

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM Pickleweed Library 2004

Overall Rating

<b>3</b>
----------

### Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		145%
Age and Condition	3	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	3	
Appropriateness of site	3	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		N/A

### Non-Evaluative Comments

None.
-------

### Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	San Rafael, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	San Rafael Public Library
<i>Project Type/Priority</i>	Renovation/2
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	6,487
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$1,288,893

# EVALUATION FORM Pickleweed Library 2004

## Age and Condition of Existing Library

**RATING**

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

### Age Rating

- 4 = No Existing Facility
- 4 = 1949 or older
- 3 = 1950-1959
- 2 = 1960-1964
- 1 = 1965-1974
- 0 = 1975-2003

### Structural Renovation Rating

- 4 = No Renovation
- 4 = 1954 & earlier
- 3 = 1955-1962
- 2 = 1963-1972
- 1 = 1973-1978
- 0 = 1979-2003

3

0

4

- 4 = Extremely Poor Condition
- 3 = Poor condition
- 2 = Acceptable condition
- 1 = Good condition
- 0 = Very good condition

### Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	3	3
3	4	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

### Rating Scale for element 9

- 4 = Very good condition
- 3 = Good condition
- 2 = Acceptable condition
- 1 = Poor condition
- 0 = Extremely poor condition

## Rating panel comments

**Library construction date: 1983**  
**Library renovation date: None**  
**Feasibility Study Issues:**

R1:

The major physical problems with the current facility center on the lack of space to provide adequate public library services. Lack of space causes dual use of areas, limiting their effectiveness. The one-room physical arrangement creates a noise-transfer problem. Other problems with the facility include inadequate and inefficient HVAC system, inadequate lighting, the presence of hazardous materials, leaking roof, dry rot, an unstable foundation.

# EVALUATION FORM

## Pickleweed Library 2004

R2:

Situated within the Pickleweed Park Community Center built in 1983, this library currently occupies just 526 square feet. Homework tutoring must be done in shifts and furniture must be removed to accommodate story time telling. Storage is inadequate and functionality in this one room library setting is highly restrictive. Inadequate space makes stacks difficult to page from and inaccessible to children. Availability of, and access to, computers is very limited.

The building has a number of serious deficiencies including roof, siding and gluelam floor beams in a state of dry rot. The HVAC and duct systems need replacement and ventilation is inadequate. One structural concern is that the facility is built on re-claimed marsh land (bay mud) with some of the footing supported by adjustable jacks that continually re-level the building as the mud settles. The jacks are currently at maximum heights.

Due to budget difficulties during construction, the facility was not completed in full accordance with the official blueprints and specifications. Shortcutting on material and workmanship led to a number of expansive water infiltration and other problems.

R3:

This is a building that has some critical structural limitations and deficiencies. The current roof leaks in many places, which has lead to the introduction of dry rot in the roof and adjacent walls. There is an extensive mold issue in the wooden walls. The facility is built on reclaimed bay land and as such the ground sinks. The 20-year building is placed on jacks that have reached their maximum adjustments. The building was not designed as a library and as such the lighting is not designed for meeting areas, computer usage, or reading. The HVAC is at the end of its life expectancy. Inspections have found PCB and asbestos

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Pickleweed Library 2004

### Needs and Response to Needs

**RATING**

**3**

Regulatory Basis: 20440

#### Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment

R1	R2	R3
3	4	3
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	3	3
2	3	3

#### Library Plan of Service

6. How well project responds to needs of residents
7. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators :
8. How well types of services are documented
9. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	3	3
3	3	3
3	4	3

#### Library Building Program

10. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
11. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
12. How well spatial relationships are described
13. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
2	3	2
3	3	2
3	3	2

#### Conceptual Plans

14. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
15. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
16. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	2	2

### Rating Panel Comments

R1:

#### Needs Assessment:

A variety of methods was used to elicit input from the service area residents. The community analysis was very well done. The space needs assessment provides a very good description of number of units and square footage conversions, but there is minimal rationale concerning how the number volumes, readers seats, technology units, etc., were determined for the proposed library building.

#### Plan of Service:

The plan of service is very well done, following the findings of the needs assessment document and translating the findings into appropriate library services for the community.

#### Building Program:

Fairly minimal, but acceptable general requirements section. Somewhat minimal, but fairly well detailed spatial relationships. This is mitigated by the fact that this is a small and fairly uncomplicated public library, and there is a spatial diagram. The space descriptions are detailed extremely well, however since the square footage for the furnishings and equipment calculations is not present in either the space descriptions nor the space summary, there is no way to determine if the sizing is appropriate.

#### Conceptual Plans:

There was no separate side-by-side comparison of building program space to conceptual plans space. However, there was a table on the conceptual floor plan that could be compared to the building program that matched exactly. In most ways the spatial relationships are good but the location of the restrooms on one side of the building where the public must walk through the library proper to access them is acceptable, but quite problematic.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Pickleweed Library 2004

R2:

**Needs Assessment**

There are a good variety of methods used and a good selection of groups contacted. Two of the assessment tools cited are more than 5 years old. However, there are enough current tools to make up for that, particularly for this relatively small project. The Community Analysis was generally excellent, except that connections between the community characteristics defined and potential library issues related to these were not generally drawn.

**Plan of Service:**

The planned services tie-in to the needs assessment findings very well, except that "improve school readiness" did not appear in the top ratings in the Needs Assessment results.

**Building Program:**

General requirements description is appropriate for a very small library. The spatial relationships are described simply and efficiently for a small library. Individual spaces are sized and described well for their size library. It follows the regulatory requirements very well.

**Conceptual drawings:**

Net-assignable and non-assignable square footage match EXACTLY. Spatial relationships provided in the drawings are what is asked for in the Building Program. The restrooms that are on the far side of the library from the entrance does pose some grave concern. This is such a small library that it would be unfortunate to require people to walk through it to reach the restrooms and walk back again. The restrooms appear to be about as large as the square footage allocated for the library.

R3:

**Needs Assessment:**

Used a variety of methods to obtain community input--good to see that there was input from differently-abled individuals. Unable to determine whether survey instruments were available in Spanish.

**Plan of Service:**

Planned services are consistent with the demographics (70.1% Latino) and other needs assessment findings.

**Building Program:**

A 2,000 gross square footage building has a very large proportion of space taken up by mandatory non-assignable functions. The building may not make sense unless shared with other municipal functions. E.g., the two sets of public restrooms could be organized in common.

At the Public Service Desk, the building program specifies one of its functions is for "holds", but the area sheet specifies no shelving nor any provision for book trucks for holds or for returns. Other specifications are skimpy or missing (e.g., "Circulation desk does not specify what cabling will be needed, its height, or the number of staff stations; it's not indicated that the Homework Center provide power and data access for laptops or instructional A-V stuff, which appears to be an oversight). Overall, the limited detail in the Building Program detracts significantly from its competitiveness. There are inconsistent adjacencies indicated (e.g., the bubble diagram shows Homework Center accessed via Computer Center Storage, but the narrative text indicates direct access to Public Area).

**Conceptual Plan:**

Sizes of programmed spaces are identical to the building program; non-assignable sq. footage corresponds to various code and function requirements. The building program is silent regarding bathrooms. Hence, the following major problem in the Conceptual Plans is not justified by any Program requirements: The larger (existing) restroom is accessed by library users of the Meeting Room, Computer Room, Homework Room, etc., via the library Public Area space, thereby disturbing any readers there who need quiet. A more satisfactory arrangement would buffer the reading area from the busy circulation and vestibule / bathroom areas. This project co-mingles those, to the detriment of users needing some quiet. Not all space adjacencies are achieved in the conceptual plan (e.g., Homework Center access via corridor from Public Area, beyond Computer Center and Storage (somewhat like Bubble diagram), not directly adjacent per the building program).

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Pickleweed Library 2004

#### ***Integration of Electronic Technologies***

**RATING**

**3**

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

#### **Integration of Electronic Technologies**

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
3	2	2
3	3	3
3	3	2

#### **Rating Panel Comments**

R1:

The needs assessment document demonstrates an understanding of the need for access to technology for the clientele, and appropriate technology solutions are addressed in the needs assessment findings. The incorporation of a computer center in this "technology poor" area is appropriate, but it appears that sharing the homework center and computer center personal computers may spread the resources a bit thin. Under-floor duct for wiring and wireless technology will be provided in the new library, both of which provide well for future expansion and technological changes.

R2:

There is an issue of available expertise to make computer center an ongoing success without undue burden to staff. Bilingual access to library services and availability of resources are emphasized.

R3:

Access to computers is important to this community, but it would be helpful to designate some computers exclusively for use by the homework center.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Pickleweed Library 2004

### Site

**RATING**

3
---

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendix 1

#### Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
3	2	3
3	3	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
3	4	3
4	4	4
3	4	4
<i>N/A</i>		
2	2	3
4	4	4
3	3	3

#### Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	3
3	2	3
2	2	3
4	4	4

### Rating Panel Comments

**Drainage issues:** The site is in the 100 Year Flood Plain, but the finished floor level of the library will be brought up above the 100 year flood level.

**Geotechnical issues:** Project needs existing fill to be removed and interconnected to shallow spread footing system, but that should not significantly increase the cost of developing the site.

R1: The building is not centrally located for the population of the service area. It is on the northern edge of the service area, which is very small and 80% of the users live within 2,400 "walkable" feet of the site. The site is located in a primarily residential area and the local elementary school is very close to the site. The site is on Canal Street which is a broad residential public thoroughfare. Traffic volume is not particularly high on Canal Street (6,241 at Canal St. and Novato St. - 3 blocks from the proposed site). The highest traffic reading is 28,456 vehicles / day 9 blocks away at Bellam Blvd and East Francisco. In addition to Canal, Kerner and Medway streets are "major" collector streets leading to the library site.

There are 3 bus stops within 1/4 mile of the site and one stop is only 400 feet from the front door of the library. A recent study showed that 2/3's of bus riders are transit dependent and that close to 1/2 of the residents report that they do not drive. There are sidewalks on both sides of Canal St., and bike routes extend throughout the neighborhood and connect to the library site. The library will have 20 bicycle spaces, which do not appear to be under shelter. There are 85 automobile parking sites available "on-site," but only 5 of them are dedicated to the library exclusively. The other 80 are available on a first come first served basis. A recent study showed that users of the community center arrive in the following ways: 27% as pedestrian, 5% as bicycle, and 68% by automobile, but 60% of those arriving by automobile are dropped off or picked up, which requires no parking.

While Canal Street is considered a "major thoroughfare" for this community, it does not have high traffic volume. However, the library site is visible in the community because of the combination with the community center and park, and it will have its own entrance with prominent signage clearly visible from the street. While there does not appear to be any business or retail nearby, the Canal area is an area of focus for the city's Community Redevelopment Agency, and the library expansion on this site is in alignment with area plans for revitalizing the area. The community center site was picked because it is a central hub of activity. The site selection process involved 6 public meetings and 16 "outreach" contacts with organizations and groups, as well as a written survey. It was decided that this was the best site because "it brings library services where people already gather." While the application does not indicate that the building or parking will be expanded in the future, there appears to be room on the site to do so if necessary.

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Pickleweed Library 2004

**R2:**

The site is located at the very edge of the service area, but mitigated by the fact that it is a small service area. There is a bus stop a quarter-mile from the site. Bicyclists and pedestrians will have no difficulty in getting here. Bicycle parking is located in two areas (at the library entry and at the community center entry), but it is not sheltered. It's easy to get to the site via either of the major thoroughfares that lead to it. Although there are five dedicated library-only parking spaces, there are 207 other spaces available that range from a few feet to 500 feet away. Few residents in the service area will arrive by automobile.

Because the site is on the edge of the service area, it's not as visible as might be desired, and there is a local code that prohibits directional signs, which does not help. At the same time, the community is built out, and has few other site choices. The needs assessment indicates that the residents of the area are well aware of the library location. The site responds to the overall community long-term planning. The site selection process was reasonable: it made good use of limited available resources and included community residents. The Community Center and park will draw people to the area.

The site size is more than adequate, but the building is strung-out along the street frontage, inhibiting efficiency of centralizing support services (bathrooms, etc.) and of promoting planned adjacencies (Homework Center supposed to be adjacent to Public Area). Location and arrangement of parking and driveways are quite sensible.

**R3:**

Site is at one end of main thoroughfare that transects the service area, is co-located with the community park, and is within 2,400 feet of 80% of the service population. Accessibility to public transit is excellent with a bus stop within 400' of the proposed library front door. Pedestrian/bicycle access is excellent. Proposed library will expand and enhance community services provided at the community center.