

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

EVALUATION FORM Temecula Public Library 2052

Overall Rating

4

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		4529%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	4	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	3	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

Non-Evaluative Comments

Temecula is currently served by a county branch library. Due to the dramatic population increase in Temecula, the library jurisdiction has determined the need for a new city library facility that will operate in addition to the existing branch facility. The Bond Act Application Form asks for the square footage and dates of construction and renovation for library buildings that will be replaced or improved. Because the current library will continue to operate, the applicant has not completed those sections in the Application Form, and it is considered to have no existing library.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	Temecula, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	Riverside County Library System
<i>Project Type/Priority:</i>	New Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	34,000
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$8,552,414

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

Age and Condition of Existing Library

RATING 4

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

4

N/A

Structural Renovation Rating

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

- 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
N/A			

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: No existing library.
Library renovation date:

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

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

RATING

4

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
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

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

Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

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

Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

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

Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

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

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

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

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

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

Needs Assessment:

An broad range of input methods was used to obtain community input, which reached a broad spectrum of user groups. Spanish translations helped ensure that the Hispanic clientele was heard from. The space assessment was well documented with the exception that it did not indicate how the number of technology units to be included in the library was determined.

Plan of Service:

Overall a very good plan of service that responds well to the findings of the needs assessment. Goals and objectives are well written, and services are presented in a clear, approachable manner.

Joint Use Agreement:

This is a joint use agreement that represents a mutually beneficial partnership. Of concern is the lack of Saturday service hours for the joint venture project, but Sunday hours will be provided. Funding is addressed in specific terms, with a minimum guarantee.

Building Program:

A very good general requirements section. Excellent spatial relationship narrative descriptions and a spatial diagram as well. In general, the space descriptions are extremely well done and detailed and appear to be appropriately sized.

Conceptual Plans:

Optimal match between both net-assignable and non-assignable space (at 25% each) in the building program and the conceptual plans. The spatial relationships on the conceptual plans appear to most of the critical spatial relationships.

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

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

R2:

Needs Assessment:

There is an excellent variety and depth of needs assessment methods, with copies of instruments and results presented in Appendix. Tools were appropriately translated into Spanish. The community analysis provided a fairly limited discussion of governmental agencies and community organizations, but they did show a reasonable feel for their community. Did not make much connection between the factors of the community analysis and potential library issues. The service needs assessment was pretty general but did relate to the Needs Assessment results. The space needs allocation was generally sufficient, though the percentage of Spanish language materials at < 5% seems low (Hispanic populations at 20%). There was also a bit more detailed discussion than was really needed in this section; detracting from the clarity of the data. Excellent Executive Summary of community, K-12 population, Needs Assessment methods and basic results.

Plan of Service:

The project is very responsive to the needs defined and is very clear. The goals and objectives are very good. They provided excellent and clear connections to the Needs Assessment results. Excellent presentation of types of services both here and within goals and objectives section; well documented and very responsive.

Joint Use Agreement:

Generally an excellent, mutually beneficial agreement. The review process was not well addressed, and the very general waiver language is a problem in that it could be used to cancel the entire agreement rather than having it in force for the required 20 years--needs to be modified if award is made.

Building Program:

The Building Program is outstanding in describing the general requirements, spatial relationships between the individual spaces, and descriptions of the individual spaces. The bubble diagram is highly effective in communicating to the architect the spatial relationships and adjacencies.

Conceptual Plan:

The net and non-assignable square footage are extremely well done. They are exceptional in matching the Building Program within reason. The spatial relationships match the Building Program exceptionally well, and the presentation with color made it easy to read.

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

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

R3:**Needs Assessment:**

The applicant has done an excellent job at gathering community information. The multi-faceted approach included community workshops, surveys, telephone surveys (also available in Spanish), focus groups, student surveys in four schools, and interviews with key informants, some of which were conducted in Spanish. A very good description of the methodologies that were used. Proposed Spanish language collections (3%) seem small in light of findings in the needs assessment (Hispanic population is 20%).

Plan of Service:

An excellent plan that responds directly to findings in the needs assessment. Described what services are currently being offered and what is being proposed based on the findings in the needs assessment.

Joint Use Agreement:

Have made an attempt to encourage a workable partnership. Service hours are not available on Saturdays even though the library is open; however, Sunday hours will be available .

Building Program:

Have done an excellent job at integrating services into the proposed facility. Homework Center is located near the Young Adult area where teens will readily use it. General requirements and room sheets are overall very well done. Space relationships clear and sensible. Modest bubble diagram assists.

Room sheets:

A Reference Copy Center is mentioned in adjacencies on p. 7-12 and 5-19, and drawn on floor plan as Copy Center B with 205 square ft. Program requirement noted - but there is no Room Sheet in the Program for that space, nothing by which to determine size or location or equipment or anything else.

Conceptual plans:

Assignable square footage very close to program. Gross square footage same as program. Spatial relationships: Library Manager's office does not meet visual supervision requirements of the building program, and public access via young adult area is questionable. Otherwise, conforms to Program.

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

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

Integration of Electronic Technologies

RATING

4

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
4	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

The planning documents demonstrate a thorough understanding of both the need for technology in providing library services and the service solutions technology can provide. The new facility will provide excellent connectivity, and the need for flexibility to allow for future technology is demonstrated.

R2:

The plan provides excellent planning for immediate needs and flexibility for the future. It is well documented and clear. It might be useful for them to investigate some self check-out/check-in systems given their high circulation volume.

R3:

A jack will be available at every seat in the proposed facility. The technology configuration takes into account future growth (Temecula is the second fastest growing city in the state with 3,700% population increase 1980-2000). A clear and straightforward technology plan.

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

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

Site

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING

3

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	3	3
1	2	2
3	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	4	3
4	4	4
<i>N/A</i>		
3	3	4
3	3	3
3	4	4

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	3	3
2	3	3
2	2	3
3	3	3

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

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: There currently is no storm sewer in the area, but it will be added as part of the project and the Pauba Road improvements.

Geotechnical issues: The closest known active fault is approximately 1.7 miles to the southwest of the site. The geotechnical investigation did not find any conditions that would prevent the use or significantly increase the cost of developing the site as a public library.

R1:

The proposed site is geographically central within the service area and has beautiful views of the surrounding valley and mountains. The site is near a Sports Park, fire station, community recreation center, teen center and high school. The site is located on Pauba Road (7,878 vehicles per day) a two-lane east/west connector road part of which will be widened to a 4-lane road with a dedicated turning lane if the library project is built. Margarita Road as a major north/south 4-lane arterial road with 17,540 vehicles per day that is one block from the library site. Five blocks from the site, Ynez Road (6-lane urban arterial road) just south of Rancho California Road has 29,068 vehicles per day. The major commercial developments in Temecula lie to the north and west of the library site at Ynez Road and Rancho California Road and Winchester Road. Ynez Road runs parallel to I-15 which cuts across the western side of the service area. There is one shopping center approximately one mile away.

There are no public transit stops within 1/4 mile of the library site, although there is a commitment to add and/or reroute bus routes to provide bus service to the site prior to the library opening. The new stop will be adjacent to the library driveway. There is also a dial-a-ride service in the area for seniors and the disabled.

The site is surrounded by residential development and there are sidewalks on the major streets in both directions. Three are Class II Bike Lanes on most major nearby streets, and Pauba Road the street the library is on is programmed for a Class II Bike lane as part of the widening of the street. There will be 18 bicycle parking spaces near the front entrance of the library, but they do not appear to be sheltered.

There are 135 parking space on site and not other off site parking within 500' of the front door. The parking lot is long and narrow (following the configuration of the site) and while the grant applicant and architect have taken advantage of this fact with a creative timeline promenade, it still is a fact that it is a pretty long walk from the furthest point in the back of the parking lot to the front entrance of the library building.

The library will be feature quite prominently on a hillside overlooking the sports park. The library's prominence on Pauba Road will make the library even more visible in the community as the road becomes an even more heavily traveled east/west conduit in the community.

While the application indicates that the building can be expanded on the site, there is nothing on the site plan to indicate the expansion potential, nor is there any indication that the parking could be expanded in the future. There is however overflow parking available to the east at the fire station.

Nine sites were identified in a site selection process that involved the community, City council, City staff and library design committee and then narrowed down to three. Site selection criteria including the cost of the site were applied and the City ultimately approved the proposed site as the best.

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

EVALUATION FORM

Temecula Public Library 2052

R2:

The site is both in the middle of the service area and in the middle of nowhere. It is a few blocks to Temecula High, but for anyone else, it's a special trip, not while enroute to or from some other shopping, commuting, etc.

Public transit is planned, but no existing route is currently close; paratransit is available. Generous bicycle parking and bike lanes on all nearby roads provide good access. Sidewalks appear to be connecting to all nearby facilities.

Widening of Pauba Rd. will facilitate auto access from I-5 and from Margarita Rd. Parking exceeds code. Although additional parking is available at the adjacent fire station and at the sports area to the north, it is not clear if there is pedestrian access from the latter.

The structure, sitting atop the bluff, will be quite visible from the north. Pauba Rd. visibility will also be good. However, it will not be visible from other areas. Since it is not on a road to anywhere in particular, and is not directly accessible from the Park / Sports Complex below, it remains a special trip.

The location provides reasonable access for the central and southern parts of Temecula. Its centrality to several schools helps that relationship. The selection process was thorough and broad-based. Several alternative sites were considered before adopting this one. The site is limited, but the design makes optimum use of it.

Although the site is 6X the footprint, much of it is unbuildable because of the grade on the northern side. Unfortunately, the drawings do not precisely locate the site boundaries on the contour map, so this reviewer cannot determine if there is additional buildable land in the northeast part of the site - but the slope shown on the sections suggests not.

The site is somewhat isolated, prominent as it may be to viewers to the north. Its civil aspects make it difficult to provide any flexibility, and there appears no room for expansion of building or parking. It appears the designers have made the best of a difficult challenge.

R3:

The proposed site is geographically central to the service area, though somewhat off the beaten path with regard to transportation and other county/city services. There is no current public transit to the site, but there is a commitment by the Riverside Transit Agency to reconfigure or add a route to provide a stop at the library. Pedestrian and bicycle access is excellent with sidewalks on both sides of Pauba, and Class II bike lanes on surrounding streets. Automobile access is from Pauba, which will be widened in conjunction with the library project and a dedicated left turn lane will be provided. Pauba connects to two major arterials: Ynez Road just to the west and Margarita Road just east of the site. Automobile parking consists of 135 spaces on site/off street in a long rectangular configuration. A shaded central walkway extends the length of the lot and features a timeline of Temecula's history. A bus turnaround, drop-off area is at the western end of the lot. Eighteen bicycle spaces are provided, though none appear to be sheltered. The site is on a hillside and will be very visible from the surrounding area, as well as enjoying panoramic of the valley below. The site looks down on a heavily utilized Sports Park and Community Recreation Center and is adjacent to a fire station in this predominantly residential area. Both the grade and the long rectangular shape of the site present challenges, the applicant has mitigated these nicely while retaining the advantages of this prominent site.

EVALUATION FORM
Temecula Public Library 2052

Financial Capacity

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.