

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

EVALUATION FORM 3011 - Lawndale Library

Overall Rating

4

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Population Growth		49%
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

None.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	Los Angeles, County of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	County of Los Angeles Public Library
<i>Project Type/Priority</i>	New Construction of Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	17,360
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$7,300,132

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

EVALUATION FORM 3011 - Lawndale Library

Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

RATING

4

Age Rating

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

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4

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
3	3	3
3	3	3
4	3	4
4	4	4
4	3	4
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	3	4
4	4	4

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: 1955 Library renovation date: None
--

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

EVALUATION FORM

3011 - Lawndale Library

R1:

Constructed in 1955, the library building is generally in good condition. Interior finishes were renovated within the last two years, including repainted ceiling and walls, new carpet and new vinyl flooring adjacent to the service desk. However, the structure does not meet current seismic requirements. The reinforced masonry shear walls do not comply with current county building code requirements for lateral load resistance. The mechanical systems are generally in good condition. The chiller was replaced in 2000; however, the air handling system cannot inefficiently keep the facility at a constant temperature. Interior lighting is an outmoded technology that is less efficient than current lighting systems. Low exterior lighting levels at each entrance and along the nearby sidewalks create a potentially hazardous situation walking after dark. The parking lot, with only nine spaces, creates stiff competition for parking and endangers pedestrians. Neither library restroom is fully ADA compliant. Although the walkway at the library main entrance is in good condition, the cross slope at the entrance exceeds the maximum slope pursuant to ADA requirements. The parking lot has no dedicated parking for the disabled. The library has an open space layout, and ambient noise levels have steadily risen. The structure is bordered by streets on three sides. The library cannot expand within the existing structure footprint. Expansion to the south is possible, but would require significant and costly modification to the structure. Additionally, electrical power for the building is insufficient to support computer equipment and other technology beyond the existing number of workstations and equipment. The small size of the building forces all components of the library into close proximity. The building's overall space constraints allow only rudimentary space planning.

R2:

This 1955 structure was modestly renovated in 2000 including replacing its mechanical chiller. Although in reasonable condition, the facility has a number of problems. The shear walls are not reinforced in compliance with seismic safety code, the restrooms are not ADA compliant, several walkways are narrow although compliant, the lighting system is antiquated, parking is insufficient for the volume of library users, and the library is not expandable without major demolition activity including redesign of the structure's existing seismic restraint system. Noise mitigation is difficult due to the open space nature of the building, and it is undersized to meet the needs of its growing population particular those 19 years and younger.

R3:

This one story 3203 square foot library occupies part of a wood diaphragm and reinforced concrete masonry structure which was built in 1955. While the building appears to be in good general condition. It does not meet the current seismic or ADA standards. Efforts have been made to maximize the space usage but this facility can no longer serve the patron population of this diverse area. Even the year 2000 addition of a new mechanical chiller can't handle the building cooling with the number of people who use the facility at peak times. Concrete walls and the rectangular shape create unacceptable sound issues. The parking available is not adequate and creates safety problems for patrons.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3011 - Lawndale Library

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	3
2	2	3
4	4	3
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	3
3	4	3
3	3	3
3	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
3	4	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

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
3	3	4
4	3	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

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

EVALUATION FORM 3011 - Lawndale Library

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Have done an excellent job at providing a methodology that was inclusive -- focus groups, surveys, interviews with key informants (some done in Spanish). Lawndale has experienced 35% growth in population between 1980-2000 with an additional projection of 10% growth through 2020. 52% of the population is Hispanic and youth under the age of 19 account for 35% of the population. 66% of the K-8 school age population is Hispanic with 34% being English learners. Demographic data was clearly presented and community needs were identified; however, there was a minimal amount of analysis provided. Have done an excellent job at describing conditions and service limitations of the 1955 building. Appendices included transcripts from focus groups and copies of surveys but it would have been helpful to have an analysis of the data included in the application.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The plan is responsive to identified needs. Have included excerpts from the county strategic plan as a foundation, however there is no specific mission statement for this particular branch library. Goals do relate to needs assessment findings, however, objectives are not measurable and service indicators are not always client-centered. More detailed descriptions of the services would have been helpful (i.e. paragraph description about collections is general, two sentences used to describe the reading and study spaces). Implementation plan does not include a timeline.

BUILDING PROGRAM

Proposed homework center is situated in the children's area and probably won't be used much by teens who requested homework assistance in their focus group.

An excellent 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. However, it seems like an oversight that the programmer didn't specify the fiction collection's proximity to the front entrance of the library more so than the non-fiction collection.

Outstanding and extremely well detailed space descriptions that appear to be appropriately sized.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

Net assignable square footage allocation is outstanding. The building program requires 13,038 net assignable square footage, and the floor plan delivers 13,180 net assignable square footage, 142 square feet in excess of program requirements. Additionally, despite one exception, the net assignable square footage of spaces provided on the floor plan meets building program requirements. The exception is that the Homework Center on the floor plan has 52 net assignable square footage less than the program requires.

Non-assignable square footage allocation is outstanding. The building program limits non-assignable square footage to 4,322 square feet, or 25% of the 17,360 gross square footage. The floor plan delivers 4,180 non-assignable square footage, or 24% of the gross square footage. Therefore, the floor plan meets building program non-assignable square footage.

Except for isolated instances, the spatial relationships indicated on the floor plan match exceptionally well with those defined in the building program. The instances are minor inconsistencies and illustrated as follows:

Public Entrance/Lobby is not in the sight line from the Information Desk.

Adult Nonfiction Books area is close, but is not adjacent to Young Adult area.

Conference Room is not adjacent to Main Path of Travel.

Technology Training Room is not adjacent to Main Path of Travel.

Adult Computers is not adjacent to Information Desk.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3011 - Lawndale Library

Children's Reference Desk is not in sight line from Storytelling area.

Children's Circulating Books is not adjacent to Homework Center.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

This agreement is between the county and the Centinela Valley High School District -- the school district felt that this agreement would provide an opportunity for the students to fulfill their community service graduation requirement. Proposed center will be staffed primarily by county staff with high school students serving as volunteers. The district will provide a certified bi-lingual teacher who can work with parents. District is providing funding and equipment and commits to a computer replacement program. Review and modification process with input from users and high school students will be done quarterly during the first year and then annually. This is a strong agreement that has the potential of a permanent partnering effort. It also may encourage high school students to seek careers related to children's services.

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

EVALUATION FORM 3011 - Lawndale Library

R2:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Methodology was provided minimal discussion, but they did use a wide variety of techniques to try to reach a substantial portion of the community - in English and Spanish where appropriate. The community analysis included no regional nor state agencies; the discussion of schools was limited, with none regarding the three private schools they listed; and the description also was limited of the extensive list of community organizations they included. The analysis was not extensive and did not draw much in the way of inferences for library services, but there was a very detailed and complete presentation on the demographics of the community - they do seem to know their community very well. The analysis of service needs is mostly very generalized statements with little or no connections drawn back to the needs assessment results in any of the service needs text. No bases were stated for the needs they assert, though, if you look through all of the appendices, the bases do exist. There is excellent detail and supporting data in the appendices, but they are never referred to in the text. They do specifically address student needs, but in the same generalized statements appearing in the rest of the section. Very significant service limitations caused by the existing facility are documented. Fifteen percent of the materials proposed for the new collection are in non-English languages, which seems a bit low considering the large portions of non-English language speakers documented; otherwise, the space needs assessment seems very realistic and reasonable. About 1,400 square feet (almost 10% of the total facility) is dedicated to quiet study areas, which seems very responsive to the community's stated needs.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The project addresses the stated needs extremely well. Specific input from the various needs assessment methods did not focus on career planning; however, there is enough input from school representatives and evidence from the demographics to see this as important for Lawndale youth. The County Library organizational and program goals are very appropriate and user-oriented; it would have been good to have a mission for this specific branch, however. The goals, objectives, etc., are rarely user-centered or measurable, but the concepts they define do address the stated needs. The types of services are very well documented except that hours of service are not clear here. They are documented carefully in the Joint Use Agreement, however, and seem reasonable - though not exceptional - for these purposes. A discussion of the county library's service structure, including the roles of regional vs. community libraries would have been helpful in the jurisdiction-wide "fit" discussion.

LIBRARY BUILDING PROGRAM

The building program is excellent in the concepts it lays out, the spatial relationships, and in the detail provided in the general requirements (General Design Considerations) and individual spaces descriptions. It provides a program design that should do an outstanding job of implementing the plan of service and should be clear and easy-to-follow for the architectural team.

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:

The information desk is not adjacent to the Computers for Adults space.

The Young Adult space is not adjacent to the Non-fiction Collection and seating, but it is very close.

The Conference and Technology Training rooms are not adjacent to the main path of travel as called for in the building program.

The sight lines from the Children's Desk to the Easy Book Collection and the Storytelling and Programming space are not optimal.

The Children's Circulating Books are not adjacent to the Homework Center, but they are quite close.

None of these exceptions is a major problem to the efficient functionality of the library building.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3011 - Lawndale Library

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

The high school district is taking responsibility, with the library, for a grades 3 - 6 homework center. That is OK, as a way of preparing elementary school students for high school success, but why isn't the Lawndale Elementary School District a formal partner in some way; they do not even provide a set of textbooks for the homework center in support of their curriculum. The joint services description is a little general but is reasonably clear. It is not clear why a set of core textbooks for the high school district is needed in the career center. The homework center hours seem appropriate for grades 3-6 and the longer and later hours for the career center seem appropriate for the grades 9-12 which it serves. The staffing and volunteer levels are probably fine, but no specific FTE commitment was provided for either the library or the district. The ownership resolution methodology made no provision for updating for future, currently-unanticipated additions by either party. Note that all of the computer equipment in the career center is provided by the district; no one, however, is committed by this agreement to replacing that equipment, just to developing a policy to do so. The review and modification process does provide for user input. Except for the omission of the elementary school district, this agreement seems excellent. As a partnership between the two entities (library and high school district), it is outstanding, as long as the school district maintains its commitment to the grades 3-6 homework center.

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

EVALUATION FORM 3011 - Lawndale Library

R3:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A wide variety of methods was used to gather input from a broad range of the residents of the service area. The types of questions asked of the focus group and interview participants were types that should provide information for developing library services specific to this clientele, being open-ended and in non-library language. Library service needs, are appropriate for the service area clientele, including both basic library services and specialized services such as a career center and English-language tutoring. However, the limited size of the Spanish and international-language materials (approx. 4%) seems low in light of the ethnic mix. Although the percentage of those who speak a language other than English was not presented for the community as a whole, for students the range is 34% to 49%.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The plan of service responds directly to the needs assessment findings. Of particular concern for this community are the students, who are seen to be at-risk. Services are planned to provide students with opportunities to improve their academic achievements and learn about career options. While goals and objectives are not written in terms of user outcomes, it is clear that they are based in the needs assessment findings and should result in library services responsive to this specific clientele. Most service indicators include qualitative measures as well as quantitative ones. Descriptions of the library services are generalized and would be better understood by the staff who will be implementing the services if they contained more detail.

BUILDING PROGRAM

An excellent, detailed, and thorough general requirements section is provided. Individual space sheets are detailed and should provide the design team with an understanding of the activities to take place in the areas. Spatial relationships are clearly described both graphically and verbally within each space sheet and enable the design team to develop the spaces appropriately.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The net-assignable sq. ft. is extremely well presented. The table on the plan clearly shows the difference in sq. ft. In this one story building there is only a difference of 142 SF or approximately 1% between the building program and the drawings.

The non-assignable SF actually dropped 1% from the building program to the drawings. The final 24% non-assignable SF is extremely well planned and clearly shown in the drawings.

The space relations are extremely well done with a few minor issues, mostly dealing with the line of sight in the building:

Information desk not adjacent to the computer area for adults.

Information desk not in line of sight to the entrance.

Information desk not in line of sight to the conference room.

Computers adult not adjacent to the information desk.

Conference room not on main travel path; it is secondary route at best.

Children's reference desk not in line of sight to the story telling area.

Children's circulation books not adjacent to the homework center.

These are minor issues in an extremely well documented plan.

JOINT USE AGREEMENT

This agreement shows a very strong partnership between the two parties. The development of the services to be provided -- a homework center for elementary students staffed in part by high school students as part of a career exploration and community service opportunity, and a career center for high school students -- are unique to this community and responsive to its needs. Of some concern is that the homework center will be provided to assist elementary students, but there does not appear to be a connection with the elementary school in order to coordinate assignments and other student needs. The hours that the two joint venture services will be staffed are excellent, but it is unclear what amount of staff will be provided during those hours. Funding levels are specified in terms of staffing and equipment value that will be provided by both parties, and it is clear that both parties are committed to the services. Review and modification is to be quarterly during the initial year and no less than annually after that, and it includes input from library and school district participants as well as the elementary and high school students involved.

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

EVALUATION FORM

3011 - Lawndale 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	3	4
3	4	4
4	4	4

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

The planning documents relate the proposed technological services of the findings in the needs assessment and then describe the services within the context of the County of Los Angeles Public Library infrastructure. They have provided specifics for software packages and databases. Additional information about future technological advancements would have been helpful.

R2:

The chosen solutions seem appropriate. More discussion of planning for future technological advancements would have been improvement to the plan of service. The building program, however, did provide excellent discussion of this need and how it should be addressed.

R3:

The importance of technology and the need for flexibility in light of rapid technology developments is made clear. Wireless technology is included, with details related to avoiding transmission difficulties throughout the building program in appropriate areas (e.g., keeping wireless "dead" areas in mind when designing shelving configurations).

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

EVALUATION FORM

3011 - Lawndale 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
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
3	3	3
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
<i>N/A</i>		
3	3	3
4	4	4
3	3	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
3	3	3
3	2	3
3	3	4
3	3	3

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

EVALUATION FORM 3011 - Lawndale Library

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: OK

Geotechnical issues: The site is not located within any fault zone currently designated in the "Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act." Removal and recompaction of the top 4' is recommended to support the foundation.

R1:

The proposed site is located in the heart of the Lawndale Civic Center and is located about 150 feet south of the existing site where it has been for 48 years. It is located 6 blocks from the geographic center of the library service area and is a 5-10 minute drive to all businesses and shopping centers. The city is bisected by the 405 San Diego Freeway and there is full access to the intersections of Rosecrans, Hawthorne, Artesia, and Redondo Beach Blvds. There are several public transit lines with a connection to light rail service. Automobile parking spaces on site will number 62 with a total of 187 parking spots--local zoning ordinance requires 53 on-site spaces. The proposed facility is intended to be one of the two focal points in the civic center plaza. Although it is indicated that there were public hearings for input regarding the proposed site, it is unclear as to how much input there was from the local residents nor whether other sites were also considered.

R2:

The proposed library site is located in the northwestern corner of the service area and is not particularly centrally located in the service area, however the site is located less than 2 miles (5 to 10 minutes driving time) from any location in the service area.

The library will be prominently located in the Civic Center along with the Lawndale City Hall and a proposed new Senior Center. The site is located one block off of Hawthorne Blvd which has 33,868 vehicles per day two blocks north of the site at the intersection of Hawthorne and Rosecrans and 12,360 vehicles per day 2 blocks south of the site at the intersection of Hawthorne and Marine Avenue. Five blocks from the site the intersection of Inglewood Avenue and 147th Street has 24,377 vehicles per day and 8 blocks away the intersection of Inglewood and Marine Ave has 20,791 vehicles per day. The corridor all along Hawthorne Blvd is heavily commercialized.

There are 5 MTA bus stops within 1/4 mile of the library site and three of the bus lines connect to the MTA light rail station at Hawthorne and Century Freeway as well as the South Bay Galleria Transit Center located on the City's southern border.

There are 62 on-site parking spaces for automobiles, but they are not particularly convenient to the front entrance of the library for users. There are also 125 off-site parking spaces within 500' of the front entrance.

Access by pedestrians and bicycles seems to have been emphasized with an attempt to bring people down 147th street from Hawthorne Boulevard to the Civic Center which includes the library. There are 10 covered bicycle parking stalls near the front entrance to the library.

The library will be highly visible as part of the Civic Center, however being removed 1 block from Hawthorne Boulevard lowers its visibility in the community somewhat.

There were needs assessment focus groups, public hearings and county site selection criteria were applied, but it is not clear from the information provided if more than the proposed site was seriously considered in the process.

The site is "L" shaped and the site plan shows no plan for expansion of either the library building or the parking in the future. The application indicates that based on the community's projected growth through 2020, it is "not anticipated to require expansion."

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

EVALUATION FORM

3011 - Lawndale Library

R3:

The site is in the Lawndale Civic Center, central to this 2 sq.mi. city. MTA light rail and major bus routes stop at Hawthorne Blvd., two blocks from the library entrance. Local bus lines connect to the site as well as to other parts of Lawndale. Weekday (daytime) paratransit is available. Sidewalks are in. There are no bicycle lanes, but App. p. 11 say bicycles can use sidewalks (!) (NB: contra Vehicle Code, although common practice). Auto access is constrained and circuitous; although the roads lead to the site, they then require circling around it, then making left turns into the Library lot across traffic from Grevillea behind City Hall. 10 bicycle slots are provided, and lockers for skateboards. Parking greatly exceeds code, but no handicapped spaces are shown in the Library lot nor on Grevillea adjacent to the Library. The library is in a familiar location and the building and its cylindrical feature should be visible from Hawthorne looking down 147th. However, the design itself does not provide prominence at any distance. Local lay and official involvement in site selection is extensive, although no mention is made of alternative sites considered.

Site size and organization is good and allows access to the meeting room as well as library proper. No expansion is provided for, although perhaps not necessary in this context. The location is appropriate for Lawndale. Were it not for the circuitous auto access traffic path, overall site configuration would be excellent. (At the same time, better to drive around the civic center campus to get to the Library parking, than to run a street down the middle of the campus.)

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

EVALUATION FORM

3011 - Lawndale 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.