

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

Overall Rating

| |
|----------|
| 4 |
|----------|

Ratings Summary

| BOND ACT CRITERIA | RATING | |
|--|---------------|------------|
| Population Growth | | 47% |
| 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

Residents of the 81st Avenue service area currently receive library services from the Oakland Public Library. As a result of population growth, a new library service area was created by the library jurisdiction.

Project Summary

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <i>Applicant:</i> | Oakland, City of |
| <i>Library Jurisdiction:</i> | Oakland Public Library |
| <i>Project Type/Priority</i> | New Construction of Library/1 |
| <i>Project Square Footage:</i> | 28,112 |
| <i>State Grant Request:</i> | \$6,513,345 |

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

Age and Condition of Existing Library and School Library **RATING**

| |
|---|
| 4 |
|---|

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

| R1 | R2 | R3 |
|----|----|----|
| 4 | 4 | 4 |

Age Rating -- Public Library

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

N/A

| R1 | R2 | R3 |
|----|----|----|
| | | |

Structural Renovation Rating -- Public Library

- 4 = No Renovation
- 4 = 1957 or 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

N/A

| R1 | R2 | R3 |
|----|----|----|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

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

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

Age of Library Rating -- School Lib

4 = No Existing Facility
 3 = 1957 or older
 2 = 1958-1962
 1 = 1963-1974
 0 = 1975-Present

| | | |
|----|----|----|
| R1 | R2 | R3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |

Structural Renovation Rating -- School Lib.

4 = No Renovation
 3 = 1957 or older
 2 = 1958-1962
 1 = 1963-1974
 0 = 1975-Present

N/A

| | | |
|----|----|----|
| R1 | R2 | R3 |
| | | |

Physical Limitations of Existing School Library

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4 = Extremely Poor Condition | 1. Structural |
| 3 = Poor condition | 2. Lighting |
| 2 = Acceptable condition | 3. Energy |
| 1 = Good condition | 4. Health & Safety |
| 0 = Very good condition | 5. ADA |
| | 6. Acoustical |
| | 7. Flexibility |
| | 8. Spatial Relationships |
| | 9. Site Considerations |

N/A

| | | |
|----|----|----|
| R1 | R2 | R3 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Rating panel comments

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

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440

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 |
|----|----|----|
| 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 |

N/A

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 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
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well the school library's mission statement is documented
11. How well types of services are documented
12. How well types of K-12 services are documented
13. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

| R1 | R2 | R3 |
|----|----|----|
| 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |

Library Building Program

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

| R1 | R2 | R3 |
|----|----|----|
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |

Conceptual Plans

18. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
20. 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

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

| R1 | R2 | R3 |
|----|----|----|
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT:

Applicant has utilized a variety of techniques to gather input from the community for this multi-purpose co-located project. In addition to serving as a branch for the Oakland Public Library, it will also serve as a school library for the two autonomous schools that will share the site. The needs assessment process was conducted during an 18 month period and included the following methodologies: 6 focus groups (teens, seniors, teachers, disabled residents, parents of students, and general community members); 18 stakeholder interviews; 5 community meetings; survey (available in both English and Spanish) of users and non-users. There were no copies of survey instruments nor was there any indication of the questions used in focus groups or summaries of the results. Most of the emphasis was on describing the different methodologies that were used. There didn't seem to be any type of analysis of the results of the needs assessment or a description of how proposed services relate to the findings. They did an excellent job at describing the community and in providing information about library service needs from community organizations. 7 broad service responses were identified (i.e., effective and efficient operations) but it was difficult to determine the relationship between the findings and the proposed responses. The most commonly identified need was for after school programs for children but there was no indication how that would be done. The space needs assessment was clearly stated but the proposed size of the Spanish Language collection (17%) seems low in light of the demographics that show that 49% of the population is Latino. Applicant has done an excellent job in describing the needs of the K-12 student population.

PLAN OF SERVICE:

7 service goals were identified and they are library-centered (i.e., to strengthen library service in East Oakland). The objectives are not measurable (i.e. children to be exposed to the joy of reading at an early age) and the service indicators are on the most part not client-centered. The plan of service does an excellent job at responding to the needs of K-12 students and in describing how the project fits into the jurisdiction-wide plan of service.

BUILDING PROGRAM:

An outstanding general requirements section both in terms of comprehensiveness and detail.

An excellent description of the library's spatial relationships both in narrative and graphic form.

Outstanding and extremely well detailed space descriptions that appear to be appropriately sized, however:

An interesting project that purposefully integrates adult, young adult and children's areas and collections.

The size of the adult collections appears to be significantly lower than in most branch libraries of this size.

The wisdom of programming a separate school entry into the library that goes directly into the children's area and not by the service desk remains to be seen.

There will be additional cost to having the separate elevators that access the school district space on the 2nd floor. Also an unprotected exterior elevator may be problematic from a security and vandalism standpoint.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS:

The building program requires 20,148 net assignable square footage for the two floors, or 70% of the 28,783 gross square footage. The floor plans provide 20,393 net assignable square footage for the floors, or 73% of the 28,112 gross square footage. In comparison to the building program, the floor plans have provided additional square footages in four program spaces:

1st floor Quiet Reading Area, 176 sq ft. more than required, or a 20% additional square footage.

1st floor Study/Special Services Room, 82 sq ft. more than required, or a 34% additional square footage.

1st floor Study/Tutor Room, 54 sq ft. more than required, or a 26% additional square footage.

2nd floor Meeting Room Reception, 51 sq ft. more than required, or a 24% additional square footage.

The floor plans have met building program requirements in an exceptional manner for both assignable and non-assignable square footage.

Despite minor differences in spatial relationships between the floor plans and the building program, the spatial relationships

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

Despite minor differences in spatial relationships between the floor plans and the building program, the spatial relationships illustrated on the floor plans follow building program requirements in an exceptional manner. The differences are:

Family Restroom is not away from all Adult spaces, especially Adult Spanish area. (BP 5-31)

Public Entrance is close, but is not adjacent to Delivery and Sorting Room. (BP 5-44)

Service Desk and School Entrance are not in sight line from Service Desk. (BP 5-46)

Teen Services area is not in sight line from Circulation Services. (BP 5-119)

Children's Restrooms (Family Restrooms?) and Children's Work Retreat (BP 5-35), in the building program are not individually identified on the floor plans.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT:

This agreement describes a partnering effort between the Oakland Unified School District and the City of Oakland. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined with the district dedicating staff that will provide support for their activities which they refer to as the district after school programs that include homework assistance. Services are clearly described and they should provide service for both students and the general public. Hours of service are excellent with Sunday hours available for the community as well as some early morning times. The facility will also be available for students in the early morning hours when it is closed to the public. There is a staffing commitment from both partners, however the district commitment will only be made for district activities. There is a commitment from both parties to provide financial support both for construction and staffing. The review and modification process will be done on a quarterly basis during the first two years and then on a semi-annual basis by a library coordinating committee, however there doesn't seem to be a mechanism in place for using input from users.

This partnering effort has commitments that will help students and will provide public library service for local residents within their own community.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

R2:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Community-based methods included focus groups, some community meetings, and key informant interviews. The surveys that were cited provided no data that could be tied to the library service needs of the specific east Oakland community. No copies of the surveys or questions addressed at focus groups, meetings, or interviews were provided and no compilation of detailed results of these instruments was presented. Some of this data was provided in the community analysis section, although it was not, for the most part, statistically analyzed, so levels of priority for most cannot be determined from the data provided. They demonstrate an excellent knowledge of their community and provided clear information on implications of school characteristics for potential library services in this joint public library/school library effort. They did not, however, draw similar connections to the implications for other characteristics and demographics of the community. The set of needs defined are probably basically appropriate for the east Oakland community. There is little statistical analysis provided to determine what priority level the community members place on the specific ones defined. Where there is statistical analysis it relates to the demographics of the community (which is fine) or to surveys that reflect citywide priorities rather than those of this individual community area. These latter are probably basically sound but clearly do not necessarily relate specifically to the nuances of this individual community. Overall, those defined are probably pretty accurate, but the presentation does not fully show how many of these specifically relate to this area. The space allocations are clear and realistic. One question is in the collections area. The text specifies that 17% of the 65,000 item collection will be in Spanish, since for 30% of the population Spanish is their primary language; the collections charts on pages 63-67, however, show a total of 8500 items in Spanish, or 13% of the collection. The executive summary did an excellent job of providing an overview of this effort. The student needs it defines, however, do not include any that seem to focus on this library's roles as an everyday school library but only those roles that a public library would play in support of an existing school library.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The goals are library-oriented rather than user-oriented, as are most of the objectives. The objectives are rarely measurable and the service indicators almost never outcomes-based. Taken together these do define a project that responds extremely well to the needs of K-12 students and the general community population. No mission statement for the school library was provided, but that for the one school that was provided was quite supportive of what a school library should mean to the school. The services are clearly defined, including very thoughtful treatment of how the library will function as a school library, with excellent information on the services specifically for that, the hours of service, and how the staffing will be accomplished. The jurisdiction-wide "fit" describes how the Oakland library system will support this branch and how the branch serves a community library function for 3 small neighborhood libraries within the overall Oakland service structure.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The general requirements are thorough, clear, and specific to this facility. The spatial relationships are clear and appropriate. There are some relationship "pairs" that do not match, but the inconsistencies do not make enough difference to be significant. The spaces seem well-sized and clearly described.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS:

Net-assignable space on the plans matches the building program extremely well.

Non-assignable space on the plans matches what was called for in the building program extremely well.

The conceptual plan meets the spatial relationships called for in the building program exceptionally well with a few exceptions:

Adult Non-Fiction is not really away from the Marketplace.

The Parent Area is not adjacent to the Storytime and Family Reading area, but it is close.

The Children's Work Retreat area is not identified on the plan.

The Delivery and Sorting area is not adjacent to the public entrance, but it is close.

The sight line from the service desk to the public restrooms and the separate children's entrance has not been maintained.

The Stepped Seating area in the Teen area appears to have little to no supervision. This could become a major problem, but it appears it would be easy to fix.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

The roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and equitably balanced. The joint use services are well-described and should be extremely useful for the students as well as the community. The hours of service are excellent for the library as a whole (6 or 7 days per week with excellent evening hours) and for the school library component (7:30 to library opening to the public at 10:00 or 12:00, 5 days per week). Staffing levels and classifications for library staff are clearly defined and appropriate for this facility as long as the

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

5 days per week). Staffing levels and classifications for library staff are clearly defined and appropriate for this facility as long as the staff efficiencies through technology are realized. Those for the district are made quite clear in the funding section and also seem reasonable for support of the strictly school library functions. The funding section is a model of the data that makes such a section clear and thorough and of a mutual effort. The review and modification process begins quarterly and then moves to semi-annual so should provide excellent timing for any needed changes. It does not seem to provide for user input into the process, however. Overall this seems an excellent partnership with equitable contributions on the part of all parties and a set of services that should be extremely useful into the future.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

R3:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The needs assessment process included a variety of methods to gather input from the residents of the service area, including six focus groups with special user groups such as teens, seniors, parents, teachers, disabled residents, and general community members; stakeholder interviews; five community meetings; and bilingual community and library surveys of both users and non-users. Unfortunately, the surveys and community meetings do not appear to be representative of the community and the adult surveys did not focus solely on library service needs. It's clear that the intent was to involve a broad spectrum of community residents, but the methods did not result in broad representation, with an unspecified number of survey responses and fewer than 80 attending all five community meetings. What was lacking in direct resident input was mitigated by the broad participation among the city agencies that have direct resident contact, resulting in what appears to be sharing of a large amount of information about the residents and their needs.

The community analysis is thorough, with insightful observations concerning the significance of community agencies to the library project. In addition to other demographic data, information gathering included mapping current library users to determine usage patterns. Some demographic information is augmented by analytical information relevant to the category, often from a local agency that works with the various user groups. The analysis of the community characteristics is somewhat brief, providing only a summary with little actual analysis. Library service needs are demonstrate thoughtful consideration of the needs assessment findings and provide more detail than would be expected at this point in the process. The space needs assessment utilizes standards adopted by the library jurisdiction and provides rationale for their application for this community. Conversion factors used to determine square footage are appropriate.

PLAN OF SERVICE

While goals and objectives are somewhat broad and not user-oriented, reading them in conjunction with the description of the services demonstrates that they correlate with the needs of the community. Of concern is the balance of adult and juvenile materials (e.g., the adult fiction collection is smaller than the juvenile fiction collection). While this is a co-located library, that would not necessarily dictate a larger children's collection -- perhaps a different configuration of children's materials to reflect curriculum support. There is not a school library mission statement, only a school mission statement for one of the two schools that is not specifically related to library services. The service plan does a particularly good job of merging basic library services with those specific to this community. There is a separate section of potential community partnership opportunities that demonstrates that the library is fully integrated into the community. The document is clearly presented and should prove to be valuable to those who will develop and implement the services. The section concerning jurisdiction-wide service clearly describes the relationship of the proposed library to the jurisdiction.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The building program follows the requirements of the plan of service, providing appropriate spaces for the services described. The general requirements section is thorough and should provide guidance for the design team as they develop a design solution for the library. Spatial relationships are thoroughly described and are logical and appropriate. Features unique to this library are explained clearly. Individual space sheets are well detailed and clearly describe the activities that are to occur in the space.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS:

The net assignable data is displayed accurately and clearly in the building program and on the plan. There is a slight increase in the actual SF and it is shown nicely. There are no major issues in this area.

The non-assignable SF in the building program is 30% and the plan has delivered this function at 27% with no major issues of concern. It is extremely well done.

This plan had no major flaws in the spatial relations. The following issues were noted:

- p. 5-8 Adult non-fiction not away from market place.
- p. 5-15 Quiet reading not away from market place or children's area.
- p. 5-19 Children's area not in line of sight to the school entry.
- p. 5-35 Preschool area not adjacent children's area.
- p. 5-44 Delivery & sorting not adjacent public entry.
- p. 5-46 Service desk not in line of sight to restrooms.
Service desk not in line of sight to school entry.
- p. 5-120 Teen area not away from quiet area.
Community room on 2nd floor cannot be closed off from library.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

Community room on 2nd floor cannot be closed off from library.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

The agreement demonstrates that careful thought has been given to service needs of both major user groups, the general public and the students of the two neighboring schools. Services are very clearly described, noting which services and areas are joint use. The hours of service for the public are spread over seven days, providing excellent accessibility. Students will be able to access the library during those hours and will also have early morning access when the library is closed to the general public. Staffing for the public and joint venture aspects is clear and unambiguous. The funding section is excellent concerning staffing, committing to specific staffing levels and FTEs, but collections and equipment are omitted, although they are committed to in general terms elsewhere. Review and modification will occur quarterly during the first two years, and semi-annually after that. This agreement definitely represents a mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

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 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 |

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

Applicant has done an excellent job of providing technological services that are responsive to needs identified by the local community. They plan to make 60 multi-functional computers accessible, which will be helpful to students as well as to the general public, many of whom do not have computers in their homes. There are lists of electronic resources for different groups of clients. They have addressed the need to plan for future technological enhancements by providing wireless connectivity which will assist in future reconfigurations should they be needed.

R2:

The electronic solutions proposed are appropriate to the needs defined, including a large number of computers for public use in this area, where not many are found in individual homes. They show excellent planning for the present and the future in conjunction with support provided by the library system as a whole and the city's technology infrastructure. An extensive list of electronic resources that will be available is provided with specific focus for different aged users. The building program, particularly in the spaces, is not clear on the specification of wireless support throughout the building nor for the public's use of their own laptop computers, as called for in the plan of service and service needs analysis. Otherwise, the treatment is very good, and these oversights can (and should) be taken care of before design goes forward.

R3:

The use of technology as a library service solution is evident throughout the planning documents. Specific types of electronic resources are detailed as early as the needs assessment. A variety of electronic resources are integrated into virtually all library services and functions. Types of technology solutions include RFID technology for check-out and return of materials; single-search interface for public access workstations; self-check and reserve pick-up; wireless technology for access to resources throughout the library and in the meeting rooms; and wireless phones and tablets/handheld devices for staff to free them from the reference desk. Fiber optic cable is strongly recommended, provided it is available at the site when construction begins.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

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 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 |
| N/A | | |
| 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 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 |
|----|----|----|
| 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 |

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: OK

Geotechnical issues: The site is 1.7 miles from the Hayward fault, but the geological study indicates that the site is suitable for the construction of the library project.

R1:

This multi-purpose co-located facility will serve as a public library branch as well as a school library. Located on a school campus that also includes a community facility, it will serve an area that is isolated and difficult to get to. There are two bus stops within 1/4 mile of the facility which connect to other bus lines and to the Coliseum BART stop. There are no bicycle lanes but there will be 20 bicycle spaces (6 covered) at the new facility. The site is accessible by automobile by driving through the neighborhood. I 880 runs parallel to San Leandro Blvd. and the BART line. The site is located 1 1/2 miles from Hegenberger Road which is a major arterial. There will be 80 on-site automobile parking spaces (no requirement) and other available spaces for a total of 100 spaces. The site selection process mentions that other sites were considered but there is no other information provided.

R2:

The proposed site is fairly centrally located in service area. The site is located within a service area that is primarily residential and industrial with commercial development being located on the edges of the service area on San Leandro Blvd and International Blvd, and Hegenberger Rd. The site is located on 81st Ave with 3,475 vehicles per day and within 2 blocks of International Blvd which has 26,394 vehicles per day.

There are two public transit stops within 1/4 mile of the site and a Bart station within 3/4's of a mile.

There are currently no bike lanes in the service area, but a 1999 plan is in implementation. There are 20 on-site bicycle parking spaces, but only 6 of them are covered.

There are 80 parking spaces on site and another 20 available on-street within 500' of the front door. Unfortunately, the way the site is configured means that the parking lot is a very long way from the front door of the library and will not be particularly convenient for patrons. Further, the on-site parking will be shared by the library and school. The parking agreement specifies that only 15 spaces will be made available exclusively for library patrons during certain hours.

The library will be visible to some extent because of its location adjacent to the community school.

There was significant community input along with the consideration of multiple alternative sites and the selection criteria used were documented in the application.

The site and parking barely fit on the site and there is no plan to expand either the building or parking shown on the site plan.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

R3:

The 81st Ave. branch of the Oakland Public Library serves a community that is isolated by freeways and major arterials from somewhat nearby small branch libraries, difficult to get to, and inappropriate for, this community of modest means. The site is on a major campus of not only neighborhood schools but also a community center. The site is near to one end of the community and on the edge of industrial area. At the same time, most of the service area is within walking distance.

There are two bus routes, with a stop in front. The major thoroughfare (International Blvd. (formerly East 14th)) is over 1/4 mile distant, and not even shown on the area map.

Sidewalks are in. No bicycle lanes at present. Bike parking is 20 slots, including 6 covered, in sight of the entry. The corner site is on the neighborhood collector (Int'l Blvd being outside the actual service area), so within the context of the community, side streets need not be used.

The joint use agreement does not speak to parking. It mentions a Ground Lease that is of 40 years' duration, and provides for 15 onsite spaces, incl. disabled, for library use during school hours, a reasonable but not generous amount. After school hours 60 additional parking spaces will be available. There are also 20 street spaces, two-hour time limit.

Within the defined service area, this is on a prominent corner, and the 39' roof peak helps make this very visible. The location on the corner of the major community service block helps as well.

In the context of the community service needs, the site, in being combined with other community services, works well. The application speaks of other sites being considered, without any information about them, other than that all were to house both schools and library.

The library site itself is a near-square, with parking in an adjoining strip rectangle that is school property. The site and the footprint are basically coextensive.

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

EVALUATION FORM
3053 - 81st Avenue Branch Library

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.