PACE
PUBLIC AFFAIRS
& COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

—SUMMARY REPORT—
Public consultation in support of the Ottawa Central Library Development Project: In-person Consultation Sessions on Site Evaluation Criteria (May 16, 2016)

June 20, 2016

This report captures the input generated from two in-person consultations that were held on May 16, 2016, on the topic of site evaluation criteria to be used in the selection of the best location for a new central library. All comments have been reviewed, analyzed and summarized to inform the Ottawa Public Library, in support of the Ottawa Central Library Development Planning Process.

About PACE

PACE`s mission is to help advance sustainability by understanding how governments, businesses, organizations and communities work — and more importantly how they work together.

PACE PUBLIC AFFAIRS & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT is a bilingual consulting firm that specializes in developing meaningful engagement programs, notably in the area of sustainable municipal affairs and city-building initiatives. With a solid understanding of government policy-making and programs, we help our clients successfully move their projects forward, reaching out to a wide range of audiences on the local, regional and national levels.

Launched in Ottawa in 2002, PACE has established itself as one of Ontario's leading experts in community and stakeholder engagement, creating innovative two-way dialogue opportunities for targeted audiences, the general public and key affected communities.

PACE is committed to meaningful engagement. Our values-based approach to consultation is paved with significant experience designing and facilitating large scale, often complex, bilingual public and stakeholder programs. We have worked on several projects in the National Capital Region, with all three levels of government, on both sides of the River. Our roster of experienced engagement experts collectively offer a wealth of experience in strategic advisory services, from high level counsel, to project management, design and execution, and full service communications.

THE PACE TEAM ASSIGNED TO THIS REPORT

- **Grégoire Jodouin**
  President and Team Leader
- **David Sherwood**
  Senior Associate and Lead Facilitator

PACE
PUBLIC AFFAIRS
& COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

145 SPRUCE STREET, SUITE 201
OTTAWA, ON K1R 6P1 CANADA
(613) 860-1685

WWW.PACECONSULTING.CA

Contents

1.0 Overview

1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Ottawa Public Library (OPL) has ambitious plans to contribute to Ottawa's transformation into a world-class city by creating a modern central library that inspires learning, sparks curiosity, and connects people. The community has demonstrated an eagerness to be involved in this project, and the plans for the new Ottawa Central Library (OCL) have generated a healthy debate on the role of libraries in society, and the benefits a new facility will bring to Ottawa.

The new facility will be an innovative, iconic, and significant civic institution playing three roles: a local branch, a citywide service, and a destination for residents of and visitors to the Nation's Capital. The initiative is supported by the OPL Board and has been approved as a strategic initiative in the 2015 – 2018 City of Ottawa Term of Council Priorities.

Discussion around the need for a new Ottawa Central Library is long-standing, and the initiative has seen many changes in scope and evolving visions.

A significant change was the unanimous decision in June of 2015 by the Ottawa Public Library Board to build a new 132,000 square feet facility in a new location. The decision followed on the recommendations of an independent expert that concluded this solution would be more effective in terms of cost and modernized service delivery, than extensively remodeling the existing 1970's vintage building.

The other significant decision that was also unanimously approved by the OPL Board in June of 2015 was that the new facility would be located within the city's Central Area. The City's Official Plan defines the Central Area as the "symbolic heart of the nation and the economic and cultural nerve centre of the city," and directs that it be the focus of intensification plans. The Central Area is bounded by the Ottawa River to the North; Wellington / Albert / Gloucester / Lisgar to the South; King Edward to the East; and, the Trillium Line (Bayview Station) to the West.

The Ottawa Public Library then issued a Request for Expressions of Interest (REOI), with the objective of indentifying potential partnerships as well as to garner information to inform the project delivery and site processes. It was through the REOI process that Library and Archives Canada (LAC) expressed an interested in developing a joint facility, which led to the signing of a Letter of Intent with OPL to explore a potential partnership.

In the spring of 2016, OPL initiated a process to identify potential sites that could accommodate either a stand-alone OCL facility or a joint facility with LAC.

Also in the Spring of 2016, OPL, with the assistance of PACE, developed a Public Engagement Framework designed to support the project's planning process. The framework, which was approved by the OPL Board on May 10, 2016, provides direction on the consultation and communications activities that will take place between the second quarter of 2016 through to the OCL's inaugural opening, scheduled for 2020. The objective is to ensure that the public and stakeholders are consulted in a meaningful way, and that a broad spectrum of input is collected to inform the location, vision, and design of this new iconic modern library.

The Public Engagement Framework outlines three phases of consultation:

1. May-June 2016: Site evaluation criteria ('Where it will be built')—Community input that will inform the evaluation process used to assess potential sites that will be considered by the OPL Board to identify the best possible location for the new OCL.

2. June 2016: Functional program ('What will be built')—As a follow-up to consultations that took place in the spring of 2015, community input will be used to help validate the spaces and uses of the Ottawa Central Library. This includes obtaining feedback on functional use, adjacencies, and breakdown of size of various spaces. This will be for both the OPL stand-alone and the OPL-LAC joint facility. The public session will be preceded by focus groups with internal and external stakeholders in late May and early June, conducted by the Resource Planning Group (RPG), an expert facilities functional planning firm specializing in libraries.

3. <u>2017: Building design ('What it will look like')</u>— Once the OPL Board makes decisions on a site and project delivery model at the end of 2016, public input will be solicited to inform the building design and architectural features, ensuring design excellence that meets community (and potentially national) expectations.

1.2 CONSULTATION OVERVIEW - PHASE 1

This Report pertains to the first phase of consultation (site evaluation criteria) and provides a summary analysis of two public consultation sessions that were held on Monday, May 16, 2016. These sessions were designed to obtain community input to inform the evaluation criteria that will be used to assess potential sites, as part of an exercise to identify the best possible location for the OCL.

The in-person meetings of May 16 were the first of two components for this phase of consultation. The comments collected at the meetings, along with an analysis of that dataset by PACE, were provided to Nanos Research to inform the development of the phase's second component: an online, citywide questionnaire. The questionnaire was made publicly available from May 26 to June 9, 2016, inclusively. Nanos Research will be responsible for the reporting on the results of that questionnaire.

The combined community input from the in-person and online consultations, together with technical expertise and best practice data from civic building projects in Ottawa and other cities, will be used in the development of a list of site evaluation criteria that will be tabled for review and approval by the OPL Board at a meeting on July 12, 2016.

In a concurrent process, the City of Ottawa launched, on April 29, 2016, a call-out to identify publicly- and privately-owned sites within the city's Central Area that could be suitable for the new Central Library. The sites identified through the call-out, which closed on May 20, will be compiled in a site inventory that will be made public after the July 12 OPL Board meeting.

The sites in the inventory will then be evaluated and analyzed against the final list of criteria. This will result in a short-listing of potential sites, which will undergo additional review,

including a financial analysis and due diligence. The OPL Board will make a decision before the end of the year regarding the best possible location for the OCL, along with decisions regarding the financial framework, partnership with Library and Archives Canada and a project delivery method. The Board will then recommend a best approach to Ottawa City Council.

A process expert (Deloitte) has been engaged to ensure the robustness and fairness of the selection process, and a Fairness Commissioner is providing an added layer of oversight and impartiality to the project.

2.0 Approach, Promotion & Methodology

2.1 APPROACH

The Ottawa Public Library has committed to public engagement throughout the life of this project. To be successful, consultation activities will need to be rooted in integrity, underpinned by principles of openness and transparency, and offer meaningful opportunities for everyone interested to provide input that can truly inform and influence the final outcomes for the OCL.

Consultations on site evaluation criteria are one component of public consultation and engagement sessions about the new Central Library. Since 2013, more than 3,000 people have taken the time to share their thoughts and input on this once-in-a-generation project. Past activities have included:

» The 2013 IMAGINE campaign on the library of the future, as envisioned by OPL customers;

» Public input (in-person and online) on spaces and services in a Central Library as gathered in March-April 2015;

» Public opinion research conducted in October-November 2015 with customers, future customers, and residents on use of the current Main branch and future Central Library;

» Board meetings and presentations by public delegations; and,

» The launch of OCL's dedicated project website, providing more detailed information on the initiative and allowing browsers to the site to leave comments and register to receive ongoing project information.

For the site evaluation criteria consultation, two consecutive in-person meetings took place on May 16 at Jean Pigott Place at Ottawa City Hall to gather input on what the community considers most important when selecting a site for a central library (the criteria). The first

session was held from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., and the second from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. A total of 177 participants attended (98 and 79 attendees per session, respectively).

Broadly, the sessions were designed to meaningfully engage participants, tap into fresh ideas to inform decision-making, and facilitate a better understanding and acceptance for the project. Specifically, the two primary objectives for the sessions were to:

1) INFORM the public about:
    a. the city-building potential of this project, in the larger context;
    b. the vision for OCL and the project planning process;
    c. the next steps, including upcoming public consultations;

2) CONSULT and request INPUT on what are the most important elements to consider when evaluating possible sites for Ottawa's new Central Library.

With respect to public expectations for the consultation sessions, it is acknowledged that at OPL board meetings, and as reported in the media and social media, there have been many suggestions made publicly with respect to the ultimate location of the OCL. The decision on a specific site will be taken by Ottawa City Council based on the OPL Board's recommendation made later in 2016, following a thorough review, assessment and due diligence process on available parcels. It was essential, in order to maximize the contribution by the public in the process, that participants be made aware of the specific objectives for this phase of consultation.

Concerted efforts were therefore made to inform the public prior to and during the consultation sessions, that the meetings were designed to solicit public input on the most important evaluation criteria, which could be used to assess any and all potential sites.

As such, the sessions were structured to provide participants with the opportunities to:

» Hear and review project details and the process and timelines around decision-making;
» Engage in dialogue regarding what they thought most important in a site location; and
» Provide comments, ideas and input that can truly influence the project outcomes.

2.0 APPROACH, PROMOTION & METHODOLOGY

Information boards were on display and a number of presentations were made at the beginning of each session. Participants then engaged in small group discussions, facilitated by a table host. The session was overseen and moderated by a professional facilitator.

Event Scenario (at-a-glance):

Description
Registration Opens
Speaking Portion   • OPL Chair Tierney — Welcoming/Opening Remarks   • Mayor Jim Watson – A new library in the context of the many city-building initiatives underway that are transforming Ottawa   • Danielle McDonald, CEO, OPL – OCL Planning process and how input will be used
Consultation Portion   • Introduced/Facilitated by David Sherwood, PACE   • Three Small Group Exercises on Criteria   • Presentation by Judy Hare, former CEO of the Halifax Central Library   • Plenary
Closing Remarks and Next Steps

2.2 PROMOTION

PACE supported OPL staff with the marketing and promotion of the May 16 in-person sessions, which included owned, earned and paid media, information materials, social media, and other communications activities. This helped not only to raise broad awareness of the opportunities to participate, but it also served to establish a shared understanding of the issues and topics of consultation. The intent was to frame the discussion at the outset, allowing participants the ability to focus on the consultative questions at hand rather than on misunderstandings or questions outside of the scope of the consultations.

Specific communications activities included:
- A media advisory and news release;
- Ads in the *Centretown Buzz* and nine EMC community newspapers covering the entirety of Ottawa

- Posters and digital displays in City facilities (33 branches);
- Promotions on the OPL and OCL websites;
- A banner on the City's website;
- A social media campaign;
- Notices to key internal and external stakeholders

Promotions from the consultation program generated considerable media coverage, including on radio, in articles in the *Ottawa Citizen* and *EMC*, and in public exchanges on social media.

2.3 METHODOLOGY

Participants at the sessions were seated at round tables (approximately 5-7 participants per table), assisted by a table host and note-taker. In order to properly frame the discussions, David Sherwood of PACE provided attendees with an explanation of the consultation exercises to come. These consisted of three small group exercises led by the table hosts.

Participants were also informed at the outset that the OPL Board had already identified two criteria that would be mandatory when it comes to identifying a site, and that these would therefore not be part of the consultation process:

1. The OCL's location can be anywhere in the Central Area as defined in the City of Ottawa's Official Plan; and

2. The property must be big enough: 3720 m^2 (40,000 square feet or approximately 1 acre) for an OPL stand-alone facility; and 6,000 m^2 (64,500 square feet or approximately 1.5 acres) for a joint facility in partnership with Library and Archives Canada.

Exercise 1—Rountable (25 minutes): Participants were asked to express themselves on the topic of location and to outline criteria they consider important for evaluating potential sites. The intent was to allow table participants to develop an unbiased list of criteria that was important to them.

Exercise 2—Criteria used by other libraries (10 minutes): Participants were then shown a list of criteria identified by PACE as best practices from other projects (see Appendix A). Two lists were provided at each table; both documents were identical, with the exception that the order was reversed in one of them to ensure that participants did not feel they were being led to favour a particular criterion.

The intent of the best practice list was to allow participants to make a more informed choice, in the event that they wanted to supplement their self-generated list.

Exercise 3—The Top Ten list (40 minutes total): The next exercise was designed to establish a relative sense of priority to the group criteria. Participants were asked to discuss the list and agree on their top ten for their table (loose consensus only). If the group could not agree on ten, then they were instructed by the table hosts to identify those criteria where consensus existed, and the note-taker recorded the non-consensus items. Table hosts were responsible for typing out the final agreed-upon list using a template.

Plenary (10 minutes total): The final exercise was a plenary, where each group at the various tables announced their top two to three criteria. The criteria was compiled and shown on the main display screens for participants to consider (see Appendix B).

3.0 What We Heard – Analysis

3.1 PROCESS

As part of its reporting mandate, PACE reviewed and analyzed **all** input received during the May 16 in-person consultation sessions. A copy of the table host notes for both sessions can be found in Appendix C. The analysis below presents the main themes and trends that were distilled from the public input, and captures the insights provided by participants to inform the selection of the best site available for the new OCL.

It is worth mentioning that some comments provided during the small group discussions were not 'criteria' per se. In these instances, table hosts were instructed to work with participants to find constructive ways of recording those comments as useable criteria for the purposes of the project planning process. For example, there were several references to the need for an iconic building design. While relevant to the OCL overall, this is not a site selection criteria in itself. However, in working this through with the table hosts, participants were encouraged to convert these comments into criteria; for example that 'the site be flexible enough to allow for architectural creativity,' or that the site be 'prominent enough to allow for a landmark structure to be built.'

In another example, several participants had suggestions for specific sites they would like the OCL to be situated. Again, while this is not a criteria in and of itself, participants were encouraged to find ways to express this as criteria (e.g., 'what is it about this particular site that you like and how can we record that as a site evaluation criteria?'), such that it could be usable data in the decision-making process.

3.2 OVERALL FEEDBACK/THEMES

With regards to the analysis below, the use of the expression "most participants" represents a very strong support or an impression of near unanimity for an idea. Similarly, the term "many" indicates predominance or support by a large amount of respondents (for example, over half), while the expressions "several" indicates a frequent but not predominant theme (e.g., one third). The expressions "some" represents a notable but minority view, while "a

few" represents an even smaller minority (e.g., under 1 in 5 responses). Even though a comment may have only been made once, it is sometimes reported in the analysis if found to be insightful, innovative or highly relevant.

Top Themes

In reviewing the comments received at both public consultation sessions, and in particular the 'top ten' lists of criteria provided by each table, a number of themes emerge as most prominent. Participants at both sessions showed a high level of understanding of the subject matter and were generally able to clearly articulate what they considered most important in the selection of a site for the OCL.

While participants demonstrated a keen interest in the OCL, there was little consensus that emerged on a specific site evaluation criteria. The only criteria that achieved a general consensus was that the facility should be easily accessible via multiple modes of transportation. The details with respect to access varied (for example, what was considered appropriate travel distances or times), although there was a clear preference for green modes of transportation, such as cycling, walking and transit. The issue of access, and the various nuances that were expressed by participants, is explored in greater detail below.

In some cases, a diverse set of opinions were expressed that often ranged from one extreme to the other; for example, on the issue of partnerships, where some participants were adamantly opposed, while others saw it as a way to generate revenue or offset costs for the new facility.

A brief synopsis is provided below for each of the top ten themes or groupings of criteria that emerged. It is noteworthy to mention that the majority of comments pertained to the first two (in this order): (1) 'Access', and (2) 'Core or density of the area.'

1. Access
2. Core or density of the area
3. Ability to be an iconic or landmark destination point
4. Outdoor considerations

5. Environmental considerations
6. Strategic considerations
7. Spaciousness
8. Accessibility
9. Flexibility of purpose/Ability to accommodate multiple-uses
10. Costs and affordability.

1. Access

The most prominent theme to emerge was 'Access' in the sense of the method one uses to travel to the Central Library. Most participants stated that the new facility should be easily accessible by all means of transportation (i.e., multi-modal access).

In elaborating this criteria, many suggested that the facility needed to be part of, adjacent, or in proximity to a light rail transit (LRT) station. Many participants also commented that the facility should be easy to walk to, either from a place of work, a residence or a transit station (again, with an emphasis on LRT rather than a bus station). Some participants stated the walking distances they considered acceptable, generally ranging between 15 to 30 minutes from an initial destination, be it someone's residence, workplace or a densely populated area. We note that this distance was greatly shortened when the initial destination was an LRT station, with some suggesting that a distance of two blocks or five-to-seven minutes walking would be appropriate.

There was also considerable support for a location, which was easily accessible to cyclists, in proximity to bike paths and along a safe route. On this point, there were several references to the facility requiring the necessary cycling infrastructure (e.g., plenty of bike racks, etc.). This last point is also captured under the theme of 'Outdoor considerations.'

There was some debate about whether the location should be easily accessible by car or private vehicle. Some participants suggested that the location should deter the reliance on cars (e.g., in offering limited or no public parking), while others felt that the library needed to be accessible to as many people as possible, including those that would be commuting to it by car. On this point, suggestions were made regarding various parking considerations (e.g., free; nearby; underground to not take away from the public outdoor space; etc.).

Although not a predominant theme, there were a few comments made about the ability to access the OCL during all seasons.

2. Core or density of the area

The second most prominent theme to emerge was that the Central Library needed to be located in a densely populated or frequented central area (i.e., 'in the heart of the city'; 'where people live, work and play'). In the discussions of centrality, some participants suggested their preferred location boundaries, which were sometimes outside of or more narrowly defined than the quadrant that was voted on by the OPL Board (for example, a few suggested the boundaries could go as far south as Gladstone or to the Queensway; others suggested the boundaries be east of Bronson and west of the canal). Some suggested that the location needed to be a central landmark for the city. Others commented that the Central Library needed to continue to serve the existing users of the current Main Library.

Many commented that they believed the OCL should be located in a busy setting (day and evenings), close to services, amenities and other civic, cultural and commercial buildings and services (such as museums, employment centres, tourist sites, banks, shopping centres, etc.). Some offered that the location itself should be a destination point, in an area that will draw people with cultural interests.

Some participants also expressed a concern that the OCL should be located in a safe area, notably for those clients that would walk or cycle to and from the facility. In this respect, they called for a site located in a populated area, rather than an isolated site. A related issue, which is captured in more detail under the theme of 'Accessibility,' is that the OCL should be located in an area where it can continue to serve vulnerable populations, such as homeless or low income individuals, and seniors.

3. Ability to be an iconic or landmark destination point

Many participants commented that the site needed to allow for the design of an iconic facility. That is to say that its location could allow for an interesting architectural design or permit the construction of a distinctive, showpiece facility. Some suggested, in this context,

that the end result should contribute to the overall quality of the City (e.g., 'worthy of a G7 capital city').

Some participants suggested that the site itself should be easily findable, at a landmark destination point, and in a prominent location. Others noted that the site needed to allow for the facility to be clearly visible, while some suggested it should allow for good views.

A few suggested that the facility should be on its own block or parcel, such that the facility not be connected or too closely situated to adjacent buildings, thereby allowing it to be more visible and prominent (e.g., "Not swallowed up by towers and high buildings around it").

4. Outdoor Considerations

Grouped under the theme of 'Outdoor Considerations' are comments pertaining to the facility's streetscaping, as well as to the desire for the site to have green and open spaces. With respect to streetscaping, some participants indicated the site needed to allow for necessary infrastructure, such as good sidewalks, bicycle parking, etc. Some wanted esthetic landscaping to ensure that the exterior of the facility had a 'presence.'

Several participants mentioned that the facility should have ample green spaces or be located near green spaces such as parks or the riverfront. There were also several comments that the site should allow for a public plaza or gathering spot with outdoor seating. A few suggested that the site could include space for a community garden.

5. Environmental Considerations

Some of the participants indicated that they wanted sustainable or environmental considerations to be taken into account when selecting the location of the OCL. For example, many suggested that the facility should have geothermal heating; a green roof; permit ample natural light to penetrate into the facility; and be oriented such that it maximizes solar panels. Others commented that it needed to be able to accommodate cycling infrastructure or be in close proximity to transit.

A few participants stated that the location should take into account the LEED rating system; for example, in offering limited parking spaces as a means to increase LEED scoring.

A few others stated that the new facility should avoid major impacts on the environment; e.g., that it should not be located on a delicate ecosystem. A few also suggested that the site should be a brownfield, such that it be eligible for decontamination funds while also addressing an urban blight.

6. Strategic Considerations

Several suggestions were made that the site should be selected with a view to advancing a specific strategic outcome. For example, some participants commented that the Central Library should add to the 'chemistry' of the area wherever it is, or more broadly, contribute to the overall vibrancy of the city.

Others suggested that the site needed to serve as a catalyst to stimulate the development of a cultural hub (for example, by providing space for an art gallery). Others suggested the site serve as a catalyst for economic development, with a view to rejuvenating an underused space or depressed area (e.g., 'if the government is going to invest in this, it should have a stimulus effect on the community and the vitality of the neighbourhood [where it's situated].'). There was a suggestion that a historical building could be re-purposed as the OCL.

Some participants suggested that the new OCL's location needed to be compatible with the surrounding area, land uses and neighbourhoods.

7. Spaciousness

There were several comments made that the selected site should be big enough to accommodate any future expansion of the OCL. A few suggested that the surface area be large enough to offer a balance between practicality and architecture. As previously noted, there were some suggestions that the site cover a full city block; a few suggested it should be located on a street corner such that the facility could be exposed on different facades. There

was a suggestion that the site be big enough such that the OCL would not need be to built vertically, in a high-rise or with too many floors.

8. Accessibility

Several participants stated that the site should be accessible for people with limited mobility, for example with accessible curbs and sidewalks. Others noted that the site needed to allow for drop-offs, special access for Para-Transpo and other access requirements for people with disabilities or mobility issues. As noted above, some participants commented that the site location needed to take into consideration all weather, all-season access to the OCL. There was also references to the site needing to be easily accessible to more vulnerable populations, such as low income clients, homeless individuals, and seniors, by being situated in proximity to social service providers or areas where such populations reside (by demographic).

9. Flexibility of Purpose/Ability to accommodate multiple-uses

Several participants noted that the site needed to have the ability to integrate a multitude of uses. In this respect, some suggested that the location should accommodate community events or services, while others wanted services that support the library's own services and programs. A suggestion was also made that the site should be able to accommodate varied amenities that are also revenue-generating (such as through partnerships, or for example, urban/community farms or gardens). There was a suggestion that the site could include mixed-income services such as public housing. There was another suggestion that the site should accommodate services that serve the local community, the city and the nation.

10. Costs and Affordability

There were mixed views made with respect to the costing of the OCL's site. Broadly, comments from participants centred around the notion that the cost of the site should not impact or limit the creativity of the facility's design, or the potential to build an iconic library. Opinions were mixed, however, with respect to the affordability of a site. Some suggested that costs should not be the driver when selecting a location. Others suggested that the site should be acquired at minimal or low cost (for example, that it should be publically-owned),

such that the majority of the project funds could be spent on the building design and construction.

Some participants noted that the site should be free of encumbrances that could increase building costs, such as the need to demolish existing structures. Conversely, others noted that the project budget needed to be large enough to afford the best site possible, regardless of any encumbrance or other challenges presented by the site.

Others commented that the site should permit revenue-generating uses to offset project costs, while some favoured a partnership with LAC as an option for sharing costs. A few commented that OPL should not partner with private developers or enterprises, while others encouraged partnerships as a means to generate revenue or offset costs.

4.0 Next Steps

All of the participant comments from the in-person and online consultations, as well as analysis of that data, have been shared with Deloitte Canada. Deloitte has been retained to assist in the development of the site evaluation criteria, which will be tabled for discussion and debate at the July 12 OPL Board meeting.

With respect to the consultation process going forward, there are two more 'input points' where the public can participate in helping to shape various decisions and influence the project outcomes: (1) the Functional programming of the OCL, with public consultations scheduled for June 2016; and (2) the building design, which will take place in 2017. This is in addition to OPL board meetings, which are open to the public.

Key project dates are as follows:

- **June 15 and 22, 2016:** Functional program public consultations ('What will be built').
- **July 12, 2016:** OPL Board meeting to approve site evaluation criteria. The site inventory will also be made public, after the Board's decision on criteria.
- **End of 2016:** Decision package to Board with recommendation on a site and project delivery method.
- **2017:** Public consultation on Building design ('What it will look like')— Public input will be solicited to inform the building design and architectural features, ensuring design excellence that meets community (and potentially national) expectations.
- **2018:** Groundbreaking
- **2020:** Opening

Appendix 'A' — Best Practices From Other Site Selection Projects

(As distributed by Table Hosts to participants during Group Exercise #2: 'Criteria Used by Other Libraries"

Typical Site Evaluation Criteria for New Libraries used by other cities – compiled by PACE Consultants

QUESTION: What are the <u>most important elements</u> to consider when it is time to evaluate possible sites for Ottawa's new central library?

Typical criteria used by other cities:

- » Potential to be a catalyst for economic development
- » Potential for revenue generation though co-development or mixed uses
- » Land can be purchased at a reasonable market value
- » Demolition costs (to be avoided)
- » Affordability: project stays within approved budget envelope

- » Location that can contribute to the vibrancy of the city / cultural life / social life / creativity
- » Location that can be in synergy with other activities near the site
- » Location that can be a destination / a special place that draws people
- » Minimal negative impact on surrounding activities
- » Evening office, retail or cultural activities in the area
- » Daytime office, retail or cultural activities in the area

- » Surrounding area has a positive identity or image / near other prestige buildings
- » Street corner / street frontage
- » Site permits landscaping / green areas
- » Environmental considerations
- » Location makes a contribution to the overall quality of the city
- » Location is visible / good views of the new building / prominent location

» Centrally located within the overall city
» Centrally located with respect to library card holders

» Automobile parking
» Automobile access / arterial roads
» Accessible for persons with limited mobility / a disability
» Bicycle access / bike parking
» Access for pedestrians / walkability / good sidewalks
» Access via LRT / near rapid transit station

» Site large enough for future expansion
» Site can accommodate a multitude of uses
» Site allows flexibility for interesting building design
» Location is compatible with surrounding area / neighbourhood / land uses

MANDATORY CRITERIA FOR THE OTTAWA CENTRAL LIBRARY – NOT INTENDED FOR DISCUSSION

» Sites must be inside the Central Area as defined by the Official Plan of the City of Ottawa.
» Sites must be at least 3720m^2 [40,000 square feet or approximately 1 acre] for a stand-alone library; if in partnership with Library and Archives Canada, must be 6,000 m^2 [64,500 square feet or approximately 1.5 acres]

Appendix B — Summary Notes from the Plenary Discussions

Plenary: **Summary of Criteria listed at the May 16, 2016 sessions and displayed on the screens:**

4 P.M. Session	7 P.M. Session
• Near other attractions day/evening/weekends (2) • Outdoor/green space • Walkability – current users (2) • Lively district • Central location • No parking • Landmark • Views / natural light • Accessibility – all types (year-round) (2) • Personal safety • Diversity of surrounding infrastructure (2) • Rejuvenate • Culturally dynamic • Partnerships • Walkability • Near Parliament • Room for expansion • Parking • Pedestrian accessibility • Proximity – high density • Low-income accessibility • Visible site • Destination	• Ethical • Welcoming to all • Personal safety • Sustainable/environmentally friendly (2) • Core of central area (4) • Near attractions • Greenspace (2) • Enough $ • Full city block • Architecturally significant • Wow factor • No partnership • Accessibility (7) • Near other services • Walkability (4) • Expandability • LRT in library • Vibrancy • Economic contribution • Hub or destination • Large outdoor public space • Flexibility • Activity • High density now • View

Appendix C — Table Host Notes

<u>Note</u>: This appendix contains a compilation of the responses provided by participants during three small group exercises that were conducted during the two in-person consultations held on May 16, 2016. The notes are presented 'as recorded' by note-takers at each table. Other than being reformatted and minor typos corrected, they have not been altered and are presented below in the original language they were recorded in.

Exercise 1: Round Table — List their criteria (from the coloured sheets of paper) plus any comments that help understand why participants chose a given criteria.

Table	Exercise 1: Round Table — List their criteria (from the coloured sheets of paper) plus any comments that help understand why participants chose a given criteria.
1st Session: 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.	
Table A	• Easy walking distance, low income residents in the central area • On the transit – stop you don't have to go outside • Walkability whether they live or work in catchment area • Easy access during the work day – more important than accessibility of their "home " branch • Closeness of transit access should not override walkability • Transit access as the most important criteria may exclude some people • Can't act as obstacle to access to low income people • Acre sized facility.. large facility along with a small / neighbourhood facility in the downtown core– not an either/ or situation • Downtown core – most walkable area .. • Key place for individuals families in need – poorest EDI in the city.. library key to that demographic • Seniors need place to walk to , place that don't need to spend money • Larger reference collection—need underground parking for those who don't take transit or walk... could be revenue generator • People place • Area where people can do whatever they want • Foot, bicycle transit or Car • Para transit access • Art (London Ontario library) site provide possibility of art gallery,

	broader cultural site • conducive to this • Green space • Community garden • Accessibility – students as a group • Site enough room for larger groups – large vehicles (but don't take away cozy feeling) • LRT or transit station – within the station -- not just close • Need downtown cosy branch – no matter where the large new central library is located • Close to Ottawa U. .. central for students. • People place • Where people are NOW .. consider where they will BE in 2036 • Define area as Metcalf and Laurier area • Rideau Centre to Bank • Canal to Bronson and Wellington to Somerset/Gladstone • Use city hall (for the small branch) • Stand alone site From note sheets: • Built where people are now, while thinking about where people will be in 30 years • Easily accessible by all modes of transportation, transit , bust walking or cycling. Parking for those who cannot use any of these. • Has to be in a central downtown location- not LeBreton Flats • Green space roof garden and outside sitting area • Easy access walk bike LRT(within station) • Van for special needs drop off • Near people and places important to the life of the city (museums etc) • A people place – consider demographics , free public space • Gather, learn and live • Green space, community garden • Easy walking distance for people who live or work in downtown area • This is a key public space for people on low income who live in Centretown • Accessible for people with mobility issues • The site should have the potential for the library to be a trend setting architectural monument embodying vision that will affect future urban

	planning/building • Understandable to have a large multi-use space BUT there is a need for a neighbourhood place • Walkability access by foot for residents and workers • Transit access, LRT and bus (but not to exclude low income users) HIGHLIGHTED on the other library criteria sheets: • Potential to be a catalyst for economic development – links to Location make a contribution to the overall quality of the city • Why avoid demolition • Land can be purchased at reasonable value – buy existing worn out buildings demolish and build these • Environmental considerations – LEED Site can accommodate a multitude of uses = of a similar character • Circled: • Access for pedestrians/walkability/good sidewalks • Automobile parking • Accessible for persons with limited mobility/a disability • Location is visible /good views of the new building/prominent location • Site permits landscaping green areas • Site can accommodate a multitude of uses • Location is compatible with surrounding area/neighbourhood/land uses • Location that can be a destination/a special place that draws people • Location that can contribute to the vibrancy of the city/cultural life/social life/creativity
Table B	1. Enough space (200,000 sqft or plus) 2. Easy and affordable access (mix of free services and charged for entering and accessing building) 3. In space that has good mix of surroundings (not all office buildings; not all restaurants) 4. Safety of surrounding area for all times of day (patrolled; populated etc) 5. Pro combining national archives with this project; saves and protects those assets (saves $) 6. Possibility of surrounding City partnerships for parking (i.e.: partner with World exchange free parking on weekends) 7. Site that will Incorporate sustainability in design; encourage imaginative design; Epic feature (e.g.: special/iconic views); Consider Brownfield sites

	(site that is contaminated to get discount and fix blight that exists)
	8. Consider accessible access in winter specifically as well; too many steps or hill in area around; possible features causing problems in winter
	9. Consider distance: area within 30mins walk or so of City Hall; consider distance from other library locations and Office buildings (look at population density)
	10. Accessible transit : Close to bike lanes; sufficient area for bicycle traffic and parking, Sufficient vehicle access- drivers must be welcomed too; sufficient parking (underground), Close to transit (no driving in downtown core if can be avoided)
	EXTRA COMMENTS:
	• Between expand to include Bronson area
	• Build iconic main brain outside main core but a separate smaller central building (2 libraries)
	• Consider Old Ottawa tech high school site (on Albert St)- may be owned by school board though
Table C	**Accessibility**
	• Access to transportation ("close" – within a block)
	• Accessibility (wheelchairs, deaf, blind)
	• "Easy for everyone to utilize it." Not just access it but that it has everything in their to everyone.
	• Q What would make it easier for an elderly person to access this? (stairs)
	• Q What about family? (make sure there is a variety that caters to many groups)
	• Proximity of no more than 2 blocks to LRT
	• It needs to have a high walkability score – it'll serve as a branch library for centretown where people can walk to from the region it serves, accessible to LRT line, accessible to moms with strollers, older people, no further way from the current dense population than the current library is, a block and a half
	• High-density, walkability after using public transit, or just walkability alone, sidewalk-accessible and big and 'right there' and part of all the sidewalks in the city
	• Close to a major bus lane downtown as well as LRT
	• Close to bike paths – the "safer" ones (the segregated ones vs. the shared lanes with cars; the newer ones versus the pothole ones)
	• Lighting for night-time walking

	Indoor Space • Lots of natural light, not surrounded by buildings • View of all directions, where there is distance between buildings • Reading stations **Outdoor Space** • Location now is bordered by streets and buildings – there needs to be ample space between the building and the street on at least two sides • Less concrete, more green • Outdoor area should be large enough to accommodate service-delivery (i.e. kids' activities or for senior citizens) • On parkway, near parks, water • Site should allow some good exterior space, example from Scandinavia (man-made water) • It needs to be a big space that incorporates big public "really huge" space where people can sit and hang out and talk and "be together" • Should be a stunning building – how it fits in, how it suits the surroundings where it sits, • Some are for it standing out • Frequent, close and accessible public transportation
Table D	• Public modern accessibility • Walking distance to most people possible • Convenient public transit • Live downtown, want to walk • Be where the most people are: office buildings • Cycling routes that are safe (e.g. well lit) • Safe walking paths • Safe transportation routes of all types • Parking **not** number 1 priority, but still need to have • Parking garage underneath • Parking not where $ should go • Build it near Bank St to energize area • Who are the users? Teens, older people, etc. so focus on whole population • Walkability • Accessibility for those who may not have cars or lower income therefore

	inclusive • Access to park/green space (may already be around) • Consider the spiritual history of the site (e.g. Algonquin histories) • Lots of natural light • Ability to look out and see something (like Art Gallery) • Consider environmental impacts, more integrated planning, not just about bottom line • Perhaps 2 separate sites for LAC and OPL, not necessarily have just one building • Location that injects life in the area • Large space for public events
Table E	• Let's make a great from a world perspective. • More important to have funding for the building than location. • Natural light not a high priority for one person. • Accessibility i.e. within walking distance, easy to get to. • Is safety an issue for downtown. Important that it be in busy, populated area for safety reasons. Near other things. • Walkability-distance. Doesn't want to have to use light rail to go to library. • Being in a hub where there is a community of people. • Core of population in downtown core will not dissipate if population grows at LeBreton Flats. • Wants it to be in a place near other services and destinations. • Convenient to other services as one of her stops. • Located where it can serve a diversity of needs and communities. • Needs to be part of the community. Located close to where diverse communities of people, including vulnerable communities, are. Very central. • Walkability and accessibility, ex. of folks in wheelchairs that also use Jack Purcell. Close and convenient to other services such as banks, municipal services, • Also close and convenient to tourist attractions such as Rideau Canal, Parliament, War Memorial. As national capital, Ottawa central library should be an institution and an attraction on par with Supreme Court, Parliament, something to see and visit. A super building that honours the aboriginal history of Ottawa downtown being a meeting place. • Currently most people walk to downtown library. • Close to public transit.

	• Central means something different to different people. For some central means downtown or centre of the central area.
Table F	• Central means Central
	• Density is important
	• The new branch should be located somewhere central (this participant uses Rosemount branch quite often as well) - the new branch should be easily accessible by transit but this person feels that we deserve something spectacular, large, noteworthy.
	• Another participant uses the branch every few weeks, picks up holds - frequently - new place has to continue to be downtown; downtown means walkable (50 percent should be within a half a km from the community) ; likes the core because it is represents bilingual
	• The walkability route has to be accessible - 20 min should be the longest walk (from office 8 - 10 min), 5 min walk from transit; it should support the way people use the Main Library currently.
	• Someone suggested that OPL considers the area outlined by Sparks St - Lisgar St. and Cartier St. to Kent St. ; it should be in a high tourist area, high density; it doesn't make sense to put it at LeBreton because of the location of the hill that people would have to climb.
	• Accessibility via bike is a concern for another participant: it should be safe to get there for children as well as adults on bicycles
	• Someone else is less concerned about location - but concerned that the location that will be selected will impose financial (high price tag) pressures that will take away from the services offered in the library.
	• Concerns expressed about not having enough money to provide services within the building, and the maintenance of the building in the future; not enough to support the activity that has to take place in the new branch;
	• Someone said that the closer we are to the current location the better
	• Agreement at the table: the new library should be independent of the development at LeBreton flats, and the financial interests there.
Table G	• Accessible by multiple modes of transport (a 15 min walk from home, bus/LRT stop, parking lot)
	• A 15-20 minute walk from home, offices, shelters and schools
	• Close to schools so that children can walk safely
	• Close for local seniors and the homeless to walk to (15-20 min walk)
	• Site large enough for future expansion
Table H	• Accessible – on foot, by bike, by public transit

	• Walk 10 min. – easy access any time of the day • Proximity – close to downtown residents • Dropin - • Dense area • Nature • Greenspace • Bike • Pedestrian • Citywide • Transit • Energy • View – of nature or proximity to a park • Positive space • Sustainable – large building • Light • Space • Not shadowed by other buildings. • Downtown • Parking • Opportunity to have a space for events – both library and public
Table I	• Au cœur du centre-ville – qu'elle soit vraiment centrale (parfait où c'est maintenant) • Proximité du marché By, du Centre Rideau, de l'université, p. ex. arrêter à la bibliothèque en allant faire les courses • Près des musées et sites importants • Possibilité de maximiser la lumière – que l'orientation de l'édifice puisse capter l'énergie solaire, aspect environnemental • Possibilité d'orientation est-ouest – pour maximiser la lumière • Proximité de la densité de la population • Proximité de la concentration des travailleurs au centre-ville • Proximité des visiteurs • Vue panoramique à partir de l'édifice, p. ex. si on le construit en hauteur • Terrain avec verdure • Accessibilité aux autobus; Proximité du transport en commun • Accessibilité aux chaises roulantes • Possibilité de stationnement gratuit • Distance de marche de la bibliothèque; pouvoir marcher

Table J	• Accessible to those who don't have cars – walkable or accessible via public transit; accessible to homeless (people who can't afford computers). • Centrally located; accessible by LRT; walkable; ideally accessible by bike path; in a location where can be seen- allowing iconic architecture; location connected to or close to other City resources (could be shared); on tourist route. Be more creative when looking at what land might be available; City owned site might be cheaper. • As employee working downtown Ottawa centre core location ideal; group of employee who work downtown is an important constituent to consider. • Agrees need to be central – east of Bronson, south of Somerset, no further east than canal. • Was member of OPL Board last term; visited several new public libraries - most of new libraries are central, accessible from public transit, became part of iconic buildings that define city, identity; connected to City Hall – Library can become forum for City. • Downtown, iconic – like New York Public library, with park, benches; old railway station would be great site – might not be possible; if City owned site considered, should be central. 1. Multi modal access (public transportation, walking, bicycle, etc) 2. Accessible by multiple users groups – downtown workers, visitors, residents / defining and serving your constituents groups – user groups (users, employees, tourists) 3. Connected to other City buildings / sharing existing City resources 4. Central core 5. Able to accommodate Library and Archives Canada
Table K	• Walkable • No partnerships • No transportation needed to get there; means have to pay • Not on escarpment • If partnership with LAC they must give up current location • Centralized • Tourists are not relevant; workers and residents only should be considered • Easy to access in all ways • Should compliment other services/groups in areas

	- High visibility - Big enough for future expansion - Green space around the building - Near bike paths - Near public transport - In an active part of the city - Established locations - Outside space; public plaza - Budget must be robust and support the project fully - Does building up require a smaller footprint; why does it need to be an acre/acre plus half?
Table L	- Needs to be central (what "central" will mean in a few years- city moving west) - Where density is, close to intersection of light rail, accessible to people w public transportation, intersection north-south-east-west of LRT (trillium and confederation lines) - Only one train ride needed (no transfer needed) - Should be complementary to other land use in area, east-west line LRT important, in vicinity of arts and tourism area, innovation area, - Access is major, accessibility for both transit, walking - Having complementary synergy with what is already existing, should be in area where there are already a lot of people - Easily accessible to as many as demographic groups as possible - Planned according to what the city knows RE development . Using as much data as we have to know where the jobs, where the people will be in a few years - Locate near existing things where we have already put money in - Vehicle parking should not be a consideration if we are thinking of core - Lots of building in the core will be deserted. Public service moving out of core. Take a look at what is vacant now in core. Many buildings will be vacant - Importance of using what resources we already have. - Needs to be accessible to car drivers, cyclists, pedestrians.0 - Free parking- accessible for drivers (financially accessible for drivers) - Needs to be accessible to university students (both for UOttawa and Carleton) - Concern for low-income people, serious demographic things to consider in terms of accessibility (students, low income seniors, low income

	clients)
	• Safety: having people around. The more people around, the safer it is. Safe for children.
	• Well lit, not a space where there are no people. Around parks, restaurants, active arts?
	• Link (physical) to National Archives
	• Esthetically inviting
	• Esthetics, environmental suitability, very large, accessibility, security, First Nations approval
	• Importance to carry over history: accessibility for low income people, Queen-O Connor core area, being a part of LRT finish, break for the disenfranchised, a place that means home for disenfranchised ppl, transitioning accessibility to future. True accessibility, AODA.
	• Core more accessible for disenfranchised ppl
	• Look at government restructuring- align w decentralization of gov
	• What are top ten category:
	○ being close to existing infrastructure
	○ close to west-ouest LRT routes (intersection preferably)
	○ animated and active space (critical mass, density needs to be there)
	○ approval from local Aboriginal groups (many participants mentioned this), make entire institution, respect for Aboriginal history in site selection, a sincere attempt to proactive reconciliation in site selection
	○ closely aligned to transportation options
	○ bicycle access
	○ sustainability considerations (heating could come from parliamentary precinct, as an example)
	○ safety- in environment that isn't isolated.
	○ welcoming area
	○ inviting to all socio demographics- so very important to have a place where people can walk there
Table M	• Walkability for the highest number of residents
	• Walkability for the highest number of employees
	• Proximity to major cultural and visitor attractions and commercial activities
	• Maximized underused spaces
	• Accessible by LRT between Bronson and canal

	• Many wanted to define core area – Bronson to Elgin, Somerset to the river • One question – is it possible to keep the present main library open for centretown resident and the new one for everyone? (mostly dominated by walkability and trying to define the core area)
Table N	• free public transportation • walkability • proximity to other landmarks, on itineraries • near bicycle routes • able to get to library through various modes, not just light rail • safe area can walk around at night • lots of natural light • central core (parliament to lisgar; canal to Kent to West) • serving population already served by existing customers (e.g. Office workers, those living downtown) • why not on Sparks street, could bring to Life a dead street • I live downtown - serve population already using the library • should be accessible - want People to be able to walk there during lunch time • tourists wandering up And downtown empty Sparks street • why do you need 1.5 acres, why can't you build up? • walking distance, 10 - 15 minutes • near popular tourists spots • we have not places transit stops near major centres • keep municipally owned • boundary (East of Bronson, North of 417; Canal to Bronson) • look at old American embassy bldg • why do we need a partnership? Don't want housing • worried that with a Partner, we need a larger site • current Main already in a partnership And not working for us • accessible by biking, walking • close to University, close to hubs of transportation • want it to be close to public space • close to residential and Work (mixed use) • Not LeBreton flats • currently have libraries in Sandy Hill, Glebe, Sandy Hill

	- Many don't agree with central planning area - don't want to move currently location - there is no library in downtown core - don't compete with existing libraries - need to support existing business areas, downtown needs critical support - parking not important - need walkability; bike paths; parking shouldn't be a drop off - create hubs of service - parking is not green, and costly - could consider drop off area - consider a little green bus, like Parliamentarians - should be close to schools, universities, should be open to everyone - University students are across the city - bike parking ok - we're not talking about a local Branch for other communities, we want our own local Branch = Main - why should I have to walk to LRT, pay to take train, to get to Library - shouldn't be skepticle about LRT - People should be able to walk around the library, location needs to be vibrant (even in minus 30) - can't be an isolated building by itself - canal, river, Parliament Hill--most public come to visit - want to walk to visit parts of Ottawa - doesn't have to have a river view; but accessible through public transport - looking at beautiful views - reading room at the top of a tall building 10 to 15 minutes of walking distance from current libraries
Table O	- Ease of access - getting in - technology - variety - easy access to technology - access by public transit - proximity to other services - not isolated - near concentration of residents - cost of property

	- ease of access - tourist and residence - access - near other attractions - while tourist walking around - be near them - homeless, indigenous people - mission downtown - no seating in entrance - LeBreton isn't good for homeless - mass population, critical mass of people/visitors, workers, tourists, residents - capacity of building (width, height) - east of Bronson - flats unsuitable - all transit - not just light rail; available for people using all transit - high density now (not future) - close to attraction - low income/homeless - doesn't have to owned by city (empty schools) - central location - downtown - bronson / somerset / ottawa river / rideau canal - not west near LeBreton - Public/private vehicle access: para isn't option; LRT isn't accessible; public transit 5km isn't accessible - ease of access - residence visitors homeless - public partnership only; private property isn't an option - green space isn't a concern - Parliament Hill! - adequate size space: when partnered with LAC, need bigger space - Downtown 2 KM e/w n/s 2KM - Bronson King Edward Somerset
Table P	**Flexibility:** adequate room for expansion / change **Activity:** Proximity to and supporting of evolving City hub / activity **Proximity:** to where people live, work, and play (day / night) **Amenities:** Proximity to community services, and attractions **Transit:** Accessible via car, pedestrian walkways, bike lanes, LRT **Accessible:** easy access for people with mobile issues **Green space:** Proximity to green space / outdoor area **Visible:** location has good views of new building / prominent **Cost:** demolition / acquisition - should be considered in the context of

	building a once in a lifetime landmark building) • Transit: walk ability, pedestrian walkways, bike lanes, Light rail, transit, accessible • Land should not be too close to waterways (distribution / weight) • Would prefer LeBreton Flats – redevelopment gives more opportunities • Would prefer 'real core' core • Near evolving City Hub: night life, active day life • Accessibility: Wider sidewalks, no steep hills, underground tunnels from LRT if possible for winter commute • Flexibility to grow and adapt – adequate room for expansion • Safe and vibrant area, activity that extends into the night time • Sustainability in design • Must still meet needs of refuge for homeless • Must be able to meet needs of current customers • Contribute to economic development – need to be where tourist are to build economy • Green space / Outdoor space • Close to amenities
2nd Session: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.	
Table AA	• Near LRT (Transitway) • Bike racks and accessibility bike paths, 1h bike rides possible. Linked to one of the major ones, not near lots of traffic. • Accessibility (Walkability) • Downtown. • Density of population (workers, living, visiting) • Near work, possibility of accessing the library during lunch break (walkable). 30 minute walk or less. • Near other sites of attraction (ex. Museums) walk to the next attraction. • Wow factor, stands out, not ho-hum. • Not put it somewhere it can get lost. • Green and outdoor open space, trees, grass, flowers. Where people can read in the summer and enjoy the outside. (2 times) Play structures. • Partnership (kids go and plant a garden). • All season facility, more than just a building. • Economic revitalisation. • Outside of downtown. • Near iconic buildings, with a nice view, connected with other

	institutional buildings. Ex. Ottawa Technical H.S. Sites
	• Stand alone
Table BB	• Equal accessibility for all modes of transportation (walk, transit, LRT, bike, car etc); on main route
	• Close to emergency and priority services; city services
	• Good amenities (eg: cafeteria)
	• Physical accessibility to the site; direct indoor connection to LRT or some form of transit
	• Fully accessible; accessible design features (ex: heated sidewalks)
	• Community Integration factor (other attractions around ie: Office building, restaurants, retail surrounding) Diversity of surrounding infrastructure.
	• Safe area for citizens at all hours; safety design features
	• Large enough surface area; balance between practicality and architecture
	• Iconic design; tourism appeal; Contributes to overall quality of City
	• As self sustaining as possible; design attraction and saves money
	• Revenue generating partnerships
	• Ensure it's not too close to too many other "BIG attractions"; spread out attractions.
	• Lead development by fostering design in area that's chosen; varied design features (retail, parks etc) rejuvenate needed area
	• Not a blockade in the community; merged/integrated communities; compatible with surrounding area.
	• Considering the historical value of the land that is chosen
Table CC	• For a person living downtown, Main is her branch, she would like something multipurpose, that serves practical purposes and necessary services.
	• Accessible by walking, bicycle, easy to get to.
	• Within 5- 7 -minute walk of public transit.
	• At a place that is as viable in winter as in summer – 4-season.
	• Walkability, as many library customers walk to their library.
	• Close to where people are working, where it is convenient for them in a work day.
	• East of Bronson. West of Bronson is not the core – psychologically and geographically.
	• Good to use an existing building or space that is underused, such as old Tech HS.

	• Should be space for outdoor space, for a plant library, a garden, sun. • Visible and centrally located for tourists. • Not in an isolated area. Should be a hub of activity, a gathering place. • Library should own parking and charge fair rates for library users. • Site and architecture that reflect Ottawa winters and is usable in winters. • Where it could be connected to LRT with underground tunnel • A library that has presence; that is not swallowed up by towers and high-buildings around it.
Table DD	1. walkability - within 30 min of Bank and Somerset 2. accessible to those who have mobility issues/ and especially during severe weather 3. Large enough to be a showpiece/ an architectural landmark 4. Accommodate community events 5. close to other important community venues (city hall, museums, employment centres, tourist sites) 6. close to transit: Lyon, Parliament and Rideau LRT stops 7. Site has green spaces around it 8. Bike spaces/biking access 9. Less concerned about the cost - build 10. Flexibility of purpose - to serve community, city and the nation • Easily accessible by public transit as well as accessible for people with accessibility issues • in close proximity to other facilities, such as • An important concern for many: the walk to the library should not be more than 30 min long; • Someone suggested that it should have a dual purpose: community branch - foster a sense of community, but it should also be large enough to be impressive as the centrepiece of the library • Close to public transit - It has to be important for this to be the entire city's library, to be relevant and used by the entire city of Ottawa. • Someone suggested that it should have a triple purpose – and play a role as central library in the nation's capital, as well. • Someone stated that: central core has the highest density of residents – and that's why the library should be located as close to the central core. It has to serve diverse needs but most importantly the area with the highest density of residents, workers, and tourists; • Someone brought up the map defined by the PACE facilitator and they

	are concerned that it's very wide and that it surpasses what people can easily walk to. • The intersection of Bank and Somerset was suggested as a good location • Another suggested location: close to Lyon, Parliament and Rideau LRT stations. • Should be close to other community venues: in order to foster community building; • Three participants expressed concerns for the need for the new branch to also be relevant to the city as a whole, for the new branch to be a showpiece for the library system as a whole.
Table EE	• Support use by school children (Sept – April) – safety, sub zero temperatures – easy for them to get to in winter • Site that will draw in the same number or more users • Walking distance from the core of downtown Ottawa – 15 minutes from downtown Ottawa – Walkability • Proximity to other services, attractions (walking distance) • Proximity to houses, govt offices, Tech HS (Queen, Albert and Lyon – parking spot on this block) • Walkability – sanctuary for those (all demographics) in the downtown core, near other services, safe place, an easy place for tourists to get to • Maximize access for those who use the library currently – not many people travel from outlying areas; it should be close to those who live downtown and work downtown. Look at historic use patterns • We should be discouraging access by car (walkable, cyclable, mass transit) = don't build more parking (this would encourage more driving); parking should already exist • Walkability – 10 minutes from the core (very important in winter); maintained streets – sidewalks, ploughed streets • Safety - not isolated • Proximity to residential areas and businesses • Within the perimeters – Laurier and Elgin – 10 minutes walk from this; not everyone is a transit area – won't spend bus money • Convenient to downtown workers – so that they don't need to make an extra trip by bus • Building should be attractive, shiny • Take into consideration the current users • No parking lot! Don't encourage cars • Close to Green Space

	• Attract additional users • NB. The group felt very strongly about the site being conveniently located for downtown residents (east of Bronson) and office workers. They argued that these are the populations that currently use (and sustain) the library. They will continue to do so if the library is walkable (15 min) but would be disinclined to walk more than 15 min, or to take public transit.
Table FF	• Accessibility to anybody • Easy to see and find; not hidden • Visible • Near transit • Near public transit • Accessible in every sense of the word • Parking • Able to get into the building • Near one of the main stops so you wouldn't need as much parking – across the street; people shouldn't have to walk too far • Being able to walk to the branch is essential • Place it where the most projected population will be • Close to a transit line • Not necessarily close to a bus line • Build it so you can see it – make it visible • Walker and bike rider • Serve the greatest number of people • Want an iconic building • Green roof • Sustainable from an environmental point of view • Must be well served by transit • Near a dense population • 20 minutes to half an hour walking • Destination place • Features to draw people in • Wish to have it central – downtown, federal convention centre • Bike to it; walk to it; transit (bus or LRT); a bit of room for cars; • Partnerships – federal; looking at archives; • Partnership with a local business; • Doesn't want the new central library to be stuck between 2 large

	buildings. • Environmental considerations - LEED building • Affordability and price tag – partnerships; multiple funding sources; possible commercial element; sponsorship of meeting rooms by a company; • Creative funding • Location that can contribute to the cultural vibrancy of the City
Table GG	• Ça soit central • Accessibilité en matière de transport en commun, tel que train léger x 2 • Accessibilité physique à mobilité réduite (bonne infrastructure qui la rend accessible) • Endroit sécuritaire • Sécurité en se rendant à la bibliothèque • Secteur dynamique : beaucoup de gens qui passent, revitalisé par la bibliothèque x2 • Ville propriétaire du terrain ou un bail – chaque option a un avantage et un désavantage • Coûts • Questions – si ça déménage trop dans l'ouest, ça semble inaccessible – pas « walkable » • Pas d'Objections à ce que ça soit au bord du centre-ville • Accessibilité en scooter, trottoir, déneigement • Proximité aux habitations • Autres : tablettes électroniques • Sans-abris – pas d'autres lieus que la bibliothèque • Cohabitation à un autre lieu
Table HH	• Adequate parking (not huge amount, but adequate amount) for seniors in Central area and surrounding areas; access by OC Transpo/LRT. • Location of library – who comes to library now (presently), and who will come in future; public transportation essential – must be on public transportation corridor; what will be the change in public usage of the library. • Parking is a good idea – not everyone can take public transportation; accessibility; proximity to river; combine with hotel or restaurant; world class. • Library should be central; public library serves downtown workforce. • Location should reflect iconic, signature building; close to water (relate to Ottawa's history); near LRT; availability of good parking; site to

	support wow building and public support. • Consider use of library tomorrow, and Ottawa of today and tomorrow – bridge to many communities; on LRT line; opportunity further west to be close to water, to create iconic building. 1. Highly visible signage on way to property / wayfinding 2. Landmark site/iconic building 3. Central location 4. Parking – adequate parking; balance between public transportation and parking 5. Accessibility: easy access to/from LRT, walkability, bicycle / located on an LRT station 6. Consider demographics (population growth) 7. Locate in a safe neighbourhood – safe streets surrounding site for those who walk there
Table II	• Allows for high foot traffic • In an area that has a lot of people and businesses • In an area frequented by street involved individuals • Accessible to the under/non employed; near services they use • Close to public transit; doesn't have to be LRT • Able to interface with existing businesses • In an area with other activities; retail, recreation, people on the street • Linked to a public transit station; connected to each other • Should be a landmark building and location should facilitate that • Should be in Centretown; east of Bronson • Not attached to anything else; future expansion should be considered • Transit access; bus or LRT • Accessible; economically and physically • Sufficient outdoor use; landmark status • Proximity to other cultural and retail • Accessible • Centretown located • Consider to build up, not just single floor • Iconic; should be seen as an "Ottawa" building • Accessibility • Biking and walking • Green space; surrounded by park, green roof, bring outdoors indoors • Integrated community; with existing

	• Should not be beholden to anyone; no corporate tie-in • No PPPs • Should be located in Centretown; shouldn't have to lose connection to it
Table JJ	• Close proximity to most number of people • Access to core in terms of transportation • Walkability • Look at current population density • Should serve population density that exists • Not good policy to plan for location where there are only projected • Critical mass, where there are people already • Access to LRT • Close to downtown LRT stations • Walkability (1, walkability, 2 access to lrt) • LeBreton flats • Walkable • Lots of people in core, but they don't live there. Downtown not busy at night, people work there. Core a daytime place. • Access to LRT • Be friendly place, not place for street people to hang out • Safety, feels intimated by street people hanging out at library. Metcalfe avoided because of loitering by street people • Core from canal and Bronson very dense, density important • Accessibility important (wheelchair or other) • Accessible to bicycles • Connections: if someone comes to Rideau Centre, Conference centre, library should be within a station or short walk from other existing attraction. Library should be for everyone in city. • Within 15 minutes walk from other attractions (eg Rideau Centre, one person can go to mall, another person from the family can bring kids to library) • Where it fits in the community, eg Sunnyside is a community hub, it's walkable, it's in middle of community, lots of things happen there • Cohesiveness with community • Close to transit, parking accessible, • Access to people who don't have cars, and close to LRT so people Easy to bike to, no riding down Bank Street (no dangerous biking) • Close to dedicated bike lanes

	• Association with Library and Archives • National archives in central library • No benefit to combine Library and Archives • Environmental consideration (solar roof, garden, tool library) • Taking advantage of sharing economy • Not a place where there are too many people, as in, if library is located near arena, too many people make it become inaccessible. Too many ppl for an event, or other, makes it unwelcoming • Green space important • Prominence of location, good views of new building • Deserves the investment, an important piece of infrastructure that deserves sufficient funds, should be well built
Table KK	• Central area- priority neighbourhood. City Ottawa city community framework. Have residence who use the library. • LRT station, north south east west stations • Beautiful view • Inviting building, inviting precinct-inviting building • Accessibility, foot traffic, pedestrian friendly, quick visit for short lunch break or on a short time window. Convenience. Not a half day trip. Extended operating hours- safe. Safe and vibrant space. Safe at night • Accessible year round for pedestrians and cyclists- lebreton might not be accessible during winter months. Think about mobility or elder users and school kids. • Shouldn't only be accessible by LRT • Integrated with other services/facilities, galleries • Library shouldn't be a shopping centre or arcade, shouldn't be a complex. Library first. • Building more integrated with downtown, with existing buildings, feeling of belonging • Less of a standalone building • On LRT station • Streetscape
Table LL	• easily found • easily recognizable, not hidden away somewhere • if too busy, safety becomes an issue. Not on arterial roads • important to have pedestrian Access, up to a quarter of a mile (Half a km) from transit, car, parking lot • location where 132,000 sq. ft. + Green Space around the building - for

	Safety, setting (pretty) • walkability • bicycle access • have it central • free parking, Access for those coming from across the city • must include parking to attend events, programs • parking after hours as well • have vertical parking, add a façade to make it part of the look and feel • have à strong objection to having it on LeBreton Flats - to Many People, with lots of People • Only a small part of bldg should be for tourist • without design, exercise seems as backwards • I see location and design to come together • Greenboro library, nice hub idea - OCL should be part of a hub • bldg should improve part of City; perhaps an 'empty' part of City; few unbuilt areas of the city-downtown • bldg should be in a mixed use area • any thought to moving to parking building on market? Current LAC? Old train station? • building needs to be accessible from handicap perspective • what is function of OCL? How is it different from a Community Branch • don't want it close to a community Branch • think really hard about what a good community Branch • libraries are great meeting places, makerspaces, and gathering spaces and creative spaces • need to look at main user groups of libraries and encourage new users to come to the library • staff at library can help find, that you don't get on line • want the library to have Windows. Not underground, or surrounded by condos • convenient for current users • financial CRITERIA Is site owned or must it purchase land (e.g. Park at Somerset and Bay) • design friendly site, allows flexibility

Table MM	• Accessibility
	  - Enable people to come - everyone from the city
	  - Public transit, walking
	• Walkability

	- a few meters (LRT proximity)
	- 20-35 minutes (year-round)
	• Site that is structurally sound and can take expansion - adapt to change (flexibility)
	• Activity - day and night
	  - Near other things - proximity to other services
	  - combine with other errands
	• Ease of access - works equally well independent of weather e.g., hills, snow clearing, foot traffic
	• Evidence-based
	  - Currently
	  - where people live, work, socialize now
	  - who is using the library now
	  - allow office workers to go
	• Populations who currently use the library should be able
	  - not realistic to think that people can afford a transit fare
	• It is a local branch for centretown
	  - can't lose a local branch function
	  - people use current branch for full services
	  - should not leave unless there's a replacement branch
	  - hub for people who need certain services
	  - people use it to access the Internet
	  - there are many regular patrons who are there everyday
	  - "serves as a community centre"
	• Assumption - central library occupies two functions
	  - Central repository for services city-wide
	  - Branch and community library for people who live in this area
	• Civic element - municipal institution
	  - tourists and visitors can see it and experience
	• Architecture - to make it iconic
	  - linkages to other buildings
	• Potential partnership - what you want for LAC is not the same as what you would want for a city library
	• Connect it to the LRT - walkway, underground passage - makes it more easily accessibility
	• Tourism - it's important to more people than just locals and residents
	  - Tourists would visit the downtown branch
	• When thinking about other city libraries -

	• Having space around outside - plaza; the building can be set and recognized for what it is - lectures and other activities • Maximize chances of it being successful - so that there are other anchors around it
Table NN	**Geographical location** • Centrally located to working/living population is a strong, consistent theme. • Something in Centretown, comprising no further West than Bronson and no further East than Cummings Bridge (Vanier), main core • Proximity to other libraries was a new consideration • Free parking but others say should not be parking dependent • Near provincial park • Identity as a public place not a development place **Accessibility** • AODA • On LRT, near buses • Walkable • Egalitarian (everyone can use it) • No cars, no dedicated parking • If cars, plugs for electric cars • Handicapped parking **Synergy** • Sharing with Library Archives Canada (like Montreal model of shared building, shared accommodation, shared connections) • Close to Quebec • Affordability (shared costs with LAC) • Potential to build surroundings (gentrification) • Synergy/complimentary uses with other facilities and services around it (practical and cultural uses) • Multi-purpose building (public vs commercial) **Facilities** • Stand-alone on green space in a holistic green building with lots of light "breathable building"

Exercise 2: Criteria used by other libraries — List any <u>new</u> criteria (from different coloured paper), plus any comments that help understand why the participants added or modified their criteria.

Table	Exercise 2: Criteria used by other libraries — List any <u>new</u> criteria (from different coloured paper), plus any comments that help understand why the participants added or modified their criteria.
1st Session: 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.	
Table A	• Location is visible • Library should add to the chemistry of the area wherever it is, contribute to the vibrancy of the city • Bike parking/bike access • Site permits landscaping/green area • Affordability could easily become a driver that will limit creativity (this is not good) • Incorporate existing heritage/interesting building .. shouldn't rule that out.
Table B	• Add criteria: Site can accommodate a multitude of uses (cultural, community events etc)
Table C	• We didn't think affordability was an option for evaluation! • All modes of transportation are to be considered EXCEPT motorized vehicles • LEED construction – a green building
Table D	• Street corner (potential for different facades) at intersection • Whole city block preferable • Not cut old growth trees, not interfere with natural environment • Not immense demolition, done in sustainable manner • Mixed usage/mixed income in neighbourhood, public housing, etc., trees, shops • Iconic buildings close by, should be a destination building • Location visible and contribute to the city • Site space for interesting design
Table E	• Location that contributes to vibrancy of city, near other landmarks, that can draw people. • Location that is inclusive, accessible to diverse people and central, easily accessible. • Access for pedestrians, walkability, good sidewalks. • Bicycle parking

	• Surrounding area has positive identity or image, draw, near other landmarks. • NOT IMPORTANT – room for future expansion, demolition costs, parking
Table F	• Concerns expressed about the LeBreton development • Negative impact on surrounding activities - someone commented that if the Main branch moved far away from the current location, there would be no library left behind for the community in downtown. • Someone asked if the potential partnership with LAC making it more difficult to find a site. Is this going to force OPL to settle for a place further away from downtown. Partnership brings money but also there could be other issues. • If Ottawa is to be considered a world class city, then the new library should be a resource for more than just the users who live on Elgin St for example, but also there is a void currently when it comes to significant libraries/resources - because the Federal Government has closed so many libraries in the recent past. • There is concern about finding 1.5 acres in the central area to accommodate the partnership with Ottawa • Sparks street is mentioned as a potential site, given that it's not being used right now well. • There is a concern about this developers who are making plans at LeBreton - people at the table agree that there should be no developers who will profit from this projects ("it should be about people not money) • Site can accommodate multiple uses was a criteria that two people responded to at the table. For instance, what services the city is lacking and provide them • Another person added: Multiple uses: there should be substantial meeting rooms, capacity for the institution to support learning; librarians who can assist with job searching, careers - big enough to have more than one auditorium for example
Table G	• Site can accommodate a multitude of uses. • Close to daytime offices, retail or cultural activities in the area • Centrally located within the overall city – a central landmark for the city • Accessibility for people with limited mobility (curbs, sidewalks etc) • Site allows flexibility for interesting building design
Table H	• Environmental impact of a new location • Location needs to accommodate future growth • Reuse of historical buildings – repurposing; is it possible.

	• Public safety for evening events • Will the location add to the cultural life of the City • Security / anti-terrorist measures for the site • Accessible to those who are downtown and those not downtown
Table I	• Accès piétonnier et cyclisme • Situé dans un endroit central de la ville • Synergie avec les activités à proximité
Table J	• Location to contribute to shared cultural space and function • Parking • Large enough for future expansion • Green spaces / Environmentally sensitive (green and LEED) • Wow factor, good views • Note: Economic development was initially proposed as a criteria, but the participants agreed to leave this criteria out.
Table K	• safe biking parking • location makes contribution to city • culturally appropriate for every culture, do it ethically • with respect from a historical perspective • strong frontage, making sure it s a vibrant, safe place with lots of people • street corner • vibrant area
Table L	• A destination site (good visibility, sight-lines from the street, not buried inside another building) • A site that can accommodate multiple uses (large enough), green spaces, architecturally significant • Accessible to people with varying income and abilities, especially low income and homeless • Accessible for bicycles (parking, safe, bicycles routes) • Proximity to commercial activities • (more ideas – moved away from walkability and expanded scope
Table M	—
Table N	• Nothing from the best practices that we would add, other than - catalyst for cultural Life, vibrancy
Table O	• High density, work, living, tourist. Critical mass. For <u>now</u> • Access by all transit, vehicles, parking - transportation. All means of transportation
Table P	• Cost: demolition / land cost – not a concern for some (once in a lifetime

	purchase)
	• Detailed discussion as most felt cost was important, 2 participants felt cost should not be a factor given it's a one time opportunity to build something great
2nd Session: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.	
Table AA	• NOT parking (not needed because of the LRT) • SOME parking, yes to make more accessible to everyone • Environmental consideration (possibility saving money) • Where people access anyways • Close to other attractions • Possible Heritage opportunity • Evening activities, retails and cultural activities near by. • Feel safe at night.
Table BB	• Consider that it is large enough for future expansion
Table CC	• Accessible for people with mobility issues, mothers with strollers. Also in winter for mobility-challenged. • Some people mentioned that a view out of the windows could be a great feature. • Natural light is a desirable asset which the site should allow. • A site that doesn't require high-rise or too many floors. • Should allow a meaningful view of Ottawa. Ideally views from indoors to be seen in all seasons. • Half the table believes the site has to be car accessible with nearby parking. • Underground parking. Not parking at the expense of public outdoor space for the library. n • A site that might allow future expansions.
Table DD	• A participant liked "Flexibility" from the list of proposed criteria: specifically, flexibility of purpose - to serve the local community, city and the nation • Someone mentioned that the location proposed at 557 Wellington is not considered as suitable from the point of view of walkability by the participants at the table. • Point made by a participant and supported by others: it's more likely that the building will be a tourist attraction if it's in a good location: the three important criteria mentioned by all: walkability, accessibility and having a showcase/significant landmark all are interconnected; • the proximity to the Parliament buildings would also be a draw;

	• Proximity to STO as well as Ottawa Public transit is also important
Table EE	• Sustainable (passive solar, geothermal)
	• Surrounding area has a positive identity / near prestigious buildings
	• Library as a public service on a not-for-profit basis
	• Site allows for multiple uses (2)
	• Contributes to vibrancy
	• Location makes contribution to the overall quality of the city
	• Canadian and Ottawa climate considerations (dark, cold, snow bound, 6 mo of year)
	• Accessible for persons with limited mobility
	• Access for pedestrians / walkability / good sidewalks
	• Daytime office, retail or cultural activities in the area
	• Location that can be a destination / a special place that draws people
	• Site with future expansion possibility
Table FF	• Location that can be a destination
	• Adjacent to other notable destinations
	• Relatively little parking;
	• Tourist destination
	• Space for Transpo to drop off and pick up customers
Table GG	• Stationnement à prix abordable
	• Accès piétonnier (15 minutes)
	• Accès piétonnier (30 minutes)
	• Vélo (10 minutes)
	• Destination rassembleuse
	• Destination culturelle et sociale (en soirée aussi)
	• Architecture intéressante (verrière)
	• Accès au train léger
	• Accès aux personnes à mobilité réduite
	• Considérations environnementales
	• Espace verts
	• Synergie avec les activités à proximité
	• Budget approuvé/abordabilité
	• Valeur marchande raisonnable du terrain
	• Stationnement couvert
	• Accès central
	• Autres : théâtre confortable

Table HH	- Location contributes to vibrancy of city / Makes contribution to overall quality of city - Site permits landscaping/green areas/plaza - Site and building will allow for future growth - Location that can be destination
Table II	—
Table JJ	- land purchased at reasonable market value, demolition costs to be avoided - Access by means other than car, public transit, pedestrian transit - Evening access - Contribute to vibrancy: if gov going to invest, should have stimulus effect, have an effect on community and vitality of neighbourhood - Ability of site to house a multitude of uses, library should be flexible, not just a place for books, (ex, Quebec city, large media section where you can watch dvd, lots of space), - Library should be community hub, have space for community groups to be hosted, space can be use in a multitude of ways - Minimal negative impact on surrounding activities (shouldn't be isolated, should fit in community) - Blends in, should serve the community, it should fit, shouldn't accommodate so many functions,
Table KK	- Street corner, ground level presence, - City owned land, not purchases at market value - Area large enough for expansion - Flexibility for building design - Contribute to social cohesion and participation by al socio economic groups - Centrally located in regards to library card owners - Truly central and at heart of the city - Catalyst for economic development - Automobile parking somewhat near by - Location makes contribution to the overall building, synergy with nearby activities - Daytime office or cultural activities in the area - Location should be iconic and draw people to it - location contributes to overall quality of the city - consider mixed base, consider density of local cardholders, priority to

	main user base
Table LL	• Safety • very good list - we should use IT.
Table MM	• Ability to have green - solar, rooftop gardens • Synergy with other activities eg., art and cultural • No co-development e.g., developers using it for building condos
Table NN	• No cars! Considered a waste of space

Exercise 3: Top Ten list and discussion — List the Top Ten below. Then note the highlights of the general discussion (topics mentioned, general nature, whether consensus was achieved on any point or whether participants were expressing individual opinions). Also note comments on the specifics of each criterion. For e.g., if "proximity" to LRT is an agreed-upon criterion, note whether any specific distance is suggested such as 600 metres, etc.

Table	Top Criteria
1st Session: 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.	
Table A	1. Access by all modes of transportation.. transit /bus /walking /biking/ car ?(parking) those with limited mobility (para transpo) 2. Walkability 3. Large Green space (roof garden, outside sitting) allowed 4. Library should add to the chemistry of the area wherever it is, contribute to the vibrancy of the city 5. Site can accommodate a multitude of uses 6. Repurpose/replace worn out office spaces in downtown core .. don't avoid a site because it involves demolition 7. Underground parking ??? 8. Smaller area – Canal to Bronson and Wellington to Gladstone 9. Large library not to preclude need for small neighbourhood downtown branch. 10. Near LRT stop .. within the LRT so you don't have to leave the LRT/ OC transpo outlet right there
Table B	1. Adequate space 2. Easy and affordable 3. Surrounding infrastructure diversity; Mixture within surroundings 4. Safety of area for citizens 5. Saving money by combining with archives project 6. Look at Revenue partnership possibilities (multiple uses) 7. Sustainable and environmentally friendly design

	8. Accessibility of surrounding area for pedestrians in all seasons *winter* 9. Population density; Distance to/from City Hall; other library locations and office building population 10. Consider all Accessible transit options equally (bike, walk, transit, car)
Table C	1. Location that is a hub 2. Large outdoor public space 3. Central location to serve current main branch users (Optimal for those who live and work in central Ottawa) 4. Walkability 5. Close to LRT and buses 6. Bike path 7. Green space 8. Flexibility for interesting building design 9. Good views both way (from inside and out) 10. Alternate use
Table D	1. Accessibility (walkable, cycling paths, public transportation, safe) 2. Cost not primary 3. Near office core 4. Prestigious and scenic (near iconic buildings) 5. Full city block 6. LAC not necessarily in same building 7. Green space (natural light, surrounding environment respected) 8. Respecting spiritual and cultural history of land 9. Sustainable (avoid major impacts on environment, footprint big enough to accommodate growth) 10. Economic catalyst (potential for economic development)
Table E	1. As accessible to diverse populations as current Main branch. Walkability – accessible to pedestrians. 2. Located in a densely populated area, not only populated by residents but visitors, workers, tourists, etc.. 3. Conveniently located close to other services and activities of daily life. 4. Cyclability and bicycle parking 5. Prestigious and worthy of a G7 capital without elitism or exclusion. 6. Safely located in a busy, active area – not an isolated location. 7. Sufficient funding for a truly iconic, prestigious, prominent, library that is a landmark. COMMENTS: Half of those at the table feel strongly that the location should be in the

	central, downtown part of the Central Area – East of Bronson. Currently, there is a larger population just East of the Central area, who should be served by a close, walkable, accessible location. Discussion that funding being envisaged is not sufficient. Space and size of building not seen as large enough.
Table F	1. Central means core central 2. Walkability from home, work, transit 3. Serve as a national capital library 4. Affordable 5. Must accommodate multiple uses/ services for the community 6. Accessible to cyclists 7. Not part of the Lebreton development 8. Enhanced visibility 9. Green building that will accommodate green technologies
Table G	1. Accessible by multiple modes of transport (a 15 min walk from home, bus/LRT stop, parking lot) 2. A 15-20 minute walk from home, offices, shelters and schools (a safe walk) 3. Close for local seniors and the homeless to walk to (15-20 min walk) 4. Site large enough for future expansion 5. Site can accommodate a multitude of uses. 6. Close to daytime offices, retail or cultural activities in the area 7. Potential for Revenue Generation 8. Centrally located within the overall city – a central landmark for the city 9. Accessibility for people with limited mobility (curbs, sidewalks etc) 10. Site allows flexibility for interesting building design
Table H	1. Walking 2. Bicycle 3. Transit 4. Parking 5. Greenspace 6. Growth 7. Downtown 8. Safety 9. Light 10. Energy 11. Culture 12. View 13. Dropin

	14. Sustainable 15. Events
Table I	1. Accessibilité 2. Central 3. Synergie avec les activités à proximité et sites importants 4. Considérations environnementales 5. Effet esthétique, verdure 6. Vue panoramique à partir de l'édifice 7. Proximité de la concentration de travailleurs, des résidents et des visiteurs *Translation*: 1. Accessibility 2. Central 3. Nearby activities and attractions 4. Environmental considerations 5. Greenery and esthetics 6. Panoramic view 7. Near density of workers, residents, visitors Détails : - Accessibilité – piétonnier (15-20 minutes de marche, bons trottoirs, déneigés), cyclisme (piste cyclables à proximité, stationnement), fauteuils roulants (rampes d'accès, sentiers assez larges, que les résidents du centre-ville n'aient pas à prendre ParaTranspo), transport en commun (5-10 minutes de marche d'une station, minimum de correspondances), stationnement (gratuit) - Central – 1) Somerset, Lyon, Canal Rideau, rivière; 2) Bronson, Canal Rideau, Somerset, rivière; 3) Preston, King Edward; on rejette les plaines Lebreton et le « site exemplaire »
Table J	1. Green spaces / Environmentally sensitive (green and LEED) 2. Multi modal access (public transportation, walking, bicycle, etc) 3. Accessible by multiple users groups – downtown workers, visitors, residents 4. Proximity to other existing civic, cultural, and commercial buildings and services 5. Central core – central meaning east of Bronson 6. Able to accommodate Library and Archives Canada 7. Site allows for future expansion (including ability to go up)

	8. Parking 9. Wow factor – visible, prominent location (note : 9 criteria only – no #10)

Table K	1. Central location
	2. Transportation (all modalities)
	3. Green space surround library
	4. Good infrastructure must accompany location (sidewalk, etc)
	5. Accessibility
	6. Spend appropriately; don't penny pinch
	7. Partnerships should not diminish role of OPL
	8. Consider potential sites regardless of what currently occupies the site
	
	Detailed
	1. Central location
	    o In the exact middle of the central area
	    o Must be in centre of downtown area
	    o Near other iconic buildings (Parliament, etc)
	    o Safety to be a consideration; when it is nearer other existing activities it will be more safe
	    o Located near residents in downtown area
	    o Don't locate near escarpment; go to true centre of city
	2. Transportation (all modalities)
	    o Near bike paths
	    o Easy to get to by foot, bike, public transit, car
	    o Doesn't have to be right on top of LRT station but close enough to walk
	    o Near public transportation
	    o Walkability
	3. Green space surround library
	    o Building should be surrounded by green area
	    o Public plaza would be good
	    o Near other complimentary services/buildings
	    o Footprint should be large enough to support future expansion
	4. Good infrastructure
	    o Proper sidewalks, etc
	5. Accessibility
	    o Building should be fully accessible
	6. Spend appropriately

	o don't penny pinch
	    o adequately resource the project from a financial perspective
	7. Partnerships
	    o should support or be complimentary of OPL
	8. Consider potential sites regardless of what currently occupies the site
	    o don't be afraid to demolish

Table L	1. Being close to existing infrastructure:
	    o Active space
	    o High Density space
	    o Centre core
	2. Closely aligned to transportation options:
	    o close to East/west LRT routes (also near intersecting North/South preferably)
	    o bicycle access (ex. Near the coming O'Connor bicycle infrastructure)
	    o AODA accessible (ex. Wheelchairs)
	    o close to low income, and within 15 min. walking distance from core.
	3. Do it Ethically (many participants mentioned this):
	    o approval/acceptance/input from local Aboriginal/First Nations groups
	    o respect for Aboriginal history in site selection
	    o a sincere attempt to be proactively inclusive with respect to culture and history
	    o Wind/Fire/Water...
	    o Inclusive of all cultures, shown through good design and
	4. Sustainable\eco-friendly:
	    o Materials used
	    o heat distributed to many buildings
	    o nearby lake water used for cooling, etc.
	5. Safety:
	    o In environment that isn't isolated (high density)
	    o Street corner
	    o Child friendly (ex. Park on site, at least one side away from traffic)
	    o Green space (away from traffic)
	    o Well lit
	6. Welcoming to All:
	    o Inviting to all social demographics (especially low income)
	    o so very important to have a place where people can walk there- walking important
	    o Good Feng Shui

	7. Aligns with current trend of decentralization of federal government and "back office" movement in public/private sectors
Table M	1. Walkability for the highest number of residents 2. Walkability for the highest number of employees 3. A destination site 4. A site that can accommodate multiple uses, green spaces 5. Accessible to people with varying income and abilities, especially low income and homeless 6. Accessible for bicycles (parking, safe, bicycles routes) 7. Proximity to major cultural and visitor attractions and commercial activities 8. Maximized underused spaces 9. Accessible by LRT between Bronson and canal
Table N	1. Public transportation 2. Walkability year round 3. Bicycle access 4. Central 5. Service continuity 6. Existing community 7. Vibrancy 8. No partnership 9. Municipally owned 10. Accessibility
Table O	1. High density now (work, live, tourists) 2. Close to all means of transportation 3. Located close to services for vulnerable persons 4. Current downtown (does not include LeBreton) 5. Space for growth and expansion 6. Consider land owned by government and other parties 7. Close to public services and retail 8. flexibility for interesting design 9. Accessible for persons with disabilities (no consensus on 10 - some items on list our table wouldn't consider part of the consideration for location; items didn't relate to location consideration)
Table P	1. **Flexibility:** adequate room for expansion / change 2. **Activity:** Proximity to and supporting of evolving City hub / activity 3. **Proximity:** to where people live, work, and play (day / night)

	4. **Amenities:** Proximity to community services, and attractions 5. **Transit:** Accessible via car, pedestrian walkways, bike lanes, LRT 6. **Accessible:** easy access for people with mobile issues 7. **Green space:** Proximity to green space / outdoor area 8. **Visible:** location has good views of new building / prominent 9. **Cost:** demolition / acquisition - should be considered in the context of building a once in a lifetime landmark building) From detailed notes: Walk ability: 10 – 30 min Easy access via transit for all City residents and outskirts Not in favour of having to move and / or expand in the coming years to accommodate growth and technology changes – new site must be flexible Most still be able to meet the needs of those customers who currently use the library and walk from work or home to get there – walk ability Tourist areas to provide service to tourists, show what Ottawa has to offer, as well as to support economy
2nd Session: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.	
Table AA	1. Population density (living, working and visiting) 2. Neighbourhood branch 3. Bike accessibility and racks\secure storage 4. Near LRT 5. Near other attractions, cultural, day and night and weekends 6. Outdoor space or near green space or part of site plan 7. Wow factor (not a ho-hum building) 8. 100 years building, future generation 9. Eco friendly 10. Stand Alone
Table BB	1. Equal Accessibility for modes of Transit and the physical site itself 2. Good and varied amenities that are also revenue generating partnerships (urban/community farms or gardens) 3. Safe area at all times for citizens (safety design features; easy to evacuate) 4. Self sustaining and environmentally friendly (light pollution considerations) 5. Contributing to overall quality of the City; iconic design/ encourage tourism 6. Properly merged/integrated communities; compatible with surrounding

	area. 7. Diversity of surrounding infrastructure 8. Large enough surface area; balance between practicality and architecture; possible future expansion 9. Lead development by fostering design in area that's chosen; rejuvenate a needed area 10. Consider any historical significance of the land- get appropriate buy in (Be historical not hysterical)
Table CC	1. Located for ease of access by all means of transport. There must be a balance to serve people who walk, cycle and drive. 2. Within 5-7 minutes walking distance of public transport. 3. On a site allowing natural light and views. 4. On a site that allows open outdoor spaces or grounds – or at least a public green roof. 5. Site that is large enough to allow interesting architecture. 6. In a visible location near tourist areas to attract people. 7. In a location where you can safely bike and walk. 8. On a site that allows drop-offs, para-transpo and access for people with mobility issues. 9. Located near or accommodating other cultural activities and amenities. 10. For the purposes of safety, site should be in an animated area, not isolated, integrated into an already active social setting. COMMENTS: A few people see the core as being more north-south i.e. as far south as the Queensway, but not as far east-west as the Central Area is currently defined.
Table DD	Discussion centered around walkability and accessibility; consensus was achieved quickly. The importance of the library to the community was emphasised; all those at the table visit the library frequently and appreciate the proximity and being able to have access to the collection. Accessible by public transit and walkable - less than 30 min walk to the branch would be better. 1. Walkability - within 30 min of Bank and Somerset 2. Accessible to those who have mobility issues/ and especially during severe weather (someone suggested that it's important to be able to get the library even if the weather is bad) 3. Large enough to be a showpiece/ an architectural landmark for the city

	4. Accommodate community events 5. Close to other important community venues (city hall, museums, employment centres, tourist sites, banks, shopping centre) 6. Close to transit: Lyon, Parliament and Rideau LRT stops 7. Site has green spaces around it 8. Bike spaces/biking access 9. Cost is less important than building a great library (also a consensus opinion) 10. Flexibility of purpose - to serve community, city and the nation
Table EE	(The group agreed on a top 7 rather than a top 10. There were other ideas, but no consensus was reached on what should go into the top 10) (From the reporting sheet) 1. Walkability for current users, including homeless, tourists, local residents – 10 -15 minute walk (should be able to get there and back on your lunch). Take into consideration winter weather and darkness in winter. 2. Proximity to existing services, recreational & cultural hubs, businesses (preferably Laurier & Elgin) 3. Located in the midst of a pedestrian, busy environment 4. Accessibility for people with disabilities 5. Close to public transit 6. A site that is welcoming to people of all income levels (a sanctuary) and disadvantaged groups 7. Near greenspace (From the email) 1. Walkability for current users (a 15 minute walk from the core) 2. Proximity to existing services, businesses, cultural centres 3. Located in the midst of a busy pedestrian environment (lively area) 4. Accessible for people with disabilities or limited mobility 5. Close to public transit 6. Welcoming to all income levels (including the disadvantaged) 7. Close to greenspace
Table FF	1. Accessibility 2. LRT 3. Bike

	4. Walk 5. Transit 6. Car 7. Visibility 8. Partnerships 9. Destination 10. Distinctive 11. Eyecatching 12. Environment
Table GG	1. Accessibilité (mobilité réduite, cycliste, piéton) – stationnement pour bicyclette couvert et voie réservée; 2. Access train léger et transport en commun 3. Stationnement couvert et abordable (pas de 5 minutes pour 1 dollar) 4. Dynamisme culturel, vie culturelle et sociale - ex. Grande Bibliothèque il y a des expositions, des conférences, lieu communautaire; partenariats (ex. musée de la guerre et Bluesfest); site partenaire; Amis de la Bibliothèque; Alliance française; partenariat avec le secteur religieux 5. Coût et budget raisonnable (qu'on le respecte) 6. Architecture intéressante – quelque chose de canadien; un landmark; emblématique; un logo intéressant; aspect fierté; bâtiment lié à d'autres commerce (ex. restaurants, parcs, café); autour d'autres commerces 7. Proximité des habitations : pour les résidents d'abord; pas trop d'ambassades 8. Aspect sécuritaire : pistes cyclables visibles; endroit familial où on se sent à l'aise et en sécurité 9. Espaces extérieurs : Place publique où les gens peuvent se rassembler à l'extérieur et espaces verts 10. Considérations environnementales – terrain contaminé? Édifice vert, eaux grises, par détruire un écosystème pour construire l'édifice, From Email: 1. Accessibilité (mobilité réduite, cycliste, piéton) 2. Access train léger et transport en commun 3. Stationnement couvert et abordable 4. Dynamisme culturel, vie culturelle et sociale 5. Architecture intéressante 6. Proximité des habitations : pour les résidents d'abord

	7. Aspect sécuritaire : pistes cyclables visibles; endroit familial où on se sent à l'aise et en sécurité 8. Espaces extérieurs : Place publique où les gens peuvent se rassembler à l'extérieur et espaces verts 9. Considérations environnementales
Table HH	1. Multi modal access (LRT, pedestrian, bicycle, via roadways). 2. Access to sufficient parking / balance between public transportation and parking. 3. Landmark site allowing for iconic building. 4. Visibility 5. Site permits landscaping/green areas/public plaza. 6. Site which allows growth – expandability in the future. 7. Proximity to other civic, cultural and commercial buildings and services – location a destination, area which will draw people with cultural interest. 8. Affordability – funding should go to building, not site. 9. Safety: locate in a safe neighbourhood / safe streets surrounding site for those who walk there; site where there is evening life. No number 10 – see notes below. <u>Notes</u>: While majority agreed on need for parking, not full consensus on parking as a criteria. Central location (narrower boundaries) was discussed as a criteria. Participants could not reach consensus on this as a criteria. Considering demographics in selection the site (present and future population growth) was also discussed, with no consensus reached.
Table II	1. Integrated community 2. Transportation 3. Iconic building 4. Centretown 5. Accessibility (open to all citizens) to street involved individuals 6. Green space 7. Funding <u>Detailed</u> 1. Integrated community

	o Must be in a mixed use area
	  o Close to lots of other businesses and services
	  o Near high density of existing businesses, including small businesses
	  o Close to other cultural organizations
	2. Transportation
	  o Close to buses and LRT
	  o Directly linked to a public transit station
	  o Cycling paths nearby
	  o Walkability; lots of foot traffic
	  o Employees can access during lunch hour
	  o Parking be under the building
	3. Iconic
	  o Location should support a landmark status building
	  o Near other major tourist attractions
	  o Should compliment other landmark buildings nearby, i.e. views
	  o Building could be seen as an "Ottawa" building
	  o Not attached to another building
	  o OPL sole owner, no selling of air rights
	4. Centretown
	  o Locate in CT, east of Bronson, west of Canal
	5. Accessibility
	  o Open to all citizens, including street involved individuals
	  o Build near the services currently accessed by street involved, under/non employed people
	  o High foot traffic, people will need to walk to it
	  o Economically and physically accessible
	6. Green space
	  o Allows for other uses
	  o Park like areas surrounding it
	  o Green roof
	  o Lots of windows to allow light so no building around it to block the light
	7. Funding
	  o No PPP; do not want to see the CocaCola Library of Ottawa
	  o Partnerships can offer opportunities for multi-uses'
	  o Independent coffee shops

Table JJ	1. Walkability: goes hand in hand with high density area, safe/well lit/well groomed routes

	2. Accessible (bike-2 blocks from a bike path/route/designation, bus – within a stop, LRT-within a station, walking-within 15 minutes from core), accessibility/mobility for seniors (able to drop off without issue) and people with mobility issues (drop off, graded sidewalk, ramps, etc.) 3. Safety: close to public transportation, well lit, more likeliness that people will be walking about (but not getting as crowded as a game night at Landsowne), where there is a sense of people walking with a purpose, and things are going on (animated watching eyes, cameras, video advertising, etc.) to make it "feel" like it is safe to walk to the library from a 15 minute walking perimeter. 4. Proximity to LRT (within 1 stop) 5. Flexibility (capacity)- most appropriate amount of square footage, should serve a variety of purposes, ease of use 6. Proximity to user base: proximity to where the library user base is 7. Scope for environmental building: green space, within viewing of Ottawa river, environmental building 8. Location deserves the investment, an important piece of infrastructure that deserves sufficient funds, should be well built and efficient to maintain 9. Minimal negative impact on surroundings (fits/blends in with the community)
Table KK	1. All modes of trip access year round 2. Locate based on current users 3. Services and business 4. Safe location 5. Iconic and inviting 6. Library first 7. Streetscape presence 8. Low land cost 9. Future expansion
Table LL	1. Natural light 2. Flexible design site 3. Accessibility 4. Finances 5. Easily found 6. Safety 7. Parking 8. Close to Community 9. Nice view from the top

	10. Flagship site
Table MM	1. Accessibility/walkability ***
	a. + transportation and year-round
	b. LRT
	2. **Proximity/synergy to where people work, live and play** - to existing services and assets in the area
	a. Drawing people to the area
	b. Provide a service to people
	c. Services e.g., businesses
	d. Assets e.g,, institutions, workplaces
	3. Tourists - Location where tourists can easily access it
	a. Cultural hub; adds to the beauty of the city; connectivity; discover local talent
	b. Civic pride that relates to city's identity e.g., Halifax
	4. Ability to integrate mixed-use services
	a. Extend uses of the library (programs and services)
	b. Can be outside of the actual building
	c. Support the library services and programs (enhance experience)
	5. Structural integrity
	6. Personal safety - busy location, lighting, communication
	7. Ability to address current and future needs (technology and structural)
	8. Flexibility / ability to grow, expand or change
	a. The library has to be the priority e.g., no selling air rights
	b. Libraries are changing
	c. "We always plan for current uses; we don't want to miss an opportunity"
	d. "We don't want to make the same mistake again"
	(From the email)
	1. Accessibility: transportation (walkability)
	2. Accessibility: weather, hill, ease of access
	3. Proximity to areas where people live work and play
	4. Tourist location: iconic / service
	5. Proximity / synergy to existing services and assets in the area. (Community Hub amidst other services and activities / synergy)
	6. Ability to integrate mix use services, that support the libraries services and programs
	7. Structural ability to hold weight / size
	8. Technology: ability to handle current and future technology needs

	9. Safe: Active area, day evening, weekend, cellular network 10. Flexibility: ability to grow / expand / change
Table NN	1. Accessibility (special needs) 2. Green building 3. Green space 4. Modern Architecture 5. Multi-purpose building 6. Community development 7. Car accessibility is not obligatory 8. Centrally located near working & living population density 9. Public Identity (not development) 10. Access by human-powered/public transport

Parking Lot — Add comments that are not directly relevant to the three exercises above.

Table	Parking Lot — Add comments that are not directly relevant to the three exercises above.
1st Session: 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.	
Table D	• Problem with definition of southern edge of central core – why not south to Nepean St or Lisgar? • Need lots of bathrooms!! • Cost of location should not be the only priority • Good sound in building so noise doesn't travel • Keep stained glass window • Less focus on parking • Space for large events
Table F	• Participants were interested in knowing when the next consultations would take place and when we would start talking about functions and services.
Table G	Around the table contributions: • Walking distance (location); Not having to pay for bus tickets; Will walk 15 minutes; Walking distance from the Mission and Shepherd's of Good Hope • Easy transportation for anyone in the city by bus or light rail for everyone in the City of Ottawa; • Walkability from transport – access by bus; the library lot should have green space and be near green space; Curb appeal – a building that will pull you in, and that is located in a lovely space

	• Room to expand so that if the library would like to partner with another organization down the road, there is room to expand; • Accessibility – easy to get to by bus, car, walking and LRT – those travelling all of these ways should be able to get to the library easily (15 min to walk to from home, parking, bus etc); easy for kids & seniors to walk to (quiet streets) • Easy for local community to walk to and for office workers to walk to (15 min walk); located in a convenient location, near to other services (grocery store, pharmacy etc);
Table H	• Able to visit easily • Current location • Greenspace • Fear of having a large building with no collections • Prompted on accessibility; 1.6 km quoted as the distance to a community branch in Toronto. • Needs to have parking • Must serve whole city • Difficult to divorce design and location • Hard to determine location without having a list of sites. • Present location doesn't elevate your energy • Service is good at all locations • Community branch of 20,000 square feet to serve the down • Separate central branch. • Not having barriers to the branch • Able to accommodate future growth. • Not negatively impact other branches. • Not too close to a hockey . • Decrease parking spaces to increase LEED scoring. • Becoming more of a community space. • Find a way to accommodate / help the homeless or more needy • Change mandate of library to help the needy.

Table L	• Cost is important:
	   ○ some programs should be revisited with future demographics in mind for cost effectiveness to pay for OCL
	   ○ other layers of government and NCC should help fund it
	• revisit existing expenses

Table P	• Location came up several times: 1 'core' (Bronson, Summerset, Canal, Wellington), 1 Lebreton Flats

	• Design elements were mentioned: green, sustainable
2nd Session: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.	
Table BB	• Look at Lebreton flats partnership • Old Ogilvie building (Nicholas at Rideau)
Table CC	• Usability of a space, open space inside library • Out of the box idea – over the canal or the locks • Why not build the library into a path underneath the downtown core – a subterranean core. • Parking outside of core near to public transport. • Put it in the old train station.
Table DD	• Concerns about programming: the new library should have spaces that flexible for many uses, and that supports rich outdoor programming • People mentioned the importance of incorporating a good coffee place • Suggested programs: Puppet shows, Paw patrol, a lego table; • Beautiful architecture would be greatly desirable: large windows, natural light • Suggestion that we make sure that we take the stained glass window and incorporate it in the new building
Table FF	• flat; no thresholds • within 5 blocks of an LRT stop • locate between Bronson and the canal • more interested in simply getting people into a library • public is interested in seeing statistics on who uses • not LeBreton Flats; not near the arena • develop a partnership to take over the federal conference • fast food outlet • funding from a variety of sources • concerns about moving a library away from one community into an area that is growing; • design needs to allow for easy access • 10 minute walk to branch tops • Holds service is much appreciated
Table JJ	• automobile parking should not be a criteria, ppl should come through other means • potential for revenue generation through co-development should be excluded (leasing is fine) • partnership w private enterprise should be excluded (i.e., against a partnership with a condo company)

	• should be entering this project to serve the community exclusively, should be a stand-alone library • don't want a "Molson Central Library"
Table KK	• Feedback form • Liked the small group- was good for those who wouldn't want to speak in front of large group • Centrally located • Cookies would be good • Given something in advance to understand what this session will be like • Specifics of the area map- idea of what square footage is • Daytime session, Weekend session to include all sorts of people
Table LL	• Need to get decisions done quickly - don't want to lose momentum • Flagship site
Table NN	• Design competition • Transparent process for site selection