

Introduction

This report was prepared at the direction of the Glenview Library Joint Administrative Committee (GLJAC). PSA-Dewberry was retained by the Committee in order to investigate the feasibility and practicality of building a library facility on a site consisting of three parcels of land: the existing library property, land formerly occupied/ owned by the EPCO Paint Store, and land being vacated by the U.S. Postal Service. PSA-Dewberry was asked to consider the evaluation of two possibilities:

1. The renovation of and an addition to the existing library building
2. The construction of a completely new library building and the demolition of the existing facility.

As directed by the GLJAC, PSA-Dewberry was asked to perform the following activities:

1. Determine the appropriate size for the proposed facility (please refer to, provided under separate cover, the "Library Building Program for the Glenview Public Library," dated September 6, 2006). This document, considered an integral part of the study, suggests that approximately 93,200 square feet is needed, subject to the assumptions/stipulations discussed under Tab 1 of the Program.
2. Based upon the size determination, evaluate both options from site planning, functionality, flexibility, practicality and economic perspectives.
3. Survey, evaluate and make recommendations regarding the appropriate number of parking spaces (for both patrons and staff).
4. Determine capital project costs and project timelines for each option.
5. Evaluate the proposed facilities' operating costs.

The GLJAC also directed that if at any time during the performance of the study it was apparent that either of the options was not going to be feasible for any reason, consideration of that option should cease. This eventually did not occur.

Aside from the assumptions made during the determination of the Library's proposed size, the Committee directed that the study must be based on the following assumptions:

1. Because it would be economically impractical to temporarily relocate the Library during construction, the study should assume that the existing facility should remain in service during construction. The implication of this assumption is that with respect to the renovation/addition option, a two phase building would be necessary. Relative to the all new construction option, an orientation along Lehigh (Harlem) Avenue would be required. A two phase parking deck construction is recommended.

2. After careful discussion and comparison to other libraries deemed to be "peers," the GLJAC directed PSA-Dewberry to consider, for the purposes of determining construction costs, that the proposed facility (whether it be an expanded and renovated one, or new) should be "above average" quality (in terms of materials used, and design details employed) relative to similar suburban library applications. This does not suggest that the Glenview Public Library should be opulent, impractical, economically challengeable, or difficult to maintain.
3. When evaluating the renovation/addition option, the scope of the existing building renovation should include the complete removal/replacement of all finishes, walls, electrical distribution, HVAC systems, and plumbing. It should include a completely new roof and appropriate rework of all the west and south exterior wall systems such that they would be compatible with new construction. In essence, a complete "gutting and remodel" should be considered.
4. The results of a structural study commissioned under a separate contract by GLJAC indicated that two assumptions should be made. First, the existing Library was not designed for vertical expansion and it would be impractical to structurally retrofit the building for a vertical expansion. Second, the original 1950's structure was designed structurally for different load resistance criteria and cannot be utilized for library book stacks or assemblies of people purposes.

In recognition that in the design of a completely new facility the size of the building will be as efficient as possible, and that when dealing with an addition to an existing structure, a less than 100% efficient building results, this study considered a new building of approximately 93,200 square feet, (based upon the Building Program) and an increased building size of 96,000 square feet for the renovation/addition option. This represents a building 3% larger in size in order to account for this inefficiency.

This report is based on a series of assumptions that may or may not be accepted by the Library Board during its design process. The assumptions were made in order to develop a framework for comparative analysis of the two primary development options: new construction or renovation-addition. The information contained herein does not reflect agreement between the Library and Village regarding facility or funding needs.

Included herein are the results of this feasibility study (except for the previously referenced building program document). More specifically, please refer to the following:

- Tab 2: Site/Building Component Adjacency Diagrams
- Tab 3: Site/Building Options Evaluation
- Tab 4: Parking Survey/Recommendations
- Tab 5: Project Cost Budgets
- Tab 6: Operational Cost Analysis
- Tab 7: Project Timeline

Site/Building Option Evaluation

Based upon the work performed to date, it appears evident that both the renovation/addition and new construction options are legitimate undertakings. That does not mean, however, that both options are equal in desirability. This portion of the report examines the relative strengths, weaknesses and opportunities afforded by each option. In general, when evaluating possible building sites and building options, specific criteria can be utilized for public library facilities. Although the actual site is a given, we have chosen to include our general site evaluation criteria herein since it does address certain site orientation issues unique to each option being considered.

Site Evaluation Criteria

Many critical factors influence the evaluation of a site ranging from regulatory factors to cultural factors to program factors to cost factors. The following criteria are considered important factors in the development of a particular site for a public library.

1. Proximity/Accessibility

Libraries should be located conveniently with respect to the Library District population center. Accessibility from major streets/highways make trips to and from the Library more efficient and more likely. Other means of transportation besides vehicular should be considered (i.e., bicycle, pedestrian, mass transit).

2. Context/Neighborhood

Libraries should be compatible with their surroundings. Retail and commercial activity districts tend to be the better fit while industrial parks and even school districts tend to be inappropriate neighbors. Civic buildings also are considered decent neighbors. Noise from fire stations, police, and manufacturing facilities are distracting.

3. Size/Geometry/Function

The overall size, shape/configuration of the site should accommodate the programmatic requirements of the Library, all support functions, such as parking and all other requirements of the zoning and building codes. Green space and storm water management requirements can add significant area to the required lot size to support the project. A reasonable future expansion capacity also should be considered. Building configuration many times is dictated by the site configuration. Building program functions are influenced by the building configuration, which, in turn, influence staff operation efficiencies. Both initial costs and long-term operational costs can be affected by the building configuration.

4. Image/Community Impact

Libraries sites should be welcoming and attractive. As a stimulus for future development, a library site should be an improvement that provides a positive impact for the surrounding properties and neighborhood and, therefore, provides a sense of pride to the community.

5. Utilities/Zoning

A library site should be near and have access to utilities capable of serving the Library. Project dollars spent to bring services to the Library site, or even to the building on the site, should not be overly depleted. The library site should be able to meet all zoning requirements with few, if any, zoning variances.

6. Buildability

Library sites should be well-drained and out of flood plains. Poor soils require special foundation systems and in some cases need to be removed causing project funds to be diverted away from service-supporting elements of the building. Extreme slopes tend to reduce the functional efficiency of the site.

7. Visibility/Safety

Libraries are community buildings and should be sited for ease of wayfinding, with the ability to advertise services and for improved safety.

8. Initial Cost

Factors to consider are land acquisition, utility services, site demolition and preparation, constructability issues, locational impact issues, and relocation requirements.

9. Long-term Cost

Factors to consider are operational costs including staff, energy, maintenance, and transportation supporting Library services.

10. Perception

When all is said and done, how will the community react to/feel about the project? Is it a worthwhile investment of resources, a source of pride, a job well done? Did the Library do the right thing? This is the ultimate measure of value.

Building Evaluation Criteria

The Building Program, identifies the objectives, building space requirements, and performance standards of a modern library for the Glenview Public Library. This document should be used as a reference during Schematic Design and used to evaluate building design options.

In addition to, and to re-emphasize some of the key objectives of the Building Program Document, the following building evaluation criteria are organized into three categories – overall philosophic design characteristics, planning aspects, and building design aspects.

Philosophically speaking, the building design should be *expressive of its functional use* as a library, or in other words, “form follows function.” There should be no compromises made toward library operations or functionalities. The Library Building construction shall *represent truth* in the designed detail and assemblage of its buildings materials and components. The building design, simple yet elegant and containing long-lasting and durable materials, should be a *warm and inviting* space that attracts increased usage. Read from the inside-out, the building’s honest representation of a modern library with all of its various community activity spaces within, shall be on display to the community within which it serves. If successful, the building design will be mutually respected by its neighbors, reinvigorating for downtown development, an exciting experience, and perceived as a *community asset* and money well spent.

Important planning aspects to consider would be the following:

- *Simple organization* combined with its “form follows function” expression allows *ease of wayfinding*. Simple organization means obvious organization of minor circulation routes connecting to major circulation routes. The organization shall be *functionally driven* for the variety of uses by a variety of user types.
 - Variety of space typologies organized or zoned to *minimize built separations* in keeping with open space. The following space types shall be considered:
 - Contemplative space (quite) vs. high-activity space (noisy)
 - Open space vs. enclosed space
 - Staff positions vs. patron activity/reading areas
 - “After-hours” space types vs. “normal library hours” space types
- * *Visibility* to and from staff positions is very important for the following reasons:
- *Convenient serviceability* for Library patrons
 - *Efficient use of Staff resources* and their time
 - *Surveillance of library materials* and security thereof
 - *Safety* of staff and library patrons
- *Zoning* of the interior environment relative to the exterior environment and its activities
 - *Views* to the exterior, views within
 - *Natural light* opportunities

Critical building design aspects for a 21st Century public library include the following:

Flexibility

Structural System: A point-loaded system or a frame of columns and beams with a *modular organization based upon library shelving arrangements*. This modular organization allows for efficient rearrangement of book stacks and transformation options without lost use of space.

The structural organization sets up the *modular arrangement of building components*, speaking to the honest expression of its organized assemblage expressed outwardly and found within.

The structural system (frame and floor assemblies) shall be designed for a *150-lb/SF live load*, required per code for library book stack areas.

Floor assemblies shall be designed with a *built-in power/data distribution system*. These requirements allow the ability to tap into these respective systems throughout the Library in any arrangement of book stacks/seating areas.

Lighting:

Artificial lighting should be of the *indirect reflective type* allowing the most flexibility and best even distribution of light which is very important for library functions. Ceiling heights should be designed to allow the most efficient use of light sources.

Natural light which is the most comforting to the human eye and best for human productivity should be *filtered/controlled* so as not to harm library materials and to provide glare control, especially due to the computer screens located throughout the Library.

Security/Technology

Programmable and designed for convenience of staff and for the security of library materials.

Mechanical/Plumbing

Humidity Control: Important for human comfort and preservation of library materials.

Zoned for controlled comfort of spaces with different heating and cooling criteria.

Plumbing located for the convenience of both public and staff and organized for security of library materials and per hours of operation.

Acoustics can be incorporated into the design in two ways:

Planning organization (zoning) of quiet areas separated from high activity areas and through the *use of acoustic materials* specified, designed, and detailed into the building construction itself.

Finishes shall be selected based upon the following considerations: utility, aesthetics, durability, acoustics, light reflectivity, safety, maintenance.

Evaluation Criteria

<u>Site</u>	<u>Option #1</u>	<u>Option #2</u>
1. <u>Proximity/Accessibility</u>		
• Proximity to Users	Excellent	Excellent
• Ease of Vehicular Egress	Fair	Good
• Ease of Pedestrian Egress	Good	Good
2. <u>Context/Neighborhood</u>		
• Compatibility with Adjacent Land Uses	Good	Fair
• Ability to Develop Proper Massing/Scale	Good	Fair
3. <u>Size/Geometry/Function</u>		
• Ability to Expand	Good	Poor
• Ability to Create Public Green Space	Excellent	Poor
• Adequacy of Patron Parking	Good	Good
• Location of Patron Parking	Good	Good
• Site's Ability to Promote Building's Functionality	Excellent	Fair
• Ease of Circulation	Fair	Good
4. <u>Image/Community Impact</u>		
• Positive Image/Sense of Presence	Excellent	Fair
5. <u>Utilities/Zoning</u>		
• Adequacy of Utilities	Fair	Fair
• Impact on Existing Zoning	Good	Good
6. <u>Buildability</u>		
• Quality of Soils	Good	Good
7. <u>Visibility/Safety</u>		
• Ease of Wayfinding	Fair	Fair
• Ability to "Market" Activities Inside the Building	Good	Fair
8. <u>Cost</u>		
• Initial Investment	Excellent	Good
• Long Term Investment	Excellent	Good
9. <u>Perception</u>		
• Ability to Create a Positive Cost-Value Relationship	Excellent	Fair

Building

1. <u>Flexibility</u>		
• Ability to Modify in Future	Excellent	Excellent/Poor *

2. <u>Functionality/Efficiency</u>		
• Building Size Efficiency	Excellent	Fair
• Staffing Efficiency	Excellent	Fair
• Ability to “Zone” Interior Spaces	Excellent	Good
• Ability to Provide Views Into/Out of	Excellent	Poor
• Capability to Provide Natural Light	Excellent	Poor
• Minimization of Long Term Costs	Excellent	Excellent

Although not specific criteria per se, the construction process will impact the potential viability of each option. Accordingly, the following construction-related evaluation should also be considered:

Construction

1. <u>Overall Ease of Construction</u>	Fair	Fair
2. <u>Minimization of Construction Direction</u>	Good	Fair
3. <u>Minimization of Impact on Patrons/Staff</u>	Good	Fair
4. <u>Minimization of Impact on Neighbors</u>	Fair	Fair

* New area has “excellent” potential, remodeled area has “poor” potential.

The above cited “ratings” reflect the following definitions for the given evaluation category:

- Excellent There are no known restrictions on achieving a desired outcome.
- Good There are minor restrictions that can minimally effect the desired outcome.
- Fair There are significant restrictions that will materially effect the desired outcome.
- Poor The desired outcome cannot be achieved without significant compromises.

By way of summarizing our evaluation, Option #1 provides the opportunity to create, subject to site specific limitations, a facility that is efficient, flexible, holistic in its approach, and functional with a “relative” minimal project cost premium of 13.0%. It can be designed, again subject to site limitations and budgeting constraints, without compromise. We view the renovation/addition (Option #2) as a legitimate alternative if Option #1 is not possible. It is inferior to the new construction option in numerous ways, most notably in the following ways:

1. Requires two public entrances.
2. Although not increasing the number of service points, it spreads its public services on three levels, whereas in Option #1 there are only two public floors.

3. The difficulty in achieving a unified and holistic design that incorporates the old and the new.
4. The significant restrictions imposed by having to “live” with the existing floor to floor heights, both from a lighting and “feel” standpoint.

Parking Survey/Recommendations

The attached survey was conducted by contacting the Director of each of the libraries selected as representative and/or comparable to the Glenview Public Library. Libraries were selected as “representative” if they were:

1. Located in the Chicago Metropolitan area
2. Situated in a downtown, “heavy” suburban environment
3. Similar in size to the proposed Glenview Public Library
4. Providing some or all parking via structured facilities (optional criteria)

Based upon the survey, the Village of Glenview Zoning Ordinance, and past experience, it is recommended that 2.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross building area be provided.

Site plan concepts developed (Tab 2) illustrates all parking spaces being provided “on-site.” The Library is currently maintaining 54 spaces on the south side of Glenview Road. Maintaining this lot for staff parking is possible, although indeterminate at this time.

Glenview Public Library
 Parking Survey Summary
 PSA-Dewberry Project No. 10020753

<u>Location</u>	<u>Building Size (sf)</u>	<u>Parking Provided</u>	<u>Total Spaces per 1,000 sf Building Area</u>	<u>Assessment</u>
Elmhurst Public Library Elmhurst, IL	90,000	134 (patron) 25 (staff off site)	1.77	Not enough
Mount Prospect Public Library Mount Prospect, IL	101,290	324 ¹	3.20	Adequate
Oak Park Public Library Oak Park, IL	104,000	85	0.82	Not enough
Gail Borden Public Library Elgin, IL	110,000	314 (patron) 77 (staff)	3.56	Adequate
Orland Park Public Library Orland Park, IL	93,000	211 (patron) 20 (staff)	2.38	Adequate
Schaumburg Township District Library Schaumburg/Hoffman Estates, IL	130,000	374	2.88	Adequate
Northbrook Public Library Northbrook, IL	85,341	158 (lot) 33 (street)	2.24	Marginal
Des Plaines Public Library Des Plaines, IL	82,000	90 (garage) ² 75 (street)	2.01	Morning Inadequate Otherwise adequate

Notes:

¹ This figure represents 124 dedicated library spaces and taking one-half of the 400 shared spaces (200) in the municipal deck.

² All parking is shared, 304 additional spaces are available during evenings.

**GLENVIEW PUBLIC LIBRARY
Project Cost Budget
New Building (Option #1)**

Construction ¹

Building/Site	\$19,106,000	
Structured Parking	\$4,536,000	
Demolition	\$100,000	
		\$23,742,000

Contingencies

Design Contingency (Included in Const. Cost)	\$0	
Plan Review (allowance)	\$5,000	
Escalation (Included in Const. Cost)	\$0	
Construction Contingency (5%)	\$1,147,400	
Subtotal		\$1,152,400

Land

Purchase of Property	\$0
----------------------	-----

Furnishings

New Furniture and Equipment	\$1,600,000	
Signage	\$46,000	
Artwork	\$0	
Telephone System	\$50,000	
Book Theft Detection	\$50,000	
Computer Cabing / AV/ Security	\$460,000	
Subtotal		\$2,206,000

Consulting Fees

Architect	\$1,491,600	
Architect Reimbursables	\$40,000	
Interior Design (FF&E)	\$160,000	
Interior Design Reimbursables	\$10,000	
Landscape Consultant	\$15,000	
Surveying	\$5,000	
Technology	\$45,000	
Subtotal		\$1,766,600

Owners Costs

Soil Investigation	\$5,000	
Construction Testing	\$25,000	
Legal	\$10,000	
Movable Equipment	\$30,000	
Opening Day Collection	\$0	
Builders Risk Insurance (included in construction cost)	\$0	
Building Permits (assumed to be waived by Village)	\$0	
Utility Connection Fees	\$0	
Moving Costs	\$75,000	
Subtotal		\$145,000
PROJECT TOTAL		\$29,012,000

Notes:

¹ Building/Site Cost = 93,000sf x \$205/sf =	\$19,106,000
Park Cost	
120 structured spaces @ \$16,500/space =	\$1,980,000
120 below grade spaces @ \$21,300/space =	<u>\$2,556,000</u>
	\$4,536,000

**GLENVIEW PUBLIC LIBRARY
Project Cost Budget
Renovation/Addition (Option #2)**

Construction¹

Building/Site	\$18,305,000	
Structured Parking	\$2,340,000	
Demolition	\$40,000	
		\$20,685,000

Contingencies

Design Contingency (Included in Const. Cost)	\$0	
Plan Review (allowance)	\$5,000	
Escalation (Included in Const. Cost)	\$0	
Construction Contingency (5%)	\$994,000	
Subtotal		\$999,000

Land

Purchase of Property	\$0
----------------------	-----

Furnishings

New Furniture and Equipment	\$1,600,000	
Signage	\$46,000	
Artwork	\$0	
Telephone System	\$50,000	
Book Theft Detection	\$70,000	
Computer Cabing / AV/ Security	\$460,000	
Subtotal		\$2,226,000

Consulting Fees

Architect	\$1,292,200	
Architect Reimbursables	\$40,000	
Interior Design (FF&E)	\$160,000	
Interior Design Reimbursables	\$10,000	
Landscape Consultant	\$15,000	
Surveying	\$5,000	
Technology	\$45,000	
Subtotal		\$1,567,200