of all, in an age when so many of our contacts are virtual, when we often live in the virtual world of computers, architecture is a constant reminder of the urgency, of the meaning and of the value of the real. Buildings are not just inanimate objects; they are occasions for human contact, and they are the shapers of human contact, which makes them a living part of our world.” Paul Goldberger

4. Human activity needs a place. We can stay in caves or we can build cathedrals. Architecture matters because it supports human activities by providing safe shelter for
it while engaging our senses in beneficial ways. Most buildings will outlast the people who build it. The value that architecture brings to our built environment will be remembered and appreciated far longer than the cost. Phil Zemke, Rhinebeck Architecture

5. "‘Timelessness’: The capacity for a building to be able to endure both in terms of performance and utility; that (a building) not be designed so specifically that it cannot adapt to changing cultural and technological requirements.” Barry Price, Architect

**Cultural Identity: Architecture expresses who we are as a people.**

“Architecture creates landmarks, identity, genus loci. Architecture gives places identity… to orient so that you know where you are in the world and in the best of places, why you are there and why you will return.”

People all over the world, live in a variety of built environments. The surroundings are a reflection of who they are a people and the forces of geography, nature, economics, politics, etc., continue to shape their habitats and buildings. Spending time in New York City is a different experience than in downtown Detroit, or Paris.

“This shape (of a building or room) creates a sense of place that helps us slow down, look around and take in the view. And then before we realize it, we are no longer in the space but of it”.

**In Conclusion,**

Woodstock is in a unique position in that we have a chance to enrich a function found nowhere else in the town, our public Library. This opportunity is a rare gift.

Our Library is a civic structure, not a residence, not a retail shop. We should take the opportunity to express the civic functions of a Library. It should not look like house or a retail store. It should look like what it is. We, as a town, should be able to allow for growth of expression, something that is at the core of the Library's mandate. It should have the elements that stimulate and make us want to linger in the building. Some of these elements are Beauty, Proportion, Coherence, Rhythm, Balance, and the Play of Light. This structure should anticipate the needs of the future with a respectful nod to the past.

“What is at stake is how we form our children, the quality of the interactions we have with each other, not to mention our foot print upon the planet. “

Good Architecture provides shelter. Great Architecture inspires us, enhances our lives and aids people in their quest to achieve their full potential. It fosters communication, healthy living and interactions, and gives expression to the meaning and purpose of the community it serves.

“No one knew Beethoven’s 5th symphony before it was written. Now we can’t imagine a world without it.” Paul Goldberger
I challenge us all to create a useful thing of beauty, one that will make our town a better place and create more opportunities in our lives.

Maria DeFranco, Architect. December 9, 2014

Sources:
“Why Architecture Matters” by Paul Goldberger
“The Architect Says” Compiled by Laura S. Dushkies
“The Architecture of Happiness” by Alain de Bolton

A Call for Unity and Open Process

The Library Board was wise to respond to sustained resistance to its proposed JSA Annex plan with an open public gathering on June 8th, 2014. Your “stone soup” afternoon at Town Hall was widely attended and most everyone felt heard.

It became clear that day that the common theme uniting Annex opponents and supporters was that they all self-identified as “pro library.” This underlying unity of purpose should be a confidence builder for you as stewards going forward. The factions are rather like doctors all wanting to save the patient but arguing over the treatment.

We encourage you to remain positive and to focus on the future. The course you take should not be a product of past battles won or lost, but instead be driven by a thirst for new solutions that meet the needs you hear from all the constituencies you serve.

We think the town will back you the most if you remain positive advocates for a wonderful future library and continue to build community trust through open input meetings. We urge you to keep the next steps you take open and build on whatever goodwill the FTF process and open meetings have engendered so far.

This FTF report gives you most of the background information we used for our basic recommendations. We wish you the best of luck finding constructive ways to work together with each other and with the town.

Thoughts on Communication

I chaired a Communications sub-committee of the Facilities Task Force that considered possible strategies for the Library Board to use to engage the community about the Library’s expansion plans. In addition to helping to organize the December 4th open meeting at the
Comeau, we looked at public voter data to identify and categorize various Library constituencies. The following thoughts come from that process:

Communication is a two-way street; it involves both listening and talking. What the Library says to the public is important; how it listens is crucial. When members of our community feel their needs are being heard, they will listen to the Library’s needs.

Early in their expansion project, the Saugerties Library asked their Townspeople to identify what services they would like from their Library. I suggest that the Woodstock Library Board and Library staff draw up a complete inventory of all possible Library services and programs they can envision, and then hold a series of public “service and programming” meetings. I urge members of the Library Board to reach out to every possible constituency they can identify: people of all ages - children, parents, teens, students, seniors, groups, scholars, people without internet service or computers, performers, business people, mentors, etc. Multiple, broad-based public meetings will give all demographic groups a chance to hear about not only their own needs, but the needs of other groups. These meetings will give the Library information and they will give Townspeople a chance to feel they are part of a larger Library community. Everyone attending will get a better sense of the remarkable range of current and potential Library programs and services.

Any effective communication begins with listening – “checking-in” with the public for feedback regarding major matters under consideration. A formal bond campaign cannot commence until an Architect is hired to create a Master Plan for the Library, but finding the resonant themes for a campaign can begin now. I know the Library Board has already begun listening (after all, you formed the FTF in response to public concerns). I urge you to continue to listen at every possible opportunity to every member of our community you are able to reach.

Hopefully, over time, a solid consensus will emerge and the public and the Library Board will be well-prepared to share an inspired vision for Library expansion.

Tim Moore, chair, FTF Communications Sub-Committee.
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