TASK #1: EFFECTIVE USE OF LIBRARY SPACE

Library users frequently comment on the need to use space effectively. After hearing the information presented tonight, please discuss the advantages, disadvantages and surprises of each of the proposed facility solutions.

TASK #2: PRIORITIZING FACILITY SOLUTIONS

Community Engagement Session #2 identified a list of "needs" for the Crystal Lake Public Library (see the Verbatim and Summary documents on your table). Tonight we heard details about four different approaches to address those "needs."

As a small group, reflect on the information presented tonight, as well as your experiences and interactions with the current Library facility, and then prioritize the proposed facility solutions based on your vision for the Crystal Lake community and the future needs of our citizens and families.

- Rank the facility solutions below from 1 to 4 (with *#1 being the top priority)*.
- Please share your thoughts/rationale on your priority rankings.

TASK #3: ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS? DID WE MISS ANYTHING?

You've heard detailed information about possible solutions for our Library facility, but we might have missed something. Does your group have suggestions or ideas that were not presented tonight? Are there any additional options or library features that your group would like considered in the facility plan? Please record your ideas in the spaces below.

TASK #4: STRATEGIC TOPIC AREAS – QUESTIONS/ISSUES/OPPORTUNITIES

What information would you like us to include in the final Community Engagement Session on June 9, "What About the Money?"

Eighty-two participants attended the third *FOCUS* Community Engagement Session on May 19, 2016, focused on "Our Facility: Does Form Follow Function?" Architect, Joe Huberty, of Engberg Anderson Architects, provided an overview of the four approaches and how each would address the "Needs" that the community identified in Community Engagement Session #2. The options included: Repair, Renew, Expand, and Replace.

Following the presentation, participants worked in nine small groups to complete the four tasks listed above. Following is a summary of the responses from the groups.

TASK #1: EFFECTIVE USE OF LIBRARY SPACE

Following the presentation, participants at the third *FOCUS* Community Engagement Session were asked to discuss and list the advantages, disadvantages and surprises for each of the four facility options. A Verbatim of the discussion of these options can be found at **http://focus.clpl.org** under the Community Engagement Session #3 link.

TASK #2: PRIORITIZING FACILITY SOLUTIONS

After considering the various advantages, disadvantages and surprises for the four facility options, participants were asked to rank the options one through four, with one being the top priority. With nine tables reporting, eight of nine selected the Replace option, and one table opted for a tie between Replace and Expand. *FOCUS* small groups were also asked to provide their thoughts/rationales for their ranking decisions. Rationales included, "We want the best for our community," "Better opportunity for Library's growth and operation in the most non-disruptive manner." The other options ranked as follows: 2nd – Expand, 3rd – Renew and 4th Repair.

TASK #3: ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS? DID WE MISS ANYTHING?

The next task asked small groups to collaborate and share any additional suggestions or ideas to be considered for the facility options. Varied responses were listed by the FOCUS small groups. Some ideas were, "Why not three stories?", "What would expanded youth center have? Possibly- Age specific story time rooms, more technology (computers)."

TASK #4: STRATEGIC TOPIC AREAS – QUESTIONS/ISSUES/OPPORTUNITIES

FOCUS participants were asked to provide input and suggestions for the final strategic topic area, "What About the Money?" The most listed questions related to how a facility project would be funded. The other topic noted by multiple groups was the cost differences between the four facility options.

For a complete listing of all responses
see the May 19, 2016 CES-3 Verbatim Response Document found at
http://focus.clpl.org