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LIBRARY CONCEPT
BOULDER: A CITY IN NATURE, A PROGRESSIVE COMMUNITY
CONSTRAST + DUALITIES
TOPOGRAPHY
ICONIC SYSTEMS

- Thermal Mass
- Induction Kitchen Maker Space
- Energy Generating Play Equipment
- Community Gardens/Pollinator Garden for Bees
- Battery Storage for Emergencies
- Natural Ventilation
- Solar Energy
- Heating and Cooling
- Photovoltaic Panels
1. QUIET SPACE
   Reading area with views to the mountains and access to nature

2. COMMUNITY SPACE
   Community room central to the library with after-hours access

3. CHILDREN’S SPACE
   Kids area with sightlines, storytime seating, and access to playground

4. MAKERSPACE
   Large makerspace with dedicated outdoor work area and access to community garden

5. OUTDOOR SPACE
   Outdoor amenities such as a community garden, children’s playground, and large public plaza

INITIAL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT RESPONSE, AUGUST-DECEMBER 2018
SCHEMATIC DESIGN CHANGES

1. PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS AND SITE SURVEY
2. DESIGN CHANGES
3. SECOND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (Site, Kids, Maker Space, Community)
4. STAFF COMMENTS AND REVIEW
PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS AND SITE SURVEY
NEW SURVEY WITH CORRECTED SETBACKS, EASEMENTS, ZONING, FLOODING

ZONING AND EASEMENTS

- Property Lines
- Zoning MU-2
- Zoning RM-2
- Zoning BMS

EASEMENTS & SETBACKS
- 25' Utility Easement
- Drainage Easement
- 0' Front Yard Setback (FYS)
- 0-5' Side Yard Setback (SYS)
- 10' Rear Yard Setback (RYS)

CITY WETLAND BUFFERS
- Outer Buffer
- Inner Buffer

FEMA FLOOD ZONE
- FEMA Conveyance Zone
- FEMA 100-Year Zone
- FEMA 500-Year Zone

OVERALL SITE AREA: 120,466 SF

MU - 2 ZONING REQUIREMENTS:
- Max. Height: 35'
- Max. No of Stories: 2
- Max. FAR: 0.6:1
- Max. Floor Area: 15,000 SF
- Min. Open Space: 15%

50% of lot frontage must contain building
Primary building entrance location to face street
SITE PLAN  Concept Plan Review Application
BUILDING FOOTPRINT SHIFTED 21' NORTHEAST

BUILDING FOOTPRINT RELOCATED AWAY FROM CREEK, PER SITE SURVEY
REVISED PARKING LAYOUT

WOONERF DESIGN EXTENDED TO 14TH ST

INTEGRATES FUTURE EXTENSION OF 14TH ST
EXISTING TRAIL NARROWED TO 5' TO ENCOURAGE PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

NEW MULTI-USE PATH CONNECTS TO WOONERF STREET

NEW MULTI-USE PATHS TO IMPROVE SITE CIRCULATION
INTEGRATED MULTI-USE RAMP (ADA ACCESSIBLE)

10' WIDE RAMP ACCOMODATES PEDESTRIANS AND BIKES
SITE ELEMENT REFERENCES

1. PEDESTRIAN ORIENTED PLAZA/STREET
2. POROUS PAVER MATERIAL
3. PAVER MATERIAL
4. SEEDUM GREEN ROOF
5. ‘MEADOW’ GREEN ROOF
DESIGN CHANGES
SOUTH FAÇADE ELEVATION  Concept Plan Review Application
REDUCED BUILDING HEIGHT (-4')
FAÇADE SECTION IDEAS
ICONIC PRESENCE – BROADWAY
SECOND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
AND STAFF REVIEW

SITE AND EXTERIOR
MARCH COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EVENTS
SEPARATED PLAYGROUNDS
NEW TREES TO SHADE PLAYGROUND AREAS
REDUCED PLAZA AREA TO CREATE ADDITIONAL OPEN GREEN SPACE

HARDSCAPE PLAZA AREA REDUCED BY 2,500 SF
NEW CONNECTION TO BOULDER MEADOWS (COORDINATED WITH OWNER)
NEW AWNING TO MARK LIBRARY ENTRANCE
NORTH FAÇADE
REFINED NORTH FAÇADE DESIGN – INTEGRATED WINDOWS AND PLANTERS
NORTH FAÇADE ELEVATION  New Design
NORTH FAÇADE
SECOND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND STAFF REVIEW

INTERIOR
RE-ORGANIZED CORE, SUPPORT SPACES

- MECHANICAL SPACE
- COURTYARD
- IT ROOM
- ELECTRICAL ROOM
- RE-ORGANIZED STAIR AND ELEVATOR LOBBY
MAKER KITCHEN
1,220 SF

OUTDOOR MAKER SPACE AREA
1,000 SF
CHILDREN’S AREA VIEW
FIRST FLOOR PLAN

LEGEND

1. Main Entrance
2. Lobby/Digital Display
3. Courtyard
4. Main Stair
5. Circulation Desk
6. Adult Area + Seating Area
7. Cafe
8. Meeting Room
9. Storage
10. Children’s Area
11. Greenhouse
12. Automated Materials Handler
13. Private Workspace
14. Staff Restroom
15. IF Room
16. Staff Storage
17. Manager’s Office
18. Public Restrooms
19. Maker space
20. Exterior Stair
21. Mechanical Room

Interior Ground Floor Area 8,700 SF
SECOND FLOOR
SECOND FLOOR PLAN  Concept Plan Review Application
2ND FLOOR DESIGN CHANGES

- Enlarged Community Lobby
- Separate Boulder Reads Classroom
- Flexible Curtain

Open to below
COMMUNITY SPACE

COMMUNITY ROOM
1,050 SF

COMMUNITY LOBBY
235 SF

WET BAR

FLEXIBLE MEETING SPACE
235 SF

STORAGE

BALCONY
NoBo Branch Library

Community Engagement Events
March 8 and 9, 2019

Summary Report

Submitted By:
WORK Architecture Company
The project team and WORKac architects hosted community engagement events on March 8 and 9, 2019. Two of the events were open to the general public and held in the Canyon Theater at the Main Library. One event was geared toward a specific audience of lower income and Spanish-speaking residents and was held at Boulder Housing Partners Broadway East Community Center. The events featured a design presentation from WORKac Principal Architect Dan Wood and a community-viewing of the updated architectural model of the branch library, including elements of the proposed internal layout. Participants were provided with floorplan and site options and asked for their preferences and feedback. The design activities focused on four areas: kids’ space, outdoor space, makerspace, and community meeting space. The purpose of the March community engagement events was to:

- Obtain feedback on internal design and programmatic elements.
- Obtain further understanding of aspirations and concerns so that they are considered in the design.
- Provide information about final decisions about the building and site design and program layout that are made by project team which includes library staff, Facilities and Asset Management staff, city staff, and WORKac architects. Decisions will incorporate community input, regulatory review process requirements, and are made with consideration to available budget resources.
- Provide information about the north Boulder library project status and next steps.

The sessions allowed the project team to connect with nearly 200 participants and provided some direction on internal design, programmatic elements, and some preferences about site layout. According to focus area facilitators and event moderators, the audience was largely excited, eager, and contented with the direction of the project and the design proposals. The energy was positive and enthusiastic about the vision for new north Boulder branch library.

In addition to community input, the team worked to collect input from other stakeholders including library staff from BoulderReads and BLDG 61, as well as city subject matter experts and staff from Planning and Development Services. The project team also presented the Concept Review to the Planning Board on April 4, 2019. The public hearing brought out 12 community members, split evenly between people that came to speak in support of the library and people that came to express concerns to Planning Board, primarily over traffic, parking, loss of green space and privacy. An additional five people submitted letters of support to Planning Board in advance of the meeting. Key issues posed to the planning board during the Concept Review included:

1. Is the proposed concept plan compatible with the goals, objectives, and recommendations of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan?
2. Is the proposed concept plan consistent with the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan?

The Planning Board unanimously agreed to both key issues that the Concept Plan was in alignment with both the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan and the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan. Specific details of their comments can be viewed here:

Event Photos

Engagement Event 1 - Boulder Main Library

Engagement Event 2 - Boulder Main Library

Engagement Event 3 - Broadway East Community Center
Feedback/input Received

Following is an executive summary of the feedback collected during the March community engagement process for the four focus areas and an “other” category, and the associated design changes that were a result of that feedback.

The feedback outlined below focused mostly on design elements and are relevant to the current design process. The Design Advisory Group (DAG) will retain feedback related to programs and services for reference when those project details are being determined after the design phase has concluded, and construction begins and when the library is preparing for staffing and service implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Feedback Received</th>
<th>Design Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kids’ Space</td>
<td>• Desire for unique and welcoming storytime space &lt;br&gt;• Desire for diverse set of program offerings for kids, including the potential for hands-on learning and possibly a sensory garden &lt;br&gt;• Desire to separate the kids’ space in a way that will keep them safe and “allow kids to be kids”</td>
<td>• A storytime nook was incorporated into the kids’ space. &lt;br&gt;• The design was altered to include a greenhouse within the facade of the southern-facing kids’ space. &lt;br&gt;• A partition was added to the kids’ area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Space</td>
<td>• Preserve open green space while maintaining publicly activated and programmable outdoor space &lt;br&gt;• Focus on making the outdoor space not only Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant, but easily accessible and navigable by wheelchair users &lt;br&gt;• Desire for a shaded outdoor play space &lt;br&gt;• Need for a separate playground for kids of different age groups &lt;br&gt;• Interest in a playground attached as an extension to the indoor kids’ space, requiring less supervision than a detached space. Interest in access to the playground when the library is closed</td>
<td>• The plaza area was reduced to preserve existing open green space. &lt;br&gt;• A ten-foot wide ADA ramp was added to the plaza area between Broadway St. and the library entrance. &lt;br&gt;• Trees and seating areas were added around the playground. &lt;br&gt;• Two separate playgrounds were incorporated to serve both patrons inside the library (attached to the kids’ space) and patrons outside the library (accessible when the library is closed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area</td>
<td>Feedback Received</td>
<td>Design Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Outdoor Space, cont.        | * No interest in brightly colored playground equipment, it should blend in with the natural environment like Boulder’s Civic Area playground.  
  * Use native plants, encourage pollinators                                                                                                                                                   | * Natural materials and natural colored play equipment were incorporated into the playground design  
  * Native plants which encourage pollinators will be a focus for the landscape design plan                                                             |
| Makerspace                  | * Excitement for a “maker kitchen” model                                                                                                                                                                                | * The DAG is researching “maker kitchen” models.                                                   |
| Community Meeting Space     | * Need to accommodate large meetings and handle crowd spillover when meeting rooms are booked back to back  
  * Maintain flexibility to accommodate both large and small groups  
  * Conducive to catering, offer a sink, counter, and staging area for catering.                                                                 | * An enlarged second floor lobby was incorporated adjacent to community room.  
  * An acoustically-rated curtain is planned for use in the community room for optimal flexibility.                                             
  * A sink with counter space was added.                                                                                   |
| Other                       | * Desire for lots of independent working spaces, co-working spaces, and areas for small groups to meet (adult area)  
  * Mark the entrance, make it readily identifiable  
  * Exterior facade made from material other than concrete,  
  * Make a pleasant view from 13th St.  
  * Include more windows and some vegetation on the north facade  
  * Make the inside of the library bright and bring nature into the building  
  * Interest in a cafe similar to SEEDS Library Cafe                                                                 | * Increased perimeter book shelving to allow for work tables, lounge spaces, and independent and group work (adult area).  
  * A large awning and sign were added to the main entrance.  
  * The north facade features a much warmer, wooden log cladding material.  
  * The north facade was redesigned to include additional windows, a variety of wooden log textures and sizes, and integrated planters.  
  * An internal courtyard was incorporated to brighten up the interior space and bring a sense of nature into the building.  
  * A cafe space was incorporated into the design. Staff will pursue partnership opportunities for operating the café. |
Next Steps

There will be several major events related to this project during the next two months, including:

- A capital fundraising campaign kickoff on May 9, 2019 spearheaded by the Boulder Library Foundation (BLF). The BLF will host a fundraising dinner on the bridge catered by SEEDS Library Café and will provide potential donors with a list outlining opportunity for funding the project and a sneak-peak of the gallery exhibition.

- The project team will host a community check-in meeting on May 10, 2019. WORKac Architects Amale Andraos and Dan Wood will present an overview of the input received during March 2019 community engagement sessions and explain its influence on the overall design of the north Boulder branch library. The opening reception for Living in Nature City Exhibition in the Main Library Canyon Gallery will feature a new large-scale model of the north Boulder branch library, alongside several other WORKac projects around the world designed during the past fifteen years.

The project team and the consultants are preparing for the next step in the development review process, the Site Review. The purpose of Site Review, as described in Section 9-2-14(a) B.R.C. 1981, includes allowing flexibility and encouraging innovation in land use development, improving the character and quality of new development, facilitating the adequate and economical provision of streets and utilities, preserving the natural and scenic features of open space, and ensuring compatibility with existing structures and established districts. The project team is planning a Site Review submission in early June 2019. This step is anticipated to take approximately six months and precedes Technical Document Review.
APRIL 2019
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Boulder Public Library
Community Survey Results
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Introduction
The Center for Research & Public Policy (CRPP) is a national research and public policy think tank working within six distinct disciplines: Market, Social, and Public Policy Research as well as Public Opinion, Political and Direct Democracy Research.

The Center for Research & Public Policy (CRPP) is pleased to present the results of the 2019 Boulder Public Library Community Surveys conducted on behalf of the City of Boulder and Boulder Public Library.
CRPP was commissioned by The City of Boulder and Boulder Public Library to collect citizen input regarding the Boulder Public Library and views on meeting future demand for library services.

The survey included the following areas for investigation:

- History, use of and relationship with the Boulder Public Library;
- The Boulder Public Library on meeting expectations of users;
- Perceptions of the Boulder Public Library;
- Interest in the process for funding the Boulder Public Library to meet current and future community needs;
- Overall, support or opposition to increased funding of the library;
- Support and opposition, at four different levels, to increased taxes for library funding;
- Impressions of various approaches to funding of the library; and,
- Demographics.
Methodology
Using a quantitative research design, CRPP completed phone surveys among 500 residents of the City of Boulder and surrounding qualifying areas.

An online survey was also completed among 1031 residents of Boulder and surrounding qualifying areas.

Survey design input was provided by the CRPP as well as library and city officials.
Survey design at CRPP is a careful, deliberative process to ensure fair, objective and balanced surveys. Staff members, with years of survey design experience, edit out any bias.

All facets of the study were completed by CRPP’s senior staff and researchers. These aspects include: survey design, sample plan design, pretest, computer programming, fielding, coding, editing, verification, validation and logic checks, computer analysis, analysis, and report writing.
Telephone Survey

All telephone interviews were conducted during March 15 – 26, 2019. Residents were contacted by phone between 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. weekdays and 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. on the weekend.

Respondents qualified for the survey if they were a resident of Boulder or qualifying communities and were 18 years of age or older.

Statistically, a sample of 500 completed surveys has an associated margin for error of +/- 4.5% at a 95% confidence level.
All population-based surveys conducted by CRPP are approximately proportional to population contributions within states, towns, and known census tract, group blocks and blocks. This distribution ensures truly representative results without significant under-or-over representation of various geographic or demographic groups within a sampling frame.

CRPP utilized a “super random digit” sampling procedure, which derives a working telephone sample of both listed and unlisted telephone numbers. This method of sample selection eliminates any bias toward only listed telephone numbers. Additionally, this process allows randomization of numbers, which equalizes the probability of qualified respondents being included in the sampling frame. A “mixed access” sample of both cell and landline phone numbers was utilized.
Online Survey

CRPP programmed an online version of the survey instrument. Boulder and qualifying Boulder-area residents were encouraged to go to the online link and complete the survey.

All online surveys were completed between March 15 and April 5, 2019. The survey was available online in English and Spanish.

The link was posted on various websites including the Boulder Public Library site. Outreach to encourage participation included posting the link on the library website, in the Boulder Public Library newsletter “BPL Now”, in social media and on distributed postcard fliers.
Summary of Findings
On several key, core questions held within this survey, CRPP presents two common views of resulting data – one what depicts the questions that include the “unsure” or “don’t know” respondents and another view that includes only those “with an opinion” where “unsure” and “don’t know” respondents are removed from the data.

It is not certain or conveyed that those who are unsure about a topic will “fallout” and decide proportionally as those with an opinion have done, but it is the best guide available to estimate final outcomes if there is to be an election, referendum or plebiscite.
On History: Use & Relationships
Overall, about one-half, 49.0%, of all telephone survey respondents reported being very frequent, frequent or moderate Boulder Public Library users. Others considered themselves light or very light users – 17.4% and 24.8%, respectively. Some, 8.0%, noted they or household members were not Boulder Public Library users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY OF LIBRARY USE</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very frequent users</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent users</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate users</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light users</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very light users</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You and household members are not users</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impressively, 34.9% noted they considered themselves “advocates” of the library while 22.5% noted they would consider themselves “loyal users”. Another 38.0% suggested they were “satisfied” users. Together, 95.4% noted they were either advocates, loyal or satisfied. Just 1.7% indicated they were dissatisfied with the Boulder Public Library, and 2.8% were unsure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP WITH BOULDER PUBLIC LIBRARY</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate(s) – talking positively about the library in your community</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal user(s) – likely to remain a long-term user</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied user(s)</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied user(s)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Meeting Expectations
A large majority, 89.1%, noted that the Boulder Public Library meets their respective expectations either always (44.8%) or most of the time (44.3%). Others suggested the library meets their expectations sometimes (6.6%), seldom (1.3%) or never (1.1%). A few, 2.0%, were unsure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY OF MEETING EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: Always and most of the time</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Library Perceptions
There exists significant and positive impressions of the role the Boulder Public Library plays in the community...

### Telephone Survey Results

| STATEMENTS                                                      | STRONGLY AGREE | SOMewhat AGREE | TOTAL: STRONGLY & SOMewhat AGREE |
|                                                               |                |                |                                  |
| The library is important to the vitality of Boulder and the Boulder area | 89.0           | 7.8            | 96.8                             |
| The library is an integral part of educating youth in Boulder and the Boulder area | 75.4           | 17.0           | 92.4                             |
| The library contributes to a positive quality of life in Boulder and the Boulder area | 84.8           | 11.6           | 96.4                             |
| The library contributes to lifelong learning                 | 85.8           | 10.8           | 96.6                             |
There exists significant and positive impressions of the role the Boulder Public Library plays in the community...

**Online Survey Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>SOMewhat AGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL: STRONGLY &amp; SOMewhat AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The library is important to the vitality of Boulder and the Boulder area</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library is an integral part of educating youth in Boulder and the Boulder area</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library contributes to a positive quality of life in Boulder and the Boulder area</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library contributes to lifelong learning</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Interest in the Process
Researchers described, to survey respondents, that the Boulder Public Library Master Plan identified increasing community demand for library programs and expanded services and urged the city of Boulder to create a dedicated and sustainable funding for the library to meet current and future community needs.

They were told the city is embarking on a process to look at funding options and were asked how closely they were following the process.
Just over one-quarter, 28.0%, noted they were following the process either very closely (6.0%) or somewhat closely (22.0%). Nearly three-quarters, 71.6%, described how closely they were following the process as either “not very closely” (25.6%) or “not at all” (46.0%).
Interest was significantly higher after the introduction of the process. Two-thirds (68.0%) noted they were very (20.2%) or somewhat interested (47.8%) in the process. Others, 29.0%, were either somewhat uninterested (13.2%) or not at all interested (15.8%). A few, 3.0%, were unsure.
On Importance of Funding
All survey respondents were presented with the following: “The Boulder Public Library is currently primarily funded by property taxes and sales taxes that are paid in Boulder. The Boulder Public Library Master Plan recognized that the library operates within an annual funding process that does not meet continuing and growing numbers of cardholders and community needs for increasing new programs, services, improved facilities and technology.

Researchers asked: “Without knowing the exact amount of money required to meet community demand, how likely are you to support or oppose increased funding of the library in general?”
Just over three-quarters, 77.4%, suggested either definitely support (38.6%) or somewhat support (38.8%). Others, 11.2%, suggested they would probably oppose (3.8%) or definitely oppose (7.4%) increased funding. When unsure respondents are removed from the data, the support moves from 77.4% to 87.4%.
Just over three-quarters, 77.4%, suggested either definitely support (38.6%) or somewhat support (38.8%). Others, 11.2%, suggested they would probably oppose (3.8%) or definitely oppose (7.4%) increased funding. When unsure respondents are removed from the data, the support moves from 77.4% to 87.4%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT/Oppose IN GENERAL</th>
<th>PHONE (PERCENT)</th>
<th>ONLINE (PERCENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=500</td>
<td>n=1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total support or opposition</td>
<td>Total support or opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely support</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably support</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably oppose</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely oppose</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Tax Implications
All respondents were presented with the following: “We have had an opportunity to present the current and future needs of the Boulder Public Library in this survey. To meet needs identified in the Boulder Public Library Master Plan, a property tax increase could be considered for residential and local business property owners. For renters and business tenants, this may mean an increase in rent.

Now we are asking you, as a resident of Boulder, Boulder Valley or the adjacent mountain communities, to indicate your support or opposition to investment in the Boulder Public Library. Your household’s share of the cost is put in terms of an average home valued at $850,000.00. Your share of the cost may be more or less depending on the value of your home or business, and likely less if you are a renter.”
At $280/year…

Respondents were asked how they would vote if their household tax increase for library funding was $280.00 per year or about $23.33 per month. A total of 45.2% suggested they would definitely (15.0%) or probably support (30.2%) such an increase. Another 38.2% reported they would probably (15.2%) or definitely oppose (23.0%) such an increase.

Among those with an opinion (when undecided / unsure respondents are removed from the data), support percent moves to 54.2% with 45.8% opposed.
At $220/year…

Respondents who were opposed or unsure at $280 were asked how they would vote if their household tax increase for library funding was $220.00 per year or about $18.33 per month. Another 4.6% move to support resulting in a new total of 49.8% who suggested they would definitely or probably support such an increase.

Among those with an opinion (when undecided / unsure respondents are removed from the data), total support percent grows to 58.8% with 41.2% opposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE INCREASE OF $220 / YEAR</th>
<th>PHONE (PERCENT)</th>
<th>ONLINE (PERCENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total support</td>
<td>Total support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely support</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably support</td>
<td>+4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tax Implications
At $160/year…

Respondents who were opposed or unsure at $220 were asked how they would vote if their household tax increase for library funding was $160.00 per year or about $13.33 per month. Another 7.4% move to support resulting in a new total of 57.2% who suggested they would definitely or probably support such an increase.

Among those with an opinion (when undecided / unsure respondents are removed from the data), total support percent moves to 66.2% with 33.8% opposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE INCREASE OF $160 / YEAR</th>
<th>PHONE (PERCENT)</th>
<th>ONLINE (PERCENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total support</td>
<td>Total support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely support</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably support</td>
<td>+6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tax Implications
At $90/year...

Respondents who were opposed or unsure at $160 were asked how they would vote if their household tax increase for library funding was $90.00 per year or about $7.50 per month. Another 10.0% move to support resulting in a new total of 67.2% who suggested they would definitely or probably support such an increase.

Among those with an opinion (when undecided / unsure respondents are removed from the data), the total support percent moves to 76.2% with 23.8% opposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE INCREASE OF $90 / YEAR</th>
<th>PHONE (PERCENT)</th>
<th>ONLINE (PERCENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely support</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably support</td>
<td>+7.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Approaches to Funding
All respondents were asked, if taxes do increase to enhance library funding, if their preference would be a property tax increase, a sales tax increase or some combination.

The largest group of respondents, 34.4%, suggested they would prefer some combination while 29.4% suggested they preferred a sales tax increase and 15.4% said they would prefer a property tax increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERENCE FOR PROPERTY OR SALES TAX</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A property tax increase</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sales tax increase</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A combination of property tax and sales tax increase</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another approach was introduced by researchers. Each respondent was asked if they would prefer a tax increase or a re-allocation of existing City of Bounder funds to the library by reducing funding for other city programs, services or departments.

A re-allocation was supported by 40.4% of respondents while 25.6% indicated they preferred a tax increase. Some, 8.6%, offered that they don’t support either a tax increase or a re-allocation. And, just over one-quarter, 25.4%, were unsure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERENCE FOR TAX INCREASE OR RE-ALLOCATION OF FUNDS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A tax increase to support increased library funding</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A re-allocation of existing City of Boulder funds</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t support either a tax increase or a re-allocation</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The idea of an Independent Library District was introduced as follows: “To broaden the funding base for the Boulder Public Library, there is an option to establish an Independent Library District. The purpose of a library district is to share expenses among residents of the City of Boulder, Boulder Valley and the adjacent mountain communities.”

Support was approximately two-to-one with 45.4% suggesting they strongly (20.8%) or somewhat supported the concept (24.6%). One-quarter, 24.4% suggested they were somewhat opposed (7.2%) or strongly opposed (17.2%). A large percentage, 30.2%, were unsure.

When unsure respondents are removed from the data, support increases to 65.0% with opposition at 35.0%.
Our reasons for believing in a favorable referendum funding outcome include the following:

• Without knowing the tax implications, there exists significant support (77.4%) for increased funding of the library in general. Just 11.2% were opposed with 11.4% unsure. Among those with an opinion – the results are 87.4% to 12.6%.

• Affinity toward the library is intense. Those who say the BPL meets their expectations always or most of the time is 89.1%. Those library users who describe themselves as advocates (34.9%) and loyal (48.6%) total 83.5% -- both being levels above just “satisfied” users. A strong affinity would indicate library supporters are likely to turn-out to vote in a support during a referendum.

• Two-thirds of all respondents, 68.0%, report being very or somewhat interested in the BPL funding process.
• A strong majority (96.8%) suggest the BPL is important to the vitality of Boulder.

• We also note, with great interest, that support in the areas surrounding Boulder is also strong – even for a Library District.

• And, however you may look at the results of the tax implication questions (at any of the four levels measured and with or without unsure respondents in the data), it appears a referendum has more support than opposition. For example, at the highest level of $280, support is 45.2% with 38.2% opposed and 16.6% unsure. Among just those with an opinion – 54.2% are in support with 45.8% opposed at this highest tax increase level measured. Support only grows stronger at each of the three lower tax implication levels.
Thank you for the opportunity to present!

Any Questions?
Public Comment Guidelines / SPEAKING AT Library Commission Meetings - DRAFT 3

Boulder Library Commission meetings are generally held the first Wednesday of the month at various libraries. Members of the public are welcome to attend any public meeting of the Library Commission. You can speak to the Commission to express your opinions about library issues that either may be on the agenda that evening or on matters of general importance to the library. To help accommodate everyone, please follow these rules:

Open comment or “Public Participation” is held at the beginning of Commission meetings and provides an opportunity for speakers to address any library issue. Sign up with the Board Secretary the night of the meeting approximately 15 minutes before the start of the meeting. There is no online sign up for open comment.

Each individual speaker will be given three (3) minutes to address the Commission. Please limit your comments to Commission-related issues. Be clear, concise, and constructive.

Citizens may pool time as a group, allowing one person to address the Commission. All persons must be present at sign up and when the speaker is called. The oral presentation will be allowed the following time allotments:

2 people = 5 minutes
3 people = 7 minutes

Speakers should introduce themselves, giving name and address. If officially representing an interest group, homeowners’ association, etc., please state that for the record as well.

Speakers are requested not to repeat items addressed by previous speakers other than to express points of agreement or disagreement. Refrain from reading long documents and summarize comments wherever possible.

Speakers shall not ask questions directly to individuals at the meeting nor expect questions to be answered directly.

Commission receives the bulk of its communications electronically but, if you have prepared a written statement / have print materials, please provide at least seven (7) copies to the Commission Secretary when it is your turn to speak; the Commission Secretary will distribute your written statements as you speak.

You may speak once per meeting.

State your name and address and be sure to state what you would like to see done (constructive problem resolution). One of the Commissioners will be the time keeper. Please be respectful of others in keeping to the time allotted.

The Chair may lengthen or shorten the time allotted as appropriate. If the allotted time is exceeded, the Chair may request that the speaker concludes his or her comments.

Please be aware that the Library Commission reserves the right to withhold comment during the meeting but your input is valued and helps inform the guidance the Library Commission gives to staff in the performance of their duties over time.
Public Comment Guidelines / SPEAKING AT Library Commission Meetings - DRAFT 3

You are welcome to follow up on the matter you brought forth. A summary of your comments will appear in the written minutes recorded from the meeting.

You may also follow up at a subsequent meeting by participating in public comment or by contacting Library Commissioners or department staff directly.