
LAWRENCE PUBLIC LIBRARY



TOMORROW'S LIBRARY

"Today, patrons are rediscovering that libraries are major community-based learning centers—not just limited to the traditional role of the library. Similar to the explosion of library construction at the turn of the 20th century, communities across the United States are building new libraries. The *Library Journal* reports that in 2003 4,066,276 square feet of new or renovated libraries were built in the United States.

These new buildings are being conceived and realized as distinctive places for individual user groups, designed with retailing techniques in mind, constructed to enhance the experience for young and old alike, and achieving their communities' forward-thinking goals of flexibility and energy conservation."

"Successful libraries respond to their communities, creating services that are specifically tailored to their needs. As institutions, they are reasserting themselves as important centers of learning and community focus. Libraries can not be overused but suffer from overuse. The Lawrence Public Library has become overcrowded and unattractive simply as a result of success. From the evidence presented by the public during the public process, it is clear that the staff are much admired and respected for what they do with what they have to work with.

As the only institution in the city that serves the mind of the entire population one individual at a time, the library can enhance its service to the community with changes in its physical structure and an increase in funding."

From the previous Meyer Scherer & Rockcastle, LTD and Library Planning Associates report titled "Lawrence Public Library, Vision for 2025, February 22, 2006."

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1 To present an appropriately sized plan for a future central Library in downtown.

2 To determine which downtown site offers the opportunity for the best Library services for Lawrence, Kansas.

3 To determine generally which downtown location is best for Lawrence, Kansas as a whole.

PROCESS



The process since the last consideration the City Commission gave the Library project is as follows.

- The Library Administrative staff worked to reduce the program previously developed by Meyer Scherer & Rockcastle, LTD and Library Planning Associates. Gould Evans Associates then proposed additional reductions with an eye on producing a program for the Library that could be achieved within a \$30 million project budget. This resulted in a significant reduction from the earlier MS&R scope of 140,000 square feet to roughly two thirds the original at 94,130 square feet.
- Invitations to the previous developers to revise and resubmit their proposals were delivered October 31. Revised submittals were received November 15. Significant improvements were evident in most of the proposals.
- The Library Board met to review proposals November 17. A subcommittee of the Board was formed and met to review the proposals in detail on November 27. The Library Board reconvened to review the direction and recommendation for site selection(s) and corresponding operations budget on November 30.

This report summarizes the process and defines the Library Board's recommendations.

Also note that this report and its conclusions rely heavily on the data and recommendations of previous studies prepared for the City and the Library in developing this project. These include specifically the reports of Meyer Scherer & Rockcastle, LTD and Library Planning Associates presented to the City Commission in spring 2006. In particular, this report utilizes the specific population counts, growth projections, per capita figures and comparables, some of which are included here for reference.

PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS

The collection size was kept to 80% of the original program while the overall square footage was reduced to roughly 67%. All areas were generally trimmed; dedicated program rooms were reduced in favor of more flexible areas. The collection item per capita kept with the MS&R recommendation raising it from 3.18 to 3.43. In doing so, however, patron convenience was reduced. By focusing on collections, aisle widths were narrowed and stack heights increased. This translates to reducing ease of movement, ease of access to collections, and visibility. But in doing this, other critical areas were retained, such as increased space for children and teen areas; dedicated space for story hours and teen programs; computer lab access; quiet study areas, etc.

The results are summarized in the table below.

AREAS OF ASSIGNABLE SQUARE FOOTAGE		06.10.16	06.10.23
	LPA Program	Revisions	Revisions
entry/control/circulation	9,773	9,200	6,690
popular library services	14,487	13,218	10,046
young adult services	6,577	6,162	4,491
references & nonfiction services	27,545	24,235	20,581
youth services	22,204	18,664	14,835
meeting rooms	9,603	7,128	7,113
staff services-technical services	2,764	2,689	2,150
staff services-network & automation	1,815	1,715	1,270
staff services-collection development	721	666	660
staff services-administration	5,247	4,382	3,887
staff services-maintenance	1,221	1,221	1,000
staff services-other	2,605	1,715	1,625
non library assignable	3,931	4,501	3,352
allowance for gallery space	1,400	0	0
add allowance for friends sorting and storage	2,100	0	0
TOTAL DEPARTMENTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE	111,993	95,496	77,700
allowance for nonassignable/mechanical	6,999	4,775	4,775
15% allowance for nonassignable/other	20,998	14,324	11,655
ESTIMATED GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE	139,990	114,595	94,130

COLLECTION & SF COMPARABLES

The following chart from the MS&R report illustrates comparable sizes and per capita collection numbers for Big 12 communities. By planning for an items per capita of 3.43 you can see that Lawrence would be in the upper percentile of most Big 12 Communities but still lower than Manhattan, Boulder, and Lincoln.

Collection, Items/Capita and Annual Circulation for Big 12 Communities¹

Library	Population	Collection	Items/Capita	Annual Circ.
Lawrence 2004	79,979	254,100	3.18	9.75
Stillwater, OK	39,065	96,102	2.46	8.28
Manhattan, KS	42,960	183,472	4.27	12.55
Ames, Iowa	56,115	148,096	2.64	19.43
Boulder, CO 2004	94,680	409,740	4.37	12.98
College Station, TX	133,550	210,777	1.58	5.11
Columbia, MO	172,462	371,465	2.15	8.24
Waco, TX	178,675	272,710	1.53	2.21
Lubbock, TX	229,378	348,930	1.52	3.83
Lincoln, NE	250,291	870,344	3.48	10.99
Norman, OK	301,277	319,352	1.06	4.65
Austin, TX	656,562	1,316,572	2.07	5.00
Other				
Norman, OK ²	120,000	406,000	3.38 ³	6.00
Fayetteville, AR ⁴ 2020	85,000	300,000	3.52	NA

City	University	Students Grad	Under Grad	Main	Branches
Lawrence, KS	U Of KS	5,318	20,581	1	0
Stillwater, OK	U of OK	4,341	18,636	1	0
Manhattan, KS	KSU	3,619	18,893	1	0
Ames, Iowa	IA State U	4,618	20,993	1	0
Boulder, CO	U of CO	5,263	25,607	1	3
College Station, TX	TX A&M	8,192	35,605	1	2
Columbia, MO	U of MO	5,051	20,541	1	2 ⁵
Waco, TX	Baylor	1,447	11,521	1	3
Lubbock, TX	TX Tech	4,311	23,329	1	3
Lincoln, NE	U of NE	4,246	17,137	1	7 ⁶
Norman, OK	U of OK	4,338	20,843	1	9 ⁷
Austin, TX	U o f TX	11,282	36,478	1	21

SO, WHAT DOES 94,130SF GET YOU?

While it is easy to focus on the “cuts” necessary to bring the project in line with potential funding scenarios the proposed plan does do a number of very positive things for Library services in Lawrence.

- Upgraded space for current crowded programming is made possible with this program. The current 45,000 square foot Library (based on the MS&R report) provides services that would normally be and should be housed in 75,000 square foot of space.
- The outcome results in a central Library more than twice the size of the current Library. And in doing so provides for services and facilities requested by the public such as increased space for children and teen areas; dedicated space for story hours and teen programs; computer lab access; quiet study areas, etc.
- This facility allows for the collection to be increased from 3.18 to 3.43 per capita and plans for increasing circulation from 9.75 items to 12.00 per capita.
- A Library this size provides for Library services into the future, out to 2020. This gives the City a window of time to begin planning and budgeting properly for branch/satellite facilities.
- The project has the potential to invigorate the downtown. This also follows the preliminary recommendations of the American Institute of Architects Sustainable Design Assessment Team that visited Lawrence this fall.

REVISED BUDGET



The revised budget made a number of changes. In the end, the construction cost per square foot was set at \$215 per square foot. This number was based on comparable projects in the region. The budget provided a baseline of 260 cars in structured/covered parking. All contingencies and estimated escalation were set tightly.

New 94K Library Construction/Parking	\$24,700,000
Library Furnishings, Equipment and Signage	\$2,700,000
Library Foundation Contribution	-\$2,000,000
Other Soft Costs including Escalation	\$4,600,000
Total Project Budget	\$30,000,000

CRITERIA



The process for identifying which criteria to utilize in evaluating the proposals was as follows. The committee identified an initial list of which criteria to use through discussion. They then identified which criteria might be non-differentiating and therefore could be removed from the list. Through this discussion it was decided that a list of special considerations/issues should be presented along-side the final evaluations.

CRITERIA UTILIZED

The criteria utilized for evaluating the alternatives were set as follows:

- Library function – This relates to everything functional including concerns such as site circulation, entry, visibility, accessibility, floor plate size, floor plate shape, number of stories, and flexibility.
- Planning and neighborhood issues – This is a consideration of general planning principles, including historic concerns, as well of an assessment of potential issues that may be raised by the broader community in general or by a specific neighborhood regarding a particular location.
- Parking – This considers not only the total number of spaces possible at a particular location but also ease of access to those spaces. The potential competition from other adjacent uses for those spaces and the overall demand in the immediate area was also taken into account.
- Phasing – Potential overall time for completion, ease of Library relocation, and degree of Library service disruption and inconvenience from construction activities were evaluated as a part of phasing.
- Design impact on operational budget – The ability to provide a sustainable Library includes providing a facility that positions the Library to maximize its services to patrons. This consideration relates mostly to staffing costs and can be affected by a facility requiring more or less “service points,” visual monitoring, materials movement and management, etc.

CRITERIA CONSIDERED - NOT USED


Criteria removed from consideration were as follows:

- Sale of the current Library site - Some proposals counted on sale of the current Library site for accounting purposes. The Library Board felt that this was something they could neither decide nor count on.
- Marketability - This was discussed but never became supported as a specific criteria.
- LEED performance – All the proposals indicated the willingness to provide this.
- Design aesthetics – All of the teams indicated they would work with the City and the Library to provide the appropriate and desired aesthetic design.
- Developer qualifications – This was something the committee felt was outside of their review and that this would be explored by the City should they decide to enter into negotiations with a developer.
- Library Budget – This received considerable discussion. It is Gould Evan's recommendation that the Library should be in the position to determine the quality of the design of its own facilities. Quality can be measured many ways but certainly is measured at least in durability and energy efficiency. Some of the responses to the RFP have suggested building the Library for a lower budget. This is possible but should be the City's and the Library's decision, not a developers. The Library, at this stage of the project, sets the quality level of the facility with establishing a cost per square foot. This is based on comparable quality and costs in our region and is a reliable method for establishing quality.
- Underground parking considered equivalent – The costs for parking varied mostly because of the number of cars provided. All solutions utilize structured parking solutions. And if the number of cars is equalized the costs can be considered as very similar.
- Site cost differences - Likewise, site cost differences are considered minimal. All sites are downtown, of limited staging area and complexity and rely on construction below grade.
- Budget for contingencies – These budget items again should be in the control of the Library and should be fixed. General contingencies, furnishings and equipment allowance and other soft costs were considered as the same between proposals.
- Differences in escalation costs – These costs are difficult to pin down and will need to be considered in more detail as the plans develop but can be considered anecdotally in the category of phasing. Longer is more.

PROPOSALS EVALUATED

The following is a narrative evaluation of the revised proposals based on the selected criteria. The proposals graphics are excerpted here as their respective documentation has been submitted previously and can be referenced for detail. The image chosen here is simply one to help remind everyone of the site and location specific to each as that is the main focus of the evaluation.


PROPOSAL - ELDRIDGE DISTRICT



Narrative Evaluation

- Library function - This alternative provides a site footprint both in its square shape and overall size that allows for maximizing efficient layouts for Library function in a two story configuration. It also allows for maximizing the impact and location of the main entry. Parking located directly underneath the Library provides for convenient access to patrons. The Library is afforded great public visibility on three sides. A drive-up window/book-drop can be easily accommodated.
- Planning and neighborhood issues - This location across from a public park and placed within mostly commercial uses appears to have little negative impact or potential neighborhood concerns. The committee also recognized that this site remains the closest to the current site of the Library in downtown. Convenient access for pool patrons remains a possibility.
- Parking - Given the bulk of parking proposed, this alternative offers the most flexibility in providing enough parking for both the Library and the other needs that exist in this zone of the downtown.
- Phasing - Moving the post office creates a number of concerns for potential delay of the project. Otherwise, this alternative provides an optimum phasing opportunity if the Library project is slated to be in the first set of projects to initiate. The new Library could be fully constructed, commissioned, and furnished prior to the relatively short move across the street for the Library materials and staff.
- Design impact on operational budget – The two story configuration and square footprint meet the RFP requirements.
- Additional and/or unique concerns – There was significant concern questioning the feasibility of moving the post office. In addition, there was concern over the possible lengthy time required to gain approval of the decision to move the post office through the federal government.


PROPOSAL – 800 NEW HAMPSHIRE



Narrative Evaluation

- Library function - This alternative provides a site footprint both in its square shape and overall size that allows for efficient layouts for Library function. Some concerns were expressed over the location of the main entry. Parking located directly underneath the Library provides for convenient access to patrons. The Library is afforded public visibility on two sides. The drive-up window/book-drop is accommodated but some questions were raised about its ease of access.
- Planning and neighborhood issues - This location at the edge of downtown could have potential neighborhood concerns but the committee felt they were not critical. Proximity to the Lawrence Arts Center was seen as good.
- Parking – The parking request has been met but the opportunity to gain more parking is somewhat constrained. This alternative does offer parking in a zone of the downtown that has lower overall demand on total parking count.
- Phasing - This alternative provides for the new Library to be fully constructed, commissioned, and furnished prior to the move for the Library materials and staff. Some concern was expressed over the uncertainty of the time it would take for land ownership transferal and the removal of current tenants to occur.
- Design impact on operational budget – The two story configuration and square footprint meet the RFP requirements.
- Additional and/or unique concerns – None noted.

PROPOSAL – 9-10



Narrative Evaluation

- Library function - This alternative proposes a site footprint that is workable but creates a less efficient layout for Library function than was requested. Separation on four levels creates additional lack of visibility and security concerns. It also limits, more than a 2 story option, future flexibility because of the smaller floor plates. This proposal does allow for maximizing the impact and location of the main entry. Parking is proposed both located directly underneath the Library and across the street in the current City parking facility. Convenient access to patrons is therefore mixed. The Library is afforded public visibility on two sides. The function of the drive-up window/book drop was questioned.
- Planning and neighborhood issues - This location across the alley was seen as a very likely negative impact on adjacent housing with potential neighborhood concerns. The four story height significantly contributes to those concerns. Proximity to the Lawrence Arts Center was seen as good.
- Parking - The parking request has been met with offers to build more if the City desires. This alternative offers parking in a zone of the downtown that has lower overall demand on total parking count as well.
- Phasing - This alternative provides for the new Library to be fully constructed, commissioned, and furnished prior to the move for the Library materials and staff. Some concern was expressed over the uncertainty of the time it would take for renegotiation and rewriting of the current TIF district in place for this site.
- Design impact on operational budget – At four stories this proposal would require at least one additional service point thereby affecting operational costs directly.
- Additional and/or unique concerns – The concerns over the current TIF district and how that impacts moving forward with this proposal were expressed as significant.

PROPOSAL – CURRENT SITE



Narrative Evaluation

- Library function - This alternative provides a site footprint both in its square shape and overall size that allows for maximizing efficient layouts for Library function. It allows for maximizing the impact and location of the main entry. Parking located directly underneath the Library provides for convenient access to patrons. The Library is afforded great public visibility on four sides. A drive-up window/book-drop is easily accommodated.
- Planning and neighborhood issues - This location across from a public park and placed within mostly commercial uses appears to have little negative impact or potential neighborhood concerns. The committee recognized that this site is the historical site of the Library in downtown. Convenient access for pool patrons remains a possibility with additional parking provided.
- Parking – This location provides for the minimum parking for the Library. As with other options, additional parking can be constructed for an additional cost.
- Phasing – There were significant concerns with the proposed phasing. Construction would have to occur in “parts.” The first being in the current parking lot south of the Library thereby taking away the bulk of parking utilized by the Library at the first stage. Once the south part was constructed the Library would move into the new part and demolition of the existing Library would occur. Then an addition to the north would be constructed with a final move by the Library into that part. Not impossible but certainly more difficult than some of the other options.
- Design impact on operational budget – The two story configuration and square footprint meet the RFP requirements.
- Additional and/or unique concerns – There was significant concern for phasing the construction over more than three years and the related the safety concerns and disruption of services caused by that type of phasing. Also, parking would remain in competition with the Aquatics Center. It was noted that this is the only entirely publicly funded and constructed option unencumbered with a partnership with a developer.

RANKING OF PROPOSALS

The process for ranking the options meant translating the evaluations into numerical values criteria by criteria. This began by utilizing a plus, check and minus that eventually got translated into a correlating 1, 0, and -1.

The criteria were then weighted for a more accurate reflection of value. This ranged from a weight of 1-4 with 4 being of highest priority.

The following chart was prepared by the committee in the ranking process and illustrates the outcome with the higher score of 6 representing the best alternative numerically.

	Function 4	Planning Issues 2	Parking 2	Phasing 2	Operational Costs 1	Total
Eldridge Redevelopment Group	+	+	+	-	✓	6
800 New Hampshire LLC	+	✓	✓	✓	✓	4
9-10, LC	✓	✓	✓	+	-	1
Current Site	+	+	✓	-	✓	4

OPERATING COST CONSIDERATIONS

Any plan must take into consideration not only capital costs but the impact of operating costs. This section only attempts to identify the likely operating cost impacts. Funding alternatives are being considered by others.

Due to the increased size of the proposed library and the additional services it will provide, staffing and costs for utilities and maintenance will increase. The Library Director has projected the operational costs necessary to serve in an expanded Library based on data gathered from peer libraries. The projected operational costs for the first year of operation in a 94,130 square foot building in 2009 are \$5,000,000.

The current projection assumes:

- A 2 story building
- The same hours of operation
- Significant increases in usage based on typical opening day numbers
- One additional service point

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1** Recommend the Eldridge Redevelopment Plan site location as the best for delivering Library services in the future.
- 2** Request that due diligence on the feasibility of moving the post office begin immediately.
- 3** Recommend that the City budget for Library operations in 2009 be set at \$5 million.

