Section 9: Appendix





Table of Contents

Meeting Presentations:

Workshop 1 (October 13th, 2022) OML All Staff Presentation (October 28th, 2022) Workshop 2 (November 10th, 2022) Workshop 3 (June 14th, 2023) Workshop 4 (July 20th, 2023) Project Report: Draft Proposed Program (August 12th, 2024) Project Meeting: Site Analysis and Potential Site Criteria (August 12th, 2024)

Community Engagement Materials

Community Digital Survey Results Summary

Technical Evaluations of Existing Main Library Site:

Historical Analysis Landscape / Site Analysis Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing and Technology Analysis Structural Seismic Analysis

Economic Reports:

Economic Case Studies Preliminary Cost Evaluation Economic Analysis of Proposed Sites and Option

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY | MAIN LIBRARY FEASIBILITY STUDY • DECEMBER 20, 2024

Overview: Visioning, Goals, Programming

- Why / How / What
- Project Schedule: Phase 1: "Gather"

Overview: Visioning, Goals, Programming





Overview: Visioning, Goals, Programming



why:

Vision / Mission

how:

Goals, Best Practices and How to Measure Success

what:

Data, Operations, Organization and Space



Visioning Process

Vision Crafting Alignment with Community Vision Considering Precedent Projects

We We

Visioning Process





Our Mission

Your Oakland Public Library empowers all people to explore, connect, and grow.

Our Vision

The Oakland Public Library will be celebrated locally and nationally as an indispensable partner in transforming lives.

Our Values

The Oakland Public Library values:

- · Diversity
- Equity
- · Community
- Responsive Service
- Adaptability
- Empowerment
- Joy



Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Calgary Central Library

Overview

- Central Library for Calgary Public Library (21 branches)
- Calgary Public Library system is used by over 670,000 Calgarians (over half of the 1.2M population)
- Library is situated within a tight urban fabric (a functional light rail transit line crosses the site). The library doubles as a portal and a bridge.
- Completed 2018
- 240,000 sf (2/3 larger than previous central library), across 4 floors
- "600,000 items"







Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Calgary Central Library



Vision

Potentials realized.

Mission

Values

Empowering community by connecting you to ideas and experiences, inspiration and insight.

INCLUSION The Library upholds the principles of a just society, chief among them respect, dignity, and equity. We engage in open, meaningful dialogue and deepen our understanding to inform Library practice and create an environment that is inclusive of all.

CURIOSITY The Library doesn't settle for what we already know. We explore new ideas, consider fresh perspectives, and seek to innovate. It is our curiosity, teamed with our creativity, that ensures we continue to achieve. We use our imaginations to set and exceed our own high standards.

COLLABORATION *Our decisions are better and our impact greater when we work with our colleagues, our members, and our partners.*



Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Calgary Central Library

In Concert with Library's Community Vision

Create opportunities to build connection, share in collaborative action, and deepen understanding of community.



INCLUSION Calgary Public Library commits to lowering barriers to participation, especially for newcomers and those living in social or digital isolation.



RECONCILIATION Calgary Public Library commits to forging a path of Reconciliation by listening to, learning from, and building relationships with local Indigenous communities.



CONNECTION Calgary Public Library commits to providing a platform for those engaged with ideas, their community, and local issues to receive unique insights, and create connections and networks. Be a positive catalyst for personal change and adaptation, sustaining curiosity and lifelong discovery.









LEARNING Calgary Public Library commits to be an igniter of human potential and a beacon for those engaged in school, lifelong, and selfdirected learning.

EMPOWERMENT Calgary Public Library commits to empowering all users to dream, learn, and grow.

Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Austin Central Library

Overview

- Central Library for Austin Public Library (21 branches)
- Austin population: 960,000
- A technologically-rich, innovative community hub which establishes a culturally-sensitive, major civic presence and community gathering space in the heart of downtown.
- Completed 2017
- 198,000 sf, across 6 floors
- 13 shared learning rooms (for classes, workshops, meetings, co-working, etc)
- 140 public use computers / 150 selfcheck devices (laptops/ipads) / 50 large screens for displaying electronic information









Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Austin Central Library





Vision

The Austin Public Library is key to making Austin a dynamic creative center and the most livable city in the country.

COMMITMENT The Austin Public Library is committed to providing easy access to books and information for all ages, through responsive professionals, engaging programs and state-of-the-art technology in a safe and friendly environment.

> **EQUITY COMMITMENT** The Austin Public Library will assure that all members of the Austin community have equal access to Library services and programs.

DIVERSITY COMMITMENT The

Austin Public Library values diversity and is dedicated to celebrating an organizational culture that respects, understands, honors and welcomes all members of the staff and community.



Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Vasche Library, CSU Stanislaus

Overview

- Academic library: Main library for CSU Stanislaus and academic heart of campus.
- Renovation more than doubled the number of study seats within the same existing footprint, from seating in communal study areas to quiet study carrels. 19 bookable study rooms.
- As a campus serving many firstgeneration college students, intuitive and welcoming access to library resources was a priority.
- Extensive technology resources, including distributed computers, laptop check out, tech help desk, and multimedia group study rooms.
- Completed 2021
- 123,000 sf







Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Vasche Library, CSU Stanislaus

Vision Statements

Welcoming environment that is accessible, comfortable, and supportive to all CSU Stanislaus students

Environment that fosters scholarship support and enhanced learning for student success Memorable library experience and a design that celebrates the Library collection, University, and Region

Shared spaces and a flexible design that can grow with the evolving needs of the library

State of the art learning environment and technology / telecommunications hub for the Campus





Visioning Process

Step 1: Library Concepts

The first step of the engagement process will be to develop five library concepts in dialog with library thought leaders. The concepts will be introduced to students for feedback and adaptation, as part of our student-driven engagement tool.

These concepts are intended to provoke discussion and inspire student-centric visions of the K12 library of the future: one that can better support its students and the unique places and communities they inhabit.



2022 ONEder Grant Application

Self-Discovery Aplace of learning and discovery, holistic wellvess assurces, and individual and community healing.



A place for students to share ideas, tools, and processes, and for the broader community to share its unique identity and passions.

Exposure

find their voice, and where their values are given a path to meaningful action.

Action A place of community organization, where students

Every Place A titing of resources and amenities field together by a focus on social and community-based service learning opportunities.

ehdd.





Survey Data



Project Goals and Measuring Success

Building Upon Existing Goals Defining Success Reference Points: Best Practices and Peer Institutions

Project Goals and Measuring Success Use Existing Data as Baseline



FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 BY THE NUMBERS

The Oakland Public Library (OPL) has **continued to offer programs and services** during an incredibly challenging year. Our 2020 Oakland Youth Poet Laureate, Greer Nakadegawa-Lee, was part of more than 25 virtual performances. OPL's tenth Oakland Youth Poet Laureate, Myra Estrada, was announced in a live virtual event in June 2021. Our 2020 Summer Program shifted to being **entirely virtual**, with programming, video content, and prizes for adults, teens, and children.

Throughout the year, OPL **continued to host** virtual history talks, a travel series, and several book clubs and ESL conversation clubs. Patrons met with lawyers and the Oakland Tenants Union through the library and were offered talks from East Bay Parks, all without leaving their homes. OPL's partnership with MOCHA continued, allowing us to send children home with craft supplies during sidewalk service, and we offered video storytime content for the youngest children of Oakland.

OPL STAFF:

Placed RFID tags on 1,102,516 circulating items at 17 locations to prepare for self-service checkout

Welcomed 13,728 new patrons

Shared **382** pieces of recorded content, including storytimes, lectures, panel discussions, and performances

OPL PATRONS BORROWED:

616,510 physical items (books, DVDs, CDs, etc) 261,000+ ebooks 86,000+ digital magazines 70,100+ digital audiobooks 65,293 streaming movies





Project Goals and Measuring Success

Putting Mission into Action.

• Define Goals of how Vision will be accomplished

<u>Example:</u> We will empower all people to Explore, Connect and Grow by providing hands-on learning opportunities via Makerspace and Art Studio programs.	Space / Program
<u>Example:</u> We will empower all people to Explore, Connect and Grow by expanding our operating hours to better serve working parents.	Operations
<u>Example:</u> We will empower all people to Explore, Connect and Grow by changing the types of materials we provide for patrons.	Collection Management

Project Goals and Measuring Success Compare to Peer Institutions and Best Practices





Community Space Amenities

• The Central Library provides a wide range of meeting spaces for community functions, bookable on short notice.

Facilitating a Range of Activities and Interactions

• Organized on a spectrum of 'Fun' to 'Serious,' the library program locates the livelier public activities on the lower floors, gradually transitioning to quieter study areas on the upper levels as one spirals upwards. At the street level, a series of multi-purpose rooms line the perimeter of the building, enhancing the connectivity between inside and outside.



Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Vasche Library, CSU Stanislaus

Intuitive Access

• As a campus serving many firstgeneration college students, intuitive and welcoming access to library resources was a priority.

Supporting Multimodal Learning

• Collaborative learning, individualized spaces, and a range of spatial scales for patrons' and students' needs.







Project Goals and Measuring Success Compare to Peer Institutions and Best Practices



Public Library Survey Data





OAKLAND NA PUBLIC LIBRARY

Project Goals and Measuring Success Compare to Peer Institutions and Best Practices

American Library Association Libraries of the Future Trends



Project Goals and Measuring Success Define How to Measure Success

Align Goals with Oakland Equitable Climate Action Plan



building for a carbon positive future



Programming Process and Objectives

- Programming Introduction
- OML Departments and Beyond
- Programming Elements
- Best Practices and Expanded Services

Programming Process and Objectives

What is programming?

Architectural programming involves research and decision making that helps the architect and owner establish performance requirements and design criteria for the project.

Programming can range broadly from identifying the project's goals and objectives to particular elements, such as the precise characteristics of a space. [AIA]



Understanding The OPL Organization



Cataloging and Processing

Adjacency / Bubble Diagrams

• The prime purpose of an adjacency diagram is to explain how different functions or spaces should be positioned in relation to one another.





Program Diagram

• Positions program stakeholders within the general spatial framework of a project. The program diagram can illustrate relationships in plan (lateral connections) and/or in section (vertical connections).



Survey Data • Project stakeholders (patrons, staff, other community members) are invited to share insight into their hopes, concerns, and vision for the project. This data will enrich the project and inform the criteria.



Programming Process and Objectives Best Practices

Looking Ahead: Best Practices

These are some of the areas of focus the programming approach may highlight, in concert with the project vision and goals:

- Targeted demographic coverage
- Technological improvements
- Automation strategies / self-service approaches
- Collections management and access
- Adjacencies of Operational Units



Precedent Study: Physical Attributes

• As relevant precedent projects are identified for consideration, the qualities of spaces provided can be investigated (for projects involving existing buildings, scale comparisons can be particularly insightful).



Total Area: 80,000 GSF Footprint: 25,000 GSF

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY - MAIN BRANCH Oakland, CA, USA





Total Area: 240,000 GSF Footprint: 57,000 GSF 150' Tea

CALGARY CENTRAL LIBRARY Calgary, Alberta, Canada



Programming Process and Objectives Expanded Services

Precedent Insight: Expanded Services

Impactful program elements as seen in some contemporary public-serving library projects.

Available community spaces



Calgary Central Library, Calgary, Canada

Technological engagement



James B. Hunt Jr. Library, NC State

Reflection of community



Austin Central Library, Austin, TX



Next Steps

Revisit Schedule Questions? Cillin.

WHAT'S NEW

Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study Workshop 1 - October 13th, 2022



Kickoff


Kickoff

• Takeaways

Oakland Public Library is the second oldest Public Library System in California, and has unique historic collections and material.



...everything at the Library belongs to the community, and should serve the community!

Focus on Resilience!

The Main Library should be a destination, an iconic place, a place of pride

The Library is a place that supports life transitions

study a Community Ambassador model for interactions with patrons?



Vision Statement





Our Mission

Your Oakland Public Library empowers all people to explore, connect, and grow.

Our Vision

The Oakland Public Library will be celebrated locally and nationally as an indispensable partner in transforming lives.

Our Values

The Oakland Public Library values:

- · Diversity
- Equity
- Community
- Responsive Service
- Adaptability
- Empowerment
- Joy



Vision Statement





Our Mission

Your Oakland Public Library empowers all people to explore, connect, and grow.

How will the Main Library empower all people to explore, connect and grow?

Our Vision

The Oakland Public Library will be celebrated locally and nationally as an indispensable partner in transforming lives.

How will the Main Library support transforming lives?

Our Values

The Oakland Public Library values:

- Diversity
- · Equity
- Community
- Responsive Service
- Adaptability
- · Empowerment
- Joy

How will the Main Library express the Library's Core Values?



Equity Goals



Goal I: OPL operationalizes racial equity

Main themes:

- · Changes in structure, culture and transparency at OPL
- · Ongoing training and learning opportunities
- · Strategies for addressing racial incidents
- · Engagement with the community

Action items:

- · Systemized incident report
- collection
- · Update OPL Guidelines of Behavior · Invest in staff education and
- training
- · Reform security guard model
- Partner with community organizations involved in restorative justice

NEW Goal V:

lens

be developed, managed, and

Goal II: Patrons feel and are treated with

- Improved Workplace Culture for BIPOC staff
- Enhanced Recruitment Strategies Representing Oakland's Diversity
- Transparent Career Process Understanding Civil Service Positions

Updating Library Job Class Specifications

Goal IV: Programming will serve needs & interests of BIPOC communities

- · Racial Equity Lens applied to all programming decisions
- · Enhanced community engagement
- Increased opportunities for BIPOC community members & organizations

RE



OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Equity Goals



Goal I: OPL operationalizes racial equity

Main themes:

- · Changes in structure, culture and transparency at OPL
- · Ongoing training and learning opportunities
- · Strategies for addressing racial incidents
- · Engagement with the community



RE

Action items:

- · Systemized incident report
- · Update OPL Guidelines of Behavior · Invest in staff education and
- training
- · Reform security guard model · Partner with community organizations involved in
- restorative justice

Goal II: Patrons feel and are

24

How can the Main Library better support building the right culture and transparency? How can the Main Library support restorative justice and explore new ways to secure the facility?

Improved Workplace Culture for BIPOC staff Enhanced Recruitment Strategies Representing Oakland's Diversity Transparent Career Process Understanding Civil Service Positions Updating Library Job Class Specifications Goal IV: Programming will serve needs & interests of BIPOC communities

- · Racial Equity Lens applied to all programming decisions
- · Enhanced community engagement

21ª

 Increased opportunities for BIPOC community members & organizations

How can the Main Library provide support (space, capabilities) for community organizations and engagement?

NEW Goal V:

Collections offered by OPL will be developed, managed, and assessed using a racial equity lens



How can a new Collection Management process work in concert with changes to the facility and operating model?

How can the Main Library become an asset to attract and retain a diverse and representative workforce?

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY



Design thinking is a human-centered approach to innovation that draws from the designer's toolkit to integrate the needs of people, the possibilities of technology, and the requirements for business success.



POAKLAND

Divergent and Convergent Thinking



Not always a linear pathway; developing multiple perspectives and viewpoints aid the process



Double Diamond - Problem and Solution Space



OP OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Double Diamond Process - Mapped to Project Schedule

Finding the right questions

Finding the right solutions



OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Finding the Right Questions



Review Examples of many approaches to stimulate our collective curiosity and widen our shared perspective of what's possible



Space Breakdown - Oakland Main Library (Existing)



Space Breakdown - Oakland Main Library (Existing)



OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Space Breakdown - Calgary Library



Space Breakdown - Hayward Main Library Noll & Tam Architects













Public Gathering and Reading Areas

Special Audience: Children



FIRST FLOOR



New Library Opened September, 2020

58,000 SF

\$65.7M PROJECT COST





Space Breakdown - Compairison

Oakland Main Library



Calgary Library



Hayward Main Library





OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Space Breakdown - Compairison

Oakland Main Library



Calgary Library



Hayward Main Library





OAKLAND

Examples from other Library Systems



Community representation in design

Formal Representation and Materials

• Form and plan of the Calgary Central Library allude to elements inherent to the First Nation Peoples cultural context. The overall geometry is said to be inspired by the Chinook arch, (cloud formations unique to Calgary). In plan, the central atrium takes the shape of a canoe and is lined almost entirely with hemlock wood slats.



Calgary Central Library; Calgary, Canada

Collaborative/Participatory Process

- Patrons are invited to engage not only in the vision of the new space, but the design itself.
- At the Sunset Park branch of the Brooklyn Public Library, a local youth empowerment program shaped the functional art installation that adorns the library's windows. The team and students created their own shading device and incorporated several meaningful themes.



OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Brooklyn Public Library, Sunset Park; Brooklyn, NY

Community-specific engagement programs at libraries

An alwaus-chanaina 9×13 space designed both for and by community members



Oak Park Public Library; Oak Park, IL

Sound booths fostering creativity and self-confidence



🔅 cpl.org

The Sound of Music: A Teen Explores New Instruments at South Branch

Teen Joswen Colon uses South Branch's sound booth to learn new instruments, produce music, and make his parents

Cleveland Public Library South Branch; Cleveland, OH

Teen-driven library programming



Making Dreams Come True: From Israel to Cleveland, How Teens

Changed E.131 Branch

On a January afternoon at Cleveland

Public Library's East 131st St. Branch, three teenagers show off the clothing

and accessories they crafted from recycled materials. Amari Fountain, 15, dons a plastic poncho trimmed with newspaper comics while Brittan...

C cpl.org

Library

Corlett Volunteens at E. 131st St. Branch. Cleveland Public Library: Cleveland, OH

WITHIN THE LIBRARY

2019 Literary Lot



Literary Lots; Cleveland, OH

OUTSIDE H LIBRARY

"Check out" a plot of land at the public library



Library Farm What is the Library Farm? The Library Farm is an organic, educational, community garden located on the grounds of the Northern Onondaga Public Library in Cicero, NY.

Northern Onondaga Public Library; Cicero, NY

Transforming vacant lots into scenes from children's books



Community-specific engagement programs at libraries

nác'a?mat ct Strathcona Library / YWCA Cause We Care House; Vancouver, BC, Canada

• Collocated programs: Vancouver Public Library branch library, inclusive gathering space, and affordable housing for single mothers and their children.





nə́c'a?mat ct Strathcona Library / YWCA Cause We Care House; Vancouver, BC, Canada (Dialog Design)



Community-specific engagement programs at libraries

MD Explorations Commons at Carroll County Public Library; Westminster, MD (near Baltimore)

• Gutted a basement, providing meeting space (4 rooms of various sizes), maker lab, demonstration kitchen.







MD Explorations Commons at Carroll County Public Library; Westminster, MD (MW Studios)



Meeting space / flexible space precedents

- Increasingly, patrons are seeking common space to facilitate meetings outside the home and workplace.
- Provide a variety of meeting space sizes to accommodate a range of groups and convenings. From individual Zoom meetings to larger convenings.
- Maximize technological compatibility and ease.
- Consider hours of community use and access (for some spaces, may extend beyond regular library hours).
- Consider room scheduling (should be easily bookable on short notice).



Calgary Central Library, Calgary, Canada



Outdoor library spaces: within library footprint

Austin Public Library (Main); Austin, TX

- Rooftop reading deck: capitalizing on Ausitn climate and culture of outdoor living/recreation. Careful to provide ample shading.
- Screened reading porches.







LIF www.lakeflato.com

Austin Central Library

Overlooking Shoal Creek and Lady Bird Lake, the LED Platinum Austin Central Library is a building shaped by light and designed to respond to the context of its place. Aspiring to be the most day-lit public library in the nation, the heart of the buildi...



Outdoor library spaces: outside / at grade

Eastman Reading Garden, Cleveland Public Library (Main); Cleveland, OH

- "Today: the garden remains a popular spot for reading, relaxing, lunching, birding and people-watching. Garden has wireless internet access." (per CPL website)
- Located between the two buildings that comprise the Main Cleveland Public library
- Formerly a city park, open to public (gated access)
- Public art collection (sculpture, rotating interactive pieces, and site works, including an installation by Maya Lin)



Reading a Garden by Maya Lin and Tan Lin (photo: OLIN)



Outdoor library spaces: sites for action



Grand Army Plaza, near Brooklyn Public Library (photo: Center for Brooklyn History)



Protest (2017); Olalekan 'LEk' Jeyifous. Initially installed at Cleveland's Public Square as a temporary public artwork, the installation series was orginally created as part of <u>LANDFORM</u> and is now permanently installed outside of the <u>Cleveland Public Library Langston Hughes Branch</u>.



Community-specific engagement programs at libraries

Corlett Volunteens at East 131st Street Branch; Cleveland, OH

- Pilot program based at the branch library giving teenagers agency to design and facilitate library programs, assist patrons, and research and write grants for programs.
- Specialized leadership roles for teens; for example, "Coordinator and Grant Writer", "Performing Arts & Walking Club Supervisor", "Technology and Podcasts Supervisor", "Culinary Arts & Garden Club Supervisor."
- Garden Club, which began in response to vandalism at public plantings in the area, has grown beyond its original goal of investing teens in the local green spaces. Teens help to maintain gardens, train community members on rainwater harvesting, and are learning about composting.

Puppet Parade at E. 131st St. Branch Library (Cleveland Public Library)



Corlett Volunteens William Sweeney, 15, and Brittani Morman, 13 (Cleveland Public Library)



Richland, SC - Artist / Entrepreneur / Writer in Residence

Library Residents

Home? Ubrary Residents







Artist-in-Residence:

Richland Library's Artist-in-Residence Program aims to connect the community with local working artists and to provide creative and educational opportunities to the community in a way that supports cultural and artistic exchange.

Created in 2015, the realdency program gives artists, performers and makers of all types and disciplines the ability to work freely in their own studio space, share their works and artistic process with the community and provide learning opportunities and programs for library customers.

BECOME AN ARTIST-IN-RESIDENCE +

Current Resident:



Terrance Henderson (he/him) Performing artist, choreographer and director July - December 2022

Office Hours: 11 a.m. - 1 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays Richland Library Main

FIND A PROGRAM

Terrance Henderson is an International award-winning performing artist, choreographer, director, writer, teacher and Equity Advisor based here in Columbia. South Carolina. He has been a driving force in the theater and dance communities of South Carolina for many years,

raising the bar on achievements in dance, theater, and choreography and forging important conversations through his work.

Entrepreneur-in-Residence:

The library's Entrepreneur-In-Residence supports, mentors, and educates new entrepreneurs and budding start-ups through office hours and public programs-building an ecosystem that sustains the development and growth of future entrepreneurs in the region. The program also aims to connect entrepreneurs with peers who have successfully designed, launched and run a new business venture.

Current Resident:



Starlitt Miller October 2022 - January 2023 Meet with Starlitt | Find An Event

Starktit is a serial entrepreneur that has taken unconventional (not so typical) pathways through education, building business, and other pursuits in her life. She is a big believer in all of what you do starts with you and that includes starting, developing, and scaling your business ventures.

Starlitt's corporate and educational background is in business operations, accounting, workflow strategy, leveraging technology for operations, and the performing arts. Her present mission is to

empower the average non-accountant decision-maker with their own financial data so that they can grow their businesses strategically and is doing so through her service-based company <u>SAABS</u> and tech start-up <u>Transity Tools, Inc.</u>

During her residency, she'll share her expertise with entrepreneurs and small business owners through an array of free programs and one-on-one coaching sessions.



Writer-in-Residence:

Noted children's author, Dinah Johnson, served as the library's first Writer-in-Residence from September 2015 - November 2016.

The South Carolina native held weekly office hours at Richland Ubrary Main-Interacting with aspiring authors of all ages. Known for her poetic stories, including Black Margic, Johnson gathered inspiration from her surroundings during her residency; and applied it to numerous projects:



Visioning



Visioning Vision Cone Exercise

What you can do with the tool

- Get a feel for changes over time.
- Think in periods and sections, for example, from the past to the future by mapping different results over time.
- Sketch a projected, plausible, possible, preferred, or absurd future.
- Linking visions with concrete next steps.
- To show the potential of all possibilities, for example with regard to technological and sociological developments.

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY



The Design Thinking Toolbox; Lewrick, Link, Leifer

Identity

What sets the Main Library apart?

What is the Main Library known for?

What is the Main Library becoming?

What does the Main Library want to be for Oakland?





Activities

What are you doing?

What do you want to do (even if you are currently unable)?

What is the new model?





Community

Who is the community the Main Library serves?

How does the Main Library relate to this community?

How does the Main Library advance equity in this community?

How can the Main Library serve a more comprehensive community?





Place

How does the Main Library relate to its place?

What kinds of places can best serve the Identity, Activities, and Community goals? (these can be indoor or outdoor)

How can the Main Library serve more places?










Community Workshops

- North Oakland North Oakland Senior center
- West Oakland- DeFremery Park
- Oakland Main
- Central East Oakland- Eastside Arts Alliance
- Deep East Oakland- East Oakland Boxing Center
- Hills- Participant's Choice

Potential Street Labs

- Lake Merritt- Lakeview Vendors Market
- Friday Night at Oakland Museum
- Deep East Oakland- Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center
- Hills- Montclair Village
- Fruitvale- Fruitvale Transit Village
- Chinatown- Pacific Renaissance Plaza
- Brooklyn Basin
- Broadway Valdez- Sprouts

(DRAFT 8/17/2023)

Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study Community Engagement Plan

Introduction:

The community engagement process for the Oakland Main Library (OML) serves as an investigation into OML's potential to serve as a vibrant hub for knowledge, culture, and social interaction through active community channels. This plan outlines the current and future community engagement efforts of this feasibility study, ensuring that OML not only meets the functional needs of the community, but also resonates with its aspirations, values, and identity.

This study represents a new, community-led approach to re-imagine how a Main Library facility should represent Oakland's authentic and dynamic culture. Using collaborative partnerships with a unique group of community engagement specialists, including artists, filmmakers, and urban planning visionaries, the project is developing a detailed picture of what the Library means to Oakland, while drawing on detailed studies of the best examples of new and evolving Library programs nationally and worldwide. Building on Oakland's civic commitment to addressing climate resilience and justice, the Study is also exploring how a new and improved Main Library can be a restorative element in the evolving network of support across the city. In the following sections, the comprehensive community engagement plan for OML is outlined. Each facet of this plan has been mindfully crafted to tap into the rich diversity of Oakland's population, ensuring that their collective wisdom guides the evolution of this vital community resource. By focusing on inventive avenues of engagement such film, storytelling, and art, the goal is to include voices that aren't traditionally participating in the planning process.

Community Engagement Team:



URBANURBANURBAN PLACE IT!

Table of Contents:

- Advisory CommitteePage 3Community WorkshopPage 4Storytelling WorkshopPage 6Street LabsPage 7Model Based EngagementPage 8Digital Community SurveysPage 9Online CommunicationsPage 10Attachments:
- Community Engagement Schedule
- Community Engagement Geographic Reach



Community Workshop 1 Participants discussing the future of the Main Library

Advisory Committee

- <u>Purpose:</u> The Advisory Committee is composed of a select group of individuals who represent the diversity of the Oakland Community. These individuals might include local leaders, educators, business owners, parents, and other stakeholders. The committee provides a structured platform for in-depth discussions, brainstorming, and strategic planning. Their input and recommendations can offer valuable insights into the specific needs of various demographics within Oakland, ensuring that the library's offerings are well-aligned with the community's expectations.
- <u>Approach:</u> The Advisory Committee will interact with the Study Team through formal meetings, and also through more focussed interactions that draw on their individual talents and areas of expertise and experience. The goal is to identify approximately 50 members, with the knowledge that not everyone can attend each meeting. The composition and contributions of the committee will likely shift during the course of the study.

- We plan to have four advisory committee meetings in total, with the following goals:
- 1. Meeting 1: Introductions and Summary of Feasibility Study and Community Engagement Process
- 2. Meeting 2: Advisory Committee Input on Library Vision
- 3. Meeting 3: Update and Feedback on Community Engagement Process
- 4. Meeting 4: Report on Preliminary Feasibility Study Options (Prior to Public Report)
- Reporting: The outcomes of the Advisory Committee meetings will be summarized and included in the Community Engagement Process updates and final report. Individual Advisory Committee members and their feedback will only be identified with their consent; The membership, contact information and contributions of the group will not be publicly accessible.



Advisory Committee Virtual Meeting

Community Workshops

- <u>Purpose:</u> Community workshops are an interactive approach for residents to come together and share their thoughts, ideas, and concerns. They offer an opportunity for our team to gather firsthand insights into the needs and preferences of different neighborhoods within Oakland. These workshops involve identifying specific interests, potential services, and programming that the community desires from the library. The workshops also serve as a means to generate excitement and foster a sense of ownership among the community members regarding the future library and the potential of future programs and services.
- <u>Approach:</u> Currently, there are 5 workshops planned in various parts of Oakland. The goal is to have participation from 20-30 actively engaged members of the local community in each neighborhood. Our approach is to partner with community organizations in each area, to connect with local voices and hear from people who are not current Library users.

Community Workshop 1 Participants discussing the future of the Main Library

These neighborhoods include:

- 1. Deep East Oakland at the East Oakland Boxing Alliance (COMPLETED, held on 7/13)
- 2. Central East Oakland
- 3. Downtown / Chinatown
- 4. West Oakland
- 5. North Oakland / Hills



Community Workshop 1 Participants discussing the future of the Main Library

The Community Workshops will be organized around the following agenda:

- 1. Induction to the Feasibility Study Process (Context)
- 2. Inspirational or thought provoking imagery and content about the Libraries potential (Inspiration)
- 3. One or more breakout activities to develop feedback in small groups (Feedback)
- 4. Share out or wrap up session (Summary / Sharing)
- Reporting: The community workshops will allow us to emerge major themes, ideas, and insights that community members have identified as the needs, desires, and expectations of OML. The results will be reported back out to the community and project team via social media channels, the newsletter, and also included in the final feasibility study report. Scans of the brainstorming sessions, along with other visuals generated during the workshop will also be included in the report for reference. Videos of attendee interviews will also be included in the final video documenting the feasibility study.

Storytelling Workshop

<u>Purpose:</u> The storytelling workshop goes beyond gathering input on physical facilities and services. It encourages community members to share their personal stories and experiences related to libraries and community spaces, and teaches them how to engage others through storytelling. These stories can provide deep insights into the role a library has played in people's lives, how it has impacted their learning, cultural experiences, and sense of belonging. It also builds capacity in the audience to develop their own storytelling approaches to share their narratives in the community, hopefully to support the Library as the project continues.

Approach:

Target of ~25 people

Agenda:

- Introduction to Storytelling
- Breakout groups to develop shared narrative regarding the OML project
- Share-out at the end



Storytelling Workshop Participants discussing the future of the Main Library

<u>Reporting</u>: The storytelling workshop will present a collection of personal narratives shared by the workshop participants regarding the authentic vision for OML's future. By activating this avenue of engagement, this will allow us to explore the common threads that surface across the narratives while also collecting interactive artistic expressions created during the workshop such as drawings and storyboards, which will be referenced and included in the final report document. Clips of the workshop will be included in the video production for the feasibility study.

Street Labs

<u>Purpose:</u> Street labs, set up in high-traffic areas or events, enable the library to engage with a wide cross-section of the population, including those who might not attend workshops or meetings. These booths allow for quick and informal interactions, making it easy for people to share their ideas even in passing. Street labs contribute to a broader outreach effort, capturing the opinions of a diverse range of individuals and ensuring that the library's plans consider the perspectives of a wide array of community members.



Approach:

- The goal for Street Labs is to engage with many people at an existing event to make them aware of the project, give them an opportunity to sign up for the notification list, participate in the survey, and learn more about how they can get involved in the future. We plan to target events where we can achieve 30 50 interactions.
- The feasibility of these locations/events is currently being investigated:
- Lake Merritt Lakeview Vendors Market
- Friday Night at Oakland Museum
- Deep East Oakland Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center
- Oakland Hills Montclair Village
- Fruitvale Fruitvale Transit Village
- Chinatown Pacific Renaissance Plaza
- Brooklyn Basin
- Broadway Valdez Sprouts

<u>Reporting:</u> The street labs will be the most accessible and ubiquitous way to measure and capture the engagement of the broader community. By making email sign-ups seamless and allowing easy access to the digital survey, we will be able to report the number of interactions achieved and consequently, individuals reached.

Model Based Engagement

- <u>Purpose:</u> Model Based Engagement Sessions, setup in conjunction with Street Labs or Community Workshops, offer an opportunity to engage with participants of all ages and language capability, and get at the deep emotional relationships people have with the Library.
- <u>Approach:</u> After providing a prompt, participants engage in building a three dimensional representation of their answer (for example: How do you want to feel when you walk into the Main Library). After the models are complete, each group explains their response, and how the three dimensional representation results in their goal.
- <u>Reporting:</u> The team will capture photos and videos of the participants sharing out, and will record and summarize the responses to identify common themes or topics that emerge. The summary reports will be part of the regular reports posted to the website and newsletter.



Model Based Engagement Participants (Photo courtesy of Place It)

Digital Community Surveys

- <u>Purpose:</u> Surveys are a structured way to collect quantitative data on a larger scale. Offering both digital and physical surveys offer convenience and accessibility to community members to provide feedback. Surveys help validate and quantify the findings from other engagement methods. They allow for statistical analysis, identifying trends, preferences, and priorities. The inclusion of both digital and physical surveys ensures that the library captures input from individuals who are comfortable with different communication channels, while also focusing on capturing a breadth of information and participation.
- In addition to the Digital Surveys, Street Labs will serve as an opportunity for individuals who aren't able or do not wish to participate in the online survey to provide feedback.
- <u>Approach:</u> Two Digital Community Surveys, one early, one later different prompts
- <u>Reporting:</u> Summary report of survey data

Online Communications

<u>Purpose:</u> To build an audience and momentum for events and surveys related to the feasibility study.

Approach:

 Project Website: Create a dedicated project website that serves as a central hub for information. The website will feature updates on the progress of the feasibility study, details about upcoming events and workshops, and a platform to showcase the outcomes of the community events. Visitors can easily access project materials, provide feedback, and stay informed about opportunities to participate.

https://www.oaklandca.gov/topics/oakland-main-library-feasi bility-study

- Project Newsletter: Based on the email list developed by signups through the project website, send out project-specific newsletter on a regular basis. The newsletter will provide insights into the various stages of the feasibility study, highlight community stories, and share event announcements.
- OPL Newsletter Updates: Prepare content for OPL's existing newsletter to disseminate updates about the feasibility study. Leverage OPL's established subscriber base to reach a wider audience and keep them informed about the ongoing community engagement efforts, progress, and opportunities for involvement.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE AUGUST 5 STORYTELLING WORKSHOP!



The **Oakland Main Library Storytelling Workshop** was held at the Main Library Community room to help build an authentic narretwin in support of a re-imagined Dakland Main Library. Participants learned about the storytelling process and shared stories and experiences that will be used to inspire and shape the design and programming of the future facility.

The 3-hour workshop had two highly interactive segments. In the first, participants became limitian with the four main components of a story - Story, Audiene, Messaga, and Style (SAMS). Keith Battle from BAVC Media led the discussion and together the group analyzed a few short videos on the impact and importance of branch libraries using the SAMS rubric. In the second half participants given drivial branch our groups led by a professional local filmmaker and generated unique storylines or simple storyboards using the SAMS rubric: about what a new Branch Library, would mean to the community.

Sign up for updates on future events



Website update example

- Social Media: Leverage social media platforms to engage with the community. Regular posts will showcase event details, share participant stories, and foster dialogue. Engaging visuals, infographics, and video clips will be used to capture attention and drive engagement.
- Media: Forge connections with local media outlets, both digitally and physically, to amplify the project's visibility. Featured articles and interviews will be conducted to share the importance of the feasibility study, promote events, and spotlight community voices.

Reporting:

Engagement statistics on the audience reach of our channels will be reported (monthly) on the project website and newsletters

Attachments:

Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study Project Schedule:





Community Workshops

- · North Oakland North Oakland Senior center
- West Oakland- DeFremery Park
- Oakland Main
- Central East Oakland- Eastside Arts Alliance
- Deep East Oakland- East Oakland Boxing Center
- · Hills- Participant's Choice

Potential Street Labs

- Lake Merritt- Lakeview Vendors Market
- · Friday Night at Oakland Museum
- Deep East Oakland- Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center
- Hills- Montclair Village
- Fruitvale- Fruitvale Transit Village
- Chinatown- Pacific Renaissance Plaza
- Brooklyn Basin
- · Broadway Valdez- Sprouts

Climate Positive Design



Context for climate action



Oakland ECAP

Relevant sections from the Oakland ECAP

Buildings

B-4

Reduce Lifecycle Emissions from Building Materials

odied carbon emissions. In subsequent standards including additional materials is needed to prevent these changes from

B-5

Require All Major Retrofits of City Facilities to be All-Electric

Lead Agency	Climate Benefit	Cost	Benefits
OPW	DDD	\$\$\$\$	
OPW	PPP	\$\$\$\$	S. D

Effective immediately, retrofits of City-owned or controlled buildings shall not install any new natural gas infrastructure or equipment. All major retrofit projects shall eliminate gas infrastructure from the building and integrate energy storage wherever technically feasible and appropriate.

Materials

MCW-5

Expand Community Repair Resources

Lead Agencies	Climate Benefit	Cost	Benefits	
OPL, EWDD	PPP	\$\$\$\$	Œ	

Expand the City's existing tool lending library services to at least 5 other Oakland Public Library branches, recreation facilities, community centers, or other community sites by 2030, prioritizing East and West Oakland and low-income neighborhoods. Ensure tool lending facilities support repairable household items and active mobility modes, including bicycles. Explore potential for onsite community partnership programming to teach repair skills and promote local repair businesses.

MCW-4

Support the Reuse, Repair, Recovery, and Refurbishment Economy

Lead Agency	Climate Benefit	Cost	Benefits	
OPW	DDD	\$\$\$\$		

By 2025, create a community reuse and repair program to increase waste diversion, reduce material consumption, and create green jobs. Specifically:

- Explore creating or designating live/work or other spaces dedicated to material repair and upcycling, and selling of repaired and upcycled goods.
- Remove land use and other barriers to developing businesses that reuse or repair consumer goods, where doing so will not adversely impact the surrounding residential neighborhood.
- Develop resources to support direct donation to charitable organizations.
- Increase public awareness of and access to opportunities for reuse, product rentals, repair, and donation.
- Support, regulate, and expand citywide reuse infrastructure.
- Establish a methodology to assess benefits of reuse and repair programs to goals for waste diversion, GHG emissions, and economic development.
- Partner with local vocational programs and/or OUSD to launch at least one high school or community college-level Repair Arts Academy.
- Develop a grant, recognition, or incentive program to celebrate and encourage local repair businesses or leaders.

Adaptation

A-1

Fund Creation and Operation of Resilience Hubs

Lead Agencies	Climate Benefit	Cost	Benefits
OPW, Resilience	PPP	\$\$\$\$	

Increase community resilience by (1) supporting community engagement and community-led disaster preparedness training, prioritizing frontline communities first; and (2) developing protocols and enhancing building systems to enable trusted community-serving facilities – including libraries, recreation and community centers, and parks – to reliably serve their communities as places of refuge during smoke days, extreme heat, and power outages. By 2022, identify and prioritize specific resilience needs and gaps in frontline communities, and assess feasibility of establishing Resilience Hubs at both municipal and community facilities in areas with prioritized gaps. By 2025, partner with established community resilience groups to co-develop and pilot three Resilience Hubs: community serving facilities that support residents year-round and support resource distribution and onsite services before, during, or after a natural hazard event. Identify ways that the City can support decentralized community facilities to serve residents who are unable to travel to centralized resilience hubs during disasters and emergencies.

A-2

Enhance Community Energy Resilience

Lead Agency	Climate Benefit	Cost	Benefits
OPW	PPP	\$\$ \$\$	

Work with EBCE to develop a program and timeline for increasing resilience to power losses, including Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS), and climate-driven extreme weather events for low-income, medically dependent, and elderly populations through installation of renewable energy and onsite energy storage with islanding capabilities, following appropriate project-level environmental review. Include energy efficiency building upgrades in any program, leveraging local and regional incentives. This program may include grants, incentives, rebates, and/or integration with other energy programs.

Decisions now will have long consequences



Emissions over time

Decisions made now will have long consequences



Emissions over time

Decisions made now will have long consequences



Material-related emissions





Material-related emissions

Emissions over time

Decisions made now will have long consequences



Material-related emissions

Efficient retrofits



Material-related emissions

An equity-first approach

This Equitable Climate Action Plan is our strategy to create a future built on justice, equal opportunity, and environmental protection. This Plan is more than just policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Equity drives every aspect of this approach, and each Action is designed to maximize benefits to frontline residents. *Libby Schaaf*



A people-first sustainability approach



A people-first sustainability approach

That recognizes that we can't do everything

A people-first sustainability approach

Grounded in relevant policy

Oakland:	2045 Climate N	eutrality Pledge	All-electric retrofit and construction requirements
California:	CalGreen Requirements	Construction materials carbon rep	porting (forthcoming 2027)





NYU Bobst Library after Hurricane Sandy



Queens Library after Hurricane Sandy



Oakland:

2045 Climate Neutrality Pledge

All-electric retrofit and construction requirements

California:

CalGreen Requirements

Construction materials carbon reporting (forthcoming 2027)



California:

CalGreen Requirements

Construction materials carbon reporting (forthcoming 2027)



All-electric cooking at OPL



Bike repair and transit advocacy



Expanded tool lending library



Summer Food Service Program



California:

CalGreen Requirements

Construction materials carbon reporting (forthcoming 2027)
Our goal:

How?

Sustainability framework for the Oakland Main Library Imagining patron and community experience What can the library experience be like ...

... after a flood or earthquake? ... on a hot day?

... when someone needs something fixed? ... when the air is full of wildfire smoke?

... when there's nowhere to go after school? ... get to and from the library?

How can patrons and community ...

> ... learn about sustainability & climate?

... know resiliency resources are meant for <u>them</u>?

... work on hands-on projects?

Process

Gather and engage:



Process



Process



Why does this matter?

- Potential access to resiliencyand climate-focused funding sources
- Resonance between sustainability framework with community values
- It's a question of when and not *if* libraries will be resilience hubs



Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study OPL All Staff Meeting - October 28th, 2022



Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study OPL All Staff Meeting - October 28th, 2022

VISION

The vision of an improved, relocated or expanded Main Library is to create a destination, a state-of-the-art resilient facility that reflects the diverse community's needs, values, demographics, and general population. The Main must be large enough to house its diverse array of resources, programs and services to attract a growing population as well as a wider cross section of the population. Spaces must be adequate and flexible to accommodate changing uses and needs.

OBJECTIVE

To understand the City's and the community's goals, understand the variety of roles a Main Library plays, document a shared vision going forward and evaluate the different scenarios for either a New, Expanded or Relocated Main Library. The feasibility study will be developed through an intentional, robust community engagement process which includes library staff and community stakeholders.







OPL All Staff Meeting - October 28th, 2022

ehdd.

EHDD Prime Architect

We believe great design lifts spirits and opens minds, connects people and communities, embraces and protects

the environment

EHDD has a 75-year history steeped in creating both new and restoration projects with deep expertise in transformative civic and government buildings. Our approach to design embraces our Client's vision with stakeholder engagement, deriving inspiration from the many different voices that work together to envision, to build, and to steward places we inhabit.

Dynamic Collaboration

We listen intentily and with a careful ear to what is unique about communities. Conversations with clients give us invaluable perspective about who they are, what they need, and how they envision their future. We value a diversity of perspectives, open dialogue, and exploring open-ended solutions together as the foundation of our research-based practice. We thrive on rich collaborations to push the boundaries of what is possible.

Listen, Engage, and Evaluate

EHDD has a long history of partnering with institutions to plan and visualize new facilities and future growth. We specialize in analyzing complex programmatic, site, operational and financial factors and simplifying them into clear design strategies that allow our clients to understand the alternatives and make informed decisions. We begin each project with an intake session that allows us to listen, and truly learn about our client's values and goals. For this project to be successful, our creative exploration must occur within a framework that suits your institutional culture, builds consensus, and distills your core beliefs.

Select Library Design, Planning, and Community Engagement Experience:



San Mateo Main Public Library

The San Mateo Main Public Library is a technologically-advanced library whose design evolved out of an extensive public workshop process. EHDD solicited input from the community about the building's massing, the quality of interior and exterior spaces, and concerns about noise levels. The library's LEED® Gold design presents a strong civic image and establishing a new landmark in downtown San Mateo.

Branch Renovation, Santa Clara Library Systems

EHDD has been working with the Santa Clara Library system since 2018 implementing a series of library services and space renovations at the Saratoga, Cupertino, and Los Altos branches. Identifying dedicated teen areas, accommodating additional reader seats, and providing more flexible adult seating arrangements are among the many renovations. In addition, we developed a system-wide merchandising program that brought curated displays, "branded" with unique qualities of each branch but with a unified county-wide graphics and display model.





City College of San Francisco Chinatown North Beach Campus

EHDD's design of the new Chinatown/North Beach campus for City College of San Francisco makes the most of its location, while respecting the interests of the client, the users, and the community. A big component of the design includes a community library. The design process required ten years of stakeholder buy-in from wide ranging interests such as the San Francisco political community, historic preservationists, and educators.



blinkLAB architecture Local Associate Architect

June A. Grant, RA, NOMA, is a visionary architect, Founder and Design Principal at blinkLAB architecture; a boutique research-based architecture and urban design studio that re-thinks conventional approaches. Launched in 2015, blinkLAB was created based on Ms. Grant's 20 years experience in architecture, design and urban regeneration of cities and communities. Her design approach rests on an avid belief in cultural empathy, data research and new technologies as integral to design futures and design solutions. blinkLAB has three mandates - A commitment to Design Exploration, Advocacy for Holistic Solutions and the Integration of Technology as a central component for a regenerative society.

Relevant Experience

Albany (Community) Library, Alameda County Library

Feasibility study for expansion of a 6,000 SF library to 20,000 SF, including selective demolition/rebuild of existing library. Cost estimate assumptions included: slab on grade substructure with spread footings and steel brace frame superstructure, exterior closure, roofing & waterproofing, interior finishes, lighting, fire protection systems, casework, and raised flooring system. Role: Subconsultant to Group4 Architecture.





Centerville (Community) Library , Alameda County Library

Feasibility study for construction of new one-story, LEED Silver, 26,000 SF library. Cost estimate assumptions included: slab on grade substructure with spread footings and steel brace frame superstructure, exterior closure, roofing & waterproofing, interior finishes, purple-pipe ready, lighting, fire protection systems, casework, raised flooring system and demolition of existing 6,000 SF building and parking. LEED Gold target. Role: Subconsultant to Group4 Architecture.

Irvington (Community) Library, Alameda County Library

Feasibility Study for two alternative development options - Construction of new one-story, LEED Silver, 26,000 SF library at new site, and expansion of existing 6,000 SF library to 20,000 SF with selective demolition/renovation. Cost Estimate target for LEED Gold. Role: Subconsultant to Group4 Architecture.





Union City Library, Alameda County Library

Feasibility Study for Construction of New LEED Silver, Two-Story 50,000 SF library, with parking, and landscape. Using Walnut Creek library as precedent, cost estimate assumptions included: slab on grade substructure with spread footings and steel brace frame superstructure, solar roof panels, purple-pipe ready, casework, and raised flooring system. Role: Subconsultant to Group4 Architecture.

Vision Statement





Our Mission

Your Oakland Public Library empowers all people to explore, connect, and grow.

How will the Main Library empower all people to explore, connect and grow?

Our Vision

The Oakland Public Library will be celebrated locally and nationally as an indispensable partner in transforming lives.

How will the Main Library support transforming lives?

Our Values

The Oakland Public Library values:

- Diversity
- · Equity
- Community
- Responsive Service
- Adaptability
- · Empowerment
- Joy

How will the Main Library express the Library's Core Values?



Equity Goals



Goal I: OPL operationalizes racial equity

Main themes:

- · Changes in structure, culture and transparency at OPL
- · Ongoing training and learning opportunities
- · Strategies for addressing racial incidents
- · Engagement with the community



RE

How can the Main Library better support building the right culture and transparency?

How can the Main Library support restorative justice and explore new ways to secure the facility?

staff Enhanced Recruitment Strategies Transparent Career Process Understanding Civil Service Positions

- & interests of BIPOC communities
 - · Racial Equity Lens applied to all programming decisions
 - · Enhanced community engagement
- Increased opportunities for BIPOC community members & organizations

How can the Main Library provide support (space, capabilities) for community organizations and engagement?

How can a new Collection Management process work in concert with changes to the facility and operating model?

How can the Main Library become an asset to attract and retain a diverse and representative workforce?

Updating Library Job Class Specifications

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY



- Improved Workplace Culture for BIPOC
 - Representing Oakland's Diversity

21ª

NEW Goal V:

Collections offered by OPL will be developed, managed, and assessed using a racial equity lens



24

Goal II:

and are

Patrons feel



Design thinking is a human-centered approach to innovation that draws from the designer's toolkit to integrate the needs of people, the possibilities of technology, and the requirements for business success.



IDEO

ie intersection where design thinking lives IDEO

OAKLAND

Divergent and Convergent Thinking



Not always a linear pathway; developing multiple perspectives and viewpoints aid the process



Double Diamond - Problem and Solution Space



OP OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Double Diamond Process - Mapped to Project Schedule

Finding the right questions

Finding the right solutions



OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Finding the Right Questions



Review Examples of many approaches to stimulate our collective curiosity and widen our shared perspective of what's possible



Project Goals and Measuring Success Use Existing Data as Baseline



FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 BY THE NUMBERS

The Oakland Public Library (OPL) has **continued to offer programs and services** during an incredibly challenging year. Our 2020 Oakland Youth Poet Laureate, Greer Nakadegawa-Lee, was part of more than 25 virtual performances. OPL's tenth Oakland Youth Poet Laureate, Myra Estrada, was announced in a live virtual event in June 2021. Our 2020 Summer Program shifted to being **entirely virtual**, with programming, video content, and prizes for adults, teens, and children.

Throughout the year, OPL **continued to host** virtual history talks, a travel series, and several book clubs and ESL conversation clubs. Patrons met with lawyers and the Oakland Tenants Union through the library and were offered talks from East Bay Parks, all without leaving their homes. OPL's partnership with MOCHA continued, allowing us to send children home with craft supplies during sidewalk service, and we offered video storytime content for the youngest children of Oakland.

OPL STAFF:

Placed RFID tags on 1,102,516 circulating items at 17 locations to prepare for self-service checkout

Welcomed 13,728 new patrons

Shared **382** pieces of recorded content, including storytimes, lectures, panel discussions, and performances

OPL PATRONS BORROWED:

616,510 physical items (books, DVDs, CDs, etc) 261,000+ ebooks 86,000+ digital magazines 70,100+ digital audiobooks 65,293 streaming movies





Project Goals and Measuring Success Compare to Peer Institutions and Best Practices



Public Library Survey Data





OAKLAND NA PUBLIC LIBRARY

Project Goals and Measuring Success Compare to Peer Institutions and Best Practices

American Library Association Libraries of the Future Trends



Project Goals and Measuring Success Define How to Measure Success

Align Goals with Oakland Equitable Climate Action Plan



building for a carbon positive future



Examples from other Library Systems



Community representation in design

Formal Representation and Materials

• Form and plan of the Calgary Central Library allude to elements inherent to the First Nation Peoples cultural context. The overall geometry is said to be inspired by the Chinook arch, (cloud formations unique to Calgary). In plan, the central atrium takes the shape of a canoe and is lined almost entirely with hemlock wood slats.



Calgary Central Library; Calgary, Canada

Collaborative/Participatory Process

- Patrons are invited to engage not only in the vision of the new space, but the design itself.
- At the Sunset Park branch of the Brooklyn Public Library, a local youth empowerment program shaped the functional art installation that adorns the library's windows. The team and students created their own shading device and incorporated several meaningful themes.



OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

Brooklyn Public Library, Sunset Park; Brooklyn, NY

Community-specific engagement programs at libraries

An alwaus-chanaina 9×13 space designed both for and by community members



Oak Park Public Library; Oak Park, IL

Sound booths fostering creativity and self-confidence



🔅 cpl.org

The Sound of Music: A Teen Explores New Instruments at South Branch

Teen Joswen Colon uses South Branch's sound booth to learn new instruments, produce music, and make his parents

Cleveland Public Library South Branch; Cleveland, OH

Teen-driven library programming



Making Dreams Come True: From Israel to Cleveland, How Teens

Changed E.131 Branch

On a January afternoon at Cleveland

Public Library's East 131st St. Branch, three teenagers show off the clothing

and accessories they crafted from recycled materials. Amari Fountain, 15, dons a plastic poncho trimmed with newspaper comics while Brittan...

🔅 cpl.org

Library

Corlett Volunteens at E. 131st St. Branch. Cleveland Public Library: Cleveland, OH

WITHIN THE LIBRARY

2019 Literary Lot



Literary Lots; Cleveland, OH

OUTSIDE H LIBRARY

"Check out" a plot of land at the public library



Library Farm What is the Library Farm? The Library Farm is an organic, educational, community garden located on the grounds of the Northern Onondaga Public Library in Cicero, NY.

Northern Onondaga Public Library; Cicero, NY

Transforming vacant lots into scenes from children's books



Community-specific engagement programs at libraries

nác'a?mat ct Strathcona Library / YWCA Cause We Care House; Vancouver, BC, Canada

• Collocated programs: Vancouver Public Library branch library, inclusive gathering space, and affordable housing for single mothers and their children.





nə́c'a?mat ct Strathcona Library / YWCA Cause We Care House; Vancouver, BC, Canada (Dialog Design)



Community-specific engagement programs at libraries

MD Explorations Commons at Carroll County Public Library; Westminster, MD (near Baltimore)

• Gutted a basement, providing meeting space (4 rooms of various sizes), maker lab, demonstration kitchen.







MD Explorations Commons at Carroll County Public Library; Westminster, MD (MW Studios)



Meeting space / flexible space precedents

- Increasingly, patrons are seeking common space to facilitate meetings outside the home and workplace.
- Provide a variety of meeting space sizes to accommodate a range of groups and convenings. From individual Zoom meetings to larger convenings.
- Maximize technological compatibility and ease.
- Consider hours of community use and access (for some spaces, may extend beyond regular library hours).
- Consider room scheduling (should be easily bookable on short notice).



Calgary Central Library, Calgary, Canada



Outdoor library spaces: within library footprint

Austin Public Library (Main); Austin, TX

- Rooftop reading deck: capitalizing on Ausitn climate and culture of outdoor living/recreation. Careful to provide ample shading.
- Screened reading porches.







LIF www.lakeflato.com

Austin Central Library

Overlooking Shoal Creek and Lady Bird Lake, the LED Platinum Austin Central Library is a building shaped by light and designed to respond to the context of its place. Aspiring to be the most day-lit public library in the nation, the heart of the buildi...



Outdoor library spaces: outside / at grade

Eastman Reading Garden, Cleveland Public Library (Main); Cleveland, OH

- "Today: the garden remains a popular spot for reading, relaxing, lunching, birding and people-watching. Garden has wireless internet access." (per CPL website)
- Located between the two buildings that comprise the Main Cleveland Public library
- Formerly a city park, open to public (gated access)
- Public art collection (sculpture, rotating interactive pieces, and site works, including an installation by Maya Lin)



Reading a Garden by Maya Lin and Tan Lin (photo: OLIN)



Outdoor library spaces: sites for action



Grand Army Plaza, near Brooklyn Public Library (photo: Center for Brooklyn History)



Protest (2017); Olalekan 'LEk' Jeyifous. Initially installed at Cleveland's Public Square as a temporary public artwork, the installation series was orginally created as part of <u>LANDFORM</u> and is now permanently installed outside of the <u>Cleveland Public Library Langston Hughes Branch</u>.



Community-specific engagement programs at libraries

Corlett Volunteens at East 131st Street Branch; Cleveland, OH

- Pilot program based at the branch library giving teenagers agency to design and facilitate library programs, assist patrons, and research and write grants for programs.
- Specialized leadership roles for teens; for example, "Coordinator and Grant Writer", "Performing Arts & Walking Club Supervisor", "Technology and Podcasts Supervisor", "Culinary Arts & Garden Club Supervisor."
- Garden Club, which began in response to vandalism at public plantings in the area, has grown beyond its original goal of investing teens in the local green spaces. Teens help to maintain gardens, train community members on rainwater harvesting, and are learning about composting.

Puppet Parade at E. 131st St. Branch Library (Cleveland Public Library)



Corlett Volunteens William Sweeney, 15, and Brittani Morman, 13 (Cleveland Public Library)



Richland, SC - Artist / Entrepreneur / Writer in Residence

Library Residents

Home? Ubrary Residents







Artist-in-Residence:

Richland Library's Artist-in-Residence Program aims to connect the community with local working artists and to provide creative and educational opportunities to the community in a way that supports cultural and artistic exchange.

Created in 2015, the realdency program gives artists, performers and makers of all types and disciplines the ability to work freely in their own studio space, share their works and artistic process with the community and provide learning opportunities and programs for library customers.

BECOME AN ARTIST-IN-RESIDENCE +

Current Resident:



Terrance Henderson (he/him) Performing artist, choreographer and director July - December 2022

Office Hours: 11 a.m. - 1 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays Richland Library Main

FIND A PROGRAM

Terrance Henderson is an International award-winning performing artist, choreographer, director, writer, teacher and Equity Advisor based here in Columbia. South Carolina. He has been a driving force in the theater and dance communities of South Carolina for many years,

raising the bar on achievements in dance, theater, and choreography and forging important conversations through his work.

Entrepreneur-in-Residence:

The library's Entrepreneur-In-Residence supports, mentors, and educates new entrepreneurs and budding start-ups through office hours and public programs-building an ecosystem that sustains the development and growth of future entrepreneurs in the region. The program also aims to connect entrepreneurs with peers who have successfully designed, launched and run a new business venture.

Current Resident:



Starlitt Miller October 2022 - January 2023 Meet with Starlitt | Find An Event

Starktit is a sarial entrepreneur that has taken unconventional (not to typicel) pathways through education, building business, and other pursuits in her life. She is a big believer in all of what you do starts with you and that includes starting, developing, and scoling your business ventures.

Starlitt's corporate and educational background is in business operations, accounting, workflow strategy, leveraging technology for operations, and the performing arts. Her present mission is to

empower the average non-accountant decision-maker with their own financial data so that they can grow their businesses strategically and is doing so through her service-based company <u>SAABS</u> and tech start-up <u>Transity Tools, Inc.</u>

During her residency, she'll share her expertise with entrepreneurs and small business owners through an array of free programs and one-on-one coaching sessions.



Writer-in-Residence:

Noted children's author, Dinah Johnson, served as the library's first Writer-in-Residence from September 2015 - November 2016.

The South Carolina native held weekly office hours at Richland Ubrary Main-Interacting with aspiring authors of all ages. Known for her poetic stories, including Black Margic, Johnson gathered inspiration from her surroundings during her residency; and applied it to numerous projects:



Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study Next Steps - Staff Survey!

Open 10/28/2022 - 11/7/2022 - See newsletter for Survey Monkey link!

OPL Staff Survey: information gathering for Main and Hoover feasibility studies

We are in the early information-gathering phases of feasibility study to create a vision for a new Hoover Branch Library and a renewed Main Library and welcome input here from staff across the system. The next phase will include in-depth community engagement meetings across the community.

* 1. Which OPL Facility do you currently spend the most time in?

() Main

O African American Museum and Library at Oakland

🔿 81st Avenue Branch

O Asian Branch

O Brookfield Branch

🔿 César Chávez Branch

O Dimond Branch

O Eastmont Branch

O Elmhurst Branch

O Golden Gate Branch

O Lakeview Branch

O Martin Luther King, Jr. Branch

O Melrose Branch

O Montelair Branch

O Piedmont Avenue Branch

O Temescal Branch

O Rockridge Branch

O West Oakland Branch

2. What three words best describe the vibe of your library?

3. Does your library feel integrated into the community? If so, in which way(s)? If not, why do you think this is?

4. What programs/activities would you like to offer to your community (even if you are currently unable)? These can be new or expanded programs/activities.



5. What programs/activities does the community ask for (even if you are currently unable to offer them)?





7. Who in your community would you like the library to try to better reach or serve?

8. Who in your community should be invited for input in the visioning of the Main Library?

9. What is one wish you have for a renewed Main Library?

10. What is one wish you have for the OPL in the future?

Schedule Recap and Today's Agenda

Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study							2022										2023																				
Revised Project Schedule 11/8/2022						Sep Oct Nov						Dec			Jan Feb				Mar				A	Apr May					Jun Jul								
			v	Veek of Veek #	- 09/12/2022	w 09/26/2022	4 10/03/2022	on 10/10/2022	√ 10/24/2022	ω 10/31/2022	8 11/14/2022	± 11/21/2022	11/28/2022 13 19/05/2022	2202/21/21 4	ti 12/19/2022	01/02/2023	哉 01/09/2023	G 01/16/2023	N 01/30/2023	N 02/06/2023	2202/02/20 24	202/22/2023 22/22/2023	6 03/13/2023	8 03/20/2023	6 03/27/2023 8 04/03/2023	년 04/10/2023	5 04/17/2023 5	<pre>% 04/24/2023 % 05/01/2023</pre>	2202/80/90	6 05/15/2023	g 05/29/2023	g 06/05/2023	5 06/19/2023 106/19/2023	5 06/26/2023 5 06/26/2023	t 07/03/2023 t 07/10/2023	2202/11/20 45	\$ 07/24/2023
<u>Task / Lane</u>	<u>Start</u>	End	Duratio	n (Wee	eks)																																
PMT Meetings Main Library Team Workshops Advisory Committee Meetings CE Events: Workshops (4 total) Youth Workshops (4 total) Storytelling Workshop (1) Public Outreach Events (Outdoor) - Newsletters (Monthly) Phase 1: Gather Phase 2: Explore	~ Every 4 week Street Lab 9/15/2022 1/2/2023	12/23/2022 4/28/2023	15 5 5 1 6 8 14 17	wks	Kickoff Mtgs X	PN	PM	W1	Phase	1: Gat	M V2		W3	PM W4	AC	SL NL		PM CV YV SL	V V NL	CW YW SL	M AC SW	NL 2: Expl	PM W SL			SL	CW YW	AC N	L		PM NL			PM	VL.	AC	M
Phase 3: Develop	5/1/2023 7/28/2023 13 wks																Phase 3: Develop																				
	Work	Workshop 2: (Nov 10th) • Best Practice and Ops Review • (Lunch) • Visioning Round 2 (May combine Workshop 2 with Programming Sessions)							s Is)	 Workshop 3: (December 1st) New Programs and Services Review Public and Children's Space Work Session Review Programming Interview Results Ops Goals and Recommendations 								ts	 Workshop 4: (Dec 15th) Proposed Vision Statement Preliminary Proposed Program Present Preliminary Existing Conditions and Historic Findings Environmental And Climate Goals (Round 2) 																		

CE Review (part of Workshop 1)

Best Practice and Operations Review





Best Practice and Operations Review



best prac-tice

noun

plural noun: best practices

commercial or professional procedures that are accepted or prescribed as being correct or most effective.

"the proprietors are keen to ensure best practice in food preparation, storage, and serving"



Maybe better questions:

What are examples of practices that are shown to lead to predictable results?

Which of those results align with the results that we want to achieve?

https://thinksem.com/blog/online-marketing-best-practices-and-why-they-matter/


Best Practice and Operations Review



Library Operations: How do we manage the Resources of the organization?





Best Practice and Operations Review



Library Operations: How do we manage the Resources of the organization?

Align Operations with the VISION!





Best Practice and Operations Review



Library Operations: How do we manage the Resources of the organization?

Align Operations with the VISION!

Benchmark against comparable institutions data



Best Practice and Operations Review

Public Library Survey Data

Public Libraries in the US by Locale



Library Name						
OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	City (11)	Municipal Government (city, town or village)	433,697	1	17	0
HIGH PLAINS LIBRARY DISTRICT	City (12)	Library District	302,022	0	14	2
JOHNSON COUNTY LIBRARY	City (12)	County/Parish	461,856	1	14	0
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH LIBRARY	City (12)	County/Parish	439,729	1	13	3
JEFFERSON PARISH LIBRARY	City (12)	County/Parish	432,346	1	15	0
NEW ORLEANS PUBLIC LIBRARY	City (11)	City/County	389,476	1	14	0
CITY OF ST. LOUIS MUNICIPAL LIBRARY DISTRICT	City (11)	Library District	319,294	1	16	3
AKRON-SUMMIT CNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	City (12)	County/Parish	377,588	1	18	3
CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	City (11)	School District	398,453	1	27	1
DAYTON METRO LIBRARY	City (12)	County/Parish	458,677	1	20	2
TOLEDO-LUCAS COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	City (11)	County/Parish	441,815	1	19	1
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH	City (11)	Non-profit Association or Agency	399,948	1	18	0
CHARLESTON COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	City (12)	County/Parish	350,209	1	16	1
FORT VANCOUVER REGIONAL LIBRARY DISTRICT	City (12)	Library District	516,815	0	15	2
TIMBERLAND REGIONAL LIBRARY	City (13)	Library District	522,675	0	27	0

https://www.imls.gov/search-compare



Best Practice and Operations Review



DATA SUMMARY (STAFF)



Best Practice and Operations Review



OR OAKLAND



DATA SUMMARY (COLLECTION)

Best Practice and Operations Review



OAKLAND **PUBLIC LIBRARY**



DATA SUMMARY (SPACE)

• Staff Expendences (5) • Total Collection Expendences (5) • Obios Operating Expendences (5)

Best Practice and Operations Review







Best Practice and Operations Review

Space Breakdown - Compairison

Oakland Main Library



Calgary Library



Hayward Main Library













Best Practice and Operations Review

Oakland Main Library



Calgary Library



Hayward Main Library







Collection Related Space: 22% + 14% + 13% + 6% = 55% of space

OR OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY



Collection Related Space: 30%+12%+3% = 50% of space



Collection Related Space: 34%+10%+3% = 47% of space

What is the right size and makeup of the collection? What needs to happen to achieve the appropriate size and makeup? How should patrons interact with the collection?

- Find items
- Retrieve and check out items
- Return items

How should staff manage the collection? How should materials move through the Library? Where should Technical Services activities take place?



Best Practice and Operations Review

LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION





Best Practice and Operations Review

SWOT Analysis:

Strengths / Weaknesses (Internal) Opportunities / Threats Challenges (External) (SWOC?)

A way to look at a topic from multiple view points, and identify areas where change can happen effectively

STRENGTHS	INTERNAL	WEAKNESSES
S		W
0		С
OPPORTUNITIES		CHALLENGES



Best Practice and Operations Review

SWOT	Helpful	Harmful
Internal	 Strengths Our workers are well-educated students who love books The space is attractive and inviting Long-term lease is at low rate Customers are supportive of small bookstores Popular café makes it easy for customers to linger and find something to buy 	 Weaknesses Space is tight Bank gave us a limited line of credit Health insurance costs are rising Business is slower during summer vacation Inventory system needs to be upgraded High staff turnover due to students graduating
External	 Opportunities We can have local authors give lectures and book signings We can make personalized recommendations to long-term customers We can deliver the same-day to mobility-impaired customers We can feature things that appeal to summer tourists We can start a frequent buyer program 	 Threats Large chains have more buying power E-books and e-book readers eliminate need for physical books Younger generations don't read as much Nearby public library reopened after 2-year remodel

What Does a SWOT Analysis Look Like?

We thought it would be helpful to show you a sample SWOT analysis for a business you can easily visualize: a small independent bookstore in a university town. The store owner brought the team together to think about how the bookstore could survive during the continuing financial downturn. After an hour of brainstorming, this is the SWOT analysis they developed.

https://cdlib.org/cdlinfo/2010/09/29/an-easy-way-tojumpstart-your-strategic-plan-swot/



Best Practice and Operations Review



Best Practice and Operations Review

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY



COLLECTION MANAGEMENT

I IFF CYCLF OF THF COLL FCT - may need to diversify the sources of ACOUISITION

EQUITY GOALS - WHAT DOES - non-English or other materials

NEW Goal V:

Collections offered by OPL will be developed, managed, and assessed using a racial equity lens

Did some audit on African American books - complicated

More popular the collection, the less it's visible (because it's

Challenges with what exists in the publishing world - supply challenge

More area for dynamic display -> share collections that we are trying to develop ? Fewer total linear feet -> if collection was more

responsive, more circulation

- Figure out what the community wants; (not just representative) - need to find ways to let the community impact selection - more multi-copy vs. single copy - "dynamic display" - make books more visible - think more retail

- how long does it take to add

copies? Assess every week.

- Mostly focussed on selection process - don't have great doc and training on policy (yet) - goal of a responsive collection - most streamlined acquisition = with major vendors material (more manual processes required) - push / pull on how this affects intake process now most ordering goes through ILS; manages the process smoothly require more manual effort - de-centralized system; purchasing happens in each branch for each branch - minimal oversight - how to allocate resources - were based on circulation, but that may not be equitable?

- "Share the Love" collection; take out to the community without cataloging (Budgeted as part of collections, but not really)

 trying to not be tied to circulation stats -> try to distribute books outside of the brick and mortar locations

- 3rd grade reading levels are key to other metrics of community success: trying to provide reading materials to increase number of books in the home - now fine free; but was even more

important when fines were still an issue

- relates to storage and receiving and loading -> requires a separate process

-> get big batches at once

- "special" materials -> make the process less efficient

- direct purchases also take longer because they aren't pre-entered in the ILS

Best Practice and Operations Review



LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION: ACQUISITION OF NEW MATERIALS

SPACE AND STAFF REQUIREMENTS



COLLECTION MANAGEMENT



Best Practice and Operations Review

PUBLIC LIBRARY



LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION: ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING

SPACE AND STAFF REQUIREMENTS



Best Practice and Operations Review



LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION: ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING

PHYSICAL PROCESSING - OFFSITE?



Best Practice and Operations Review



Cleveland Public Library Facilities Master Plan Rockaway Branch and Distribution Hub

LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION: ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING

PHYSICAL PROCESSING - OFFSITE CLEVELAND BRANCH OFFSITE PRECEDENT

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

Branch Recommendations

MAJOR RENOVATION WITH NEW DISTRIBUTION HUB

CURRENT STATE This branch and support facilities do not take advinates of the wisibility and access efforted by its location on a nearly trafficked road near the city certer. The large complex is formed by the nonescript locary building that affects tiltle vulsibility from the street. The branch is well used in split of being surrounded by develct properties without drate unmits institution in the area. There is opportunity to expand the siltle with a large number of adjacent lindback or otherwise works properties.

FUTURE VISION It is recommended that the Woodind site be expended to encomparis the summating vicant properties and be used as a new central distribution and service hub for the thrany system. This would include hubding a new strange and distribution facility and updating maintenance facilities as wells a major reposition of the existing branch library. The Brany renovation would include significant exterior work in proposition from an elevator. This project would support the basement with the addition of an elevator. This project would support the attributes and provide a highly visible preview for the base.



POTENTIAL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT DIAGRAM





Best Practice and Operations Review

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

- try not to have a backlog of things leaving the collection - each selector has a small cart of things they are reviewing (hopefully not more)



WHEN / WHY DO THIN - Main has a storage collection; last copies, etc. deep periodicals collection (in the stacks) **COLLECTION?**

of collection may not include periodicals and other "storage" items





COLLECTION MANAGEMENT

https://www.ifla.org/past-wlic/2010/135-urness-en.pdf

Best Practice and Operations Review

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY % of storage vs. circulating collection - data?

- how much storage items are in storage but not in the catalog? (Not very visible?)

- periodicals are bound and then stored

- use vs. research?

LIFE CYCLE OF THE

SPECIAL CASES:

PERIODICALS

DIGITIZING YOUR

COLLECTION

DESELECTION / ENC. Main's periodical room has more subscriptions than could be feasible for a branch; have lots of back issues, etc.

- could archive?
- No use data because it doesn't circulate (now)
- People use it as a study space or retreat
- Also serves as deep reference tasks important service

3 things going on:

1) Physical space; reading room (not attached to the periodicals specifically)

- 2) Staff; support the deep research tasks
 - need access to microfiche
- 3) Linear foot of back issues

- could be more distant, maybe offsite (but less convienent)

Remove things when some other institution in the Bay Area has it

Don't have a good sense of what's in high demand or unique

Gov Docs -> Largest portion on non-cataloged materials

Federal Repository (now) but trying to remove

Gov Docs 1.5 floors of stacks Periodicals are 3

Periodicals and Gov Docs -Should be smaller than now,

COLLECTION MANAGEMENT

https://www.ala.org/pla/resources/tools/circulation-technical-services/digital-collections https://www.ala.org/aboutala/sites/ala.org.aboutala/files/content/oitp/publications/oitpperspectives/oitp_perspectives_ju.pdf



Best Practice and Operations Review

Handful of vendors, have changed over time

Now use a vendor who sells re-useable books online -> Better World books

For rare items, will re-sell through the Friends book store (mostly donated items)

LIFE CYCLE OF Rare items are treated one by one via donation to another institution or with dealers or auction houses

DESELECTION / One level of stacks that circulate but low circulation A level stack -> would be circulating in other libraries (might be small "rare" collection remaining

DONATION / RE^B was public and is still mostly public (Fiction)

F Archive

Rest is Periodicals and Gov Docs





COLLECTION MANAGEMENT

https://www.ifla.org/past-wlic/2010/135-urness-en.pdf

Best Practice and Operations Review

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

STRENGTHS	S: Everything (except stacks) was RFID tags and weeded (Circulating collection is in pretty good shape) (partially because of lack of space) Decentralized selection (variety, diverse viewpoints, better community connection) Original Cataloger -> can create new catalog records if needed Catalog has strong internal vocabulary Main Collection team is used to working with minimal space; Childrens (example) is used to being creative in tight space IMPRESSIVLY SCRAPY!	ER	W: Adult non-Fiction may be bloated Decentralized selection (can duplicate purchasing unintentionally, more administrative load) Don't yet have an analysis of periodical collection in use and sq ft Don't circulate everything we want because of lack of space / storage	WEAKNESSES
OPPORTUNIT	O: Find ways to make more of collection visible to public More dynamic display of items More flexibility in space / building would allow for adjustin to future changes - process and infrastructure Have deep physical collection that can be shared Building / Site / Location have great potential	g	C: Limitations of existing space and storage - decentralized (existing Main) - Unknowns about pace of digitization of periodicals and oth materials E-book and Audio adoption rate / trends (Now have to buy a lot of book / e-book and audio format of same title) Distrust of vendor led market place Some physical archiving always	er of HALLENGES
			Challenges of existing facility (light, heat, sound)	

Lack of connection to exterior / landscape

Best Practice and Operations Review



Best Practice and Operations Review



CIRCULATION



Best Practice and Operations Review

Boston - way finding in the floor

Wayfinding in the shelves themselves (example in children's; shelf hanger signs and face outs)

Austin Public Library Wayfinding and Graphics

- Large Signage on glazed partitions to identify rooms / areas but maintain visibility
- Pendant Signs and Dimensional Signage to orient to materials
- Signage integrated into the exterior envelope









https://segd.org/stacks-and-bike-racks%E2%80%94austin-central-library-wayfinding



Best Practice and Operations Review

LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION: ROLE OF CLOSED STACKS ?





CIRCULATION



Best Practice and Operations Review



Free Library Of Philadelphia Parkway Central Library

- 1926 Era Building with original closed stacks holding 800,000 volumes in Downtown Philadelphia
- Moved 500,000 volumes to new, offsite Climate Controlled Regional Operations Center
- Demolished existing stacks
- Renovated in 2019 to created new public space (Cener for Cultural Engagement, Business Resource Innovation Center and Teen Space)
- Created ~20,000 sf of new public space, changed building from 40% open to public to over 60% open









https://www.safdiearchitects.com/projects/free-library-of-philadelphia https://hiddencityphila.org/2018/02/at-parkway-central-stacks-cleared-to-make-way-for-public-space/ https://hiddencityphila.org/2019/04/public-space-rises-from-the-stacks-at-parkway-central/



Best Practice and Operations Review

LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION:

- FINDING A RESOURCE
- RETRIEVING A RESOURCE
- CHECKOUT

Holds; went up during pandemic Now going down, but so has overall circulation unclear if higher as a % ofcirculation?

E-book and e-resources in general use went up

Hold shelves not as full as they were during pandemic

Foot traffic is down, fewer programs -> may be related





Best Practice and Operations Review

LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION: RETURNING THE RESOURCE

- RETURN
- CHECK-IN TO THE SYSTEM
- TRANSPORT
- SORT / PLACE ON TRUCKS
- RE-SHELVE





Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study Best Practice and Operations Review

LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION: AUTOMATED MATERIAL HANDLING OPTIONS



Space limitations have been a main limitation before

Getting better than they were

Noise, maintenance, faults

Worth the cost for the amount of print materials -> doesn't circulate enough to justify it?

Workflow could be optimized more without the major investment of equipment

(Could re-locate the manual process) (Make the return process easier for public and staff)

Automatically or efficiently by hand

Straight to delivery / shelf

One reason at circulating desk now; doubling up on staffing

If we removed Tech Services; room for an AMH to sort for main / branches in lower level?

Other libraries -> new facility == much more circulation; need to include capacity for higher circulation figures

Publicly visible is valuable / popular

Visibility to service point

Accessible stacks compacted? Probably not? Need to understand safety





Best Practice and Operations Review

LIFE CYCLE OF THE COLLECTION: RETURNING THE RESOURCE - CAR DROP OFF?



Key would be to have a way to have books go from curb or exterior or building directly into building (no cart / ramp / elevator process)



Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study Best Practice and Operations Review





What is the right size and makeup of the collection? What needs to happen to achieve the appropriate size and makeup? How should patrons interact with the collection?

- Find items
- Retrieve and check out items
- Return items

How should staff manage the collection? How should materials move through the Library? Where should Technical Services activities take place?



Visioning Summary




Visioning Summary

Vision Cone Exercise



The Design Thinking Toolbox; Lewrick, Link, Leifer











Visioning Summary

IDENTITY



PAST

///

- Building: Imposing, formal, large.
- Unique Assets: Oakland History Room.

PRESENT

IDENTITY

- Building: see "Past"; plus, being in disrepair.
- Unique Assets: see "Past"; plus core library functions for special audiences (Children's Library and Teen Room).
- Gathering: Where unhoused individuals congregate and/or seek resources.
- Memory occupation: recollections from time spent at Main Library during childhood; a place of first independence.

FUTURE

///

- Building: A flexible space with greater capacity to facilitate gathering across many scales, formats, and times. A place that is well-maintained and wellused(/loved).
- Unique Assets: See "Present".
- Gathering: A place of belonging, refuge, and respect for all. Where individuals can find and foster community. Free.
- "A model of what the City of Oakland can do!"



Visioning Summary

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY



dormant--Main Library could

play a role as a vehicle in this

regard).

• Support literacy communitywide--literacy in multiple formats, not just ability to read.

Visioning Summary



etc).

• Kids and teens.

property research assistance,

more broadly (beyond literacy, academic reference, and general

- Current library staff support users' expanded knowledge ... life goals, housing, job searches, healthcare and legal resources.
- · This is a model of expanded equity of services.
- · Main Library policies promote access without borders (no real requirements to access services) and values privacy (though this isn't always understood).
- · Immediate communities have a reliable user set (school groups in afternoons, seniors, etc).

• Embraced by immediate community: Main Library is

their branch library.

FUTURE

///

· A visible, reliable omnipresence in Oakland civic life.

 Individuals utilize all library services: interactions are rooted in respect, equity, and consideration for individual dignity.

 Greater capacity to support well-loved activities and generate forward-looking programs at the Main Library.



Visioning Summary



Activate outdoor space and create

connections to Main Library.

• A critical question for

community feedback during

community engagement process.

Oakland as a whole (limited parking, not a visible player in

· Limited activation of outdoor

civic life).

spaces.

OP OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY A vision for how people relate to the Library.

A place of belonging

The spot where individuals find and foster community.

A memory-keeper. Not only of cherished materials and Oakland history, but of experiences and lives shaped by the Library. A supportive and vibrant place attracting and retaining a diverse and representative workforce.

A setting for community-led activities that support everyday resilience.



A vision for how the Library serves people.

A gracious host

The Library belongs to the people. Community is the author of these spaces. A champion of all Oakland communities, with visibility in civic space. The Library reaches out to the City--both programmatically and physically.

A mix of environments in and around the Library to facilitate community-informed programs. Nimble, flexible, adaptable, inviting spaces.

A reliable destination during times of both celebration and crisis. A healthy and safe space--societally and environmentally.



A vision for why the Library.

An agent of empowerment

People feel supported and encouraged to discover: seeking solutions, sharing talents, "doing things".

Services are made visible, relevant, and available to all. Interactions are rooted in respect, equity, and consideration for individual dignity. The Library facilitates skill-building and knowledge-sharing for individuals to benefit themselves and their communities.

The Library advances literacy in all forms.

Meeting people where they are - allow them to find their passion

"Used to come as a kid" -> positive associations! Nostalgia

Warm library



Oaka How to integrate Joy? (Discovery and Exploration) Library intrinsic part of your life -> how

Visior Don't have to be empowered every time;

Too fixed -> how to make this an iterative process? Change relationship over. Playground -> ("laboratory" but that's the wrong word)

Open ended inquiry - alone, with strangers, by accident

Nostalgia: people bring different experiences to the Library -> some good, some bad

A vision Some people have no reference for what a library is Some kids come and need to understand what a library is Some come from other Library systems with different norms on what a Main Library should be. (SF)

> Sense of belonging is in contrast to expectations -> if the Library exceeds them, they might feel a sense of belonging

The spo

commu (Youth) A space that invites them to be themselves can be powerful.

A memc different voices! materia

Library staff try to make everyone feel like they belong experier

Library. How to get people in to experience it? - try to get people in -> visibility People use the children's room entrance because it's more open

A suppcand you can get in and out...

and reterransition space important! None now.

workfor Different experiences of belonging - how to capture

A setting for community-led activities that support everyday resilience.

2



A vision for how the Library serves people.

A gracious host

The Library belongs to the people. Community is the author of these spaces.

A mix of environments in and around the Library to facilitate community-informed programs. Nimble, flexible, adaptable, inviting spaces.

A champion of all Oakland communities, with visibility in civic space. The Library reaches out to the City--both programmatically and physically.

A reliable destination during times of both celebration and crisis. A healthy and safe space--societally and environmentally.

Host -> implies ownership; not right language But sub-points are good Give a face to staff in the process; staff as connector

(Children) place to make decisions about activities -> some have it for the first time at the Library (giving them decision making power)

Meeting spaces -> gather and meet Adults seeking help -> non-judgmental help to not be chewed up or patronized

Presentation to the Parks on San Antonio Community Groups -> programmed by community groups; park with no staff for 10 years; they programmed the rec center themselves

Kitchen in the (San Antonio) Library

-> Community having control of the space -> no (less) gatekeepers

"Empowerment" unpack in Oakland -> need

Library as set of tools for community empowerment -> "Library as Toolkit"

Tool Library as example

Learning your own legacy / history

Don't do enough to enable self service -> wayfinding, digital collections accessibility

Grass roots organizational change -> discover common interests or issues in common -> build capacity and organize at the Library

**Staff Assistance (come back)

The Library facilitates skill-building and knowledge-sharing for individuals to benefit themselves and their communities.

Avoid patronizing language; Library as provider Center the Community - agent word is not right -> Community has agency, but "agent" too institutional Use Active words and how they relate to people "Welcome to your Library"

Workshop 3 - Agenda

Workshop 3 - June 14th, 2023 Agenda:

10:00 – 10:45am	Community Engagement Plan Review / Update
10:45 – 11:30am	Review OPL Vision Statement (from Workshop 2, 10/2022), OPL Staff Survey (10/2022) and Programming Interview (5/2023) Staff Feedback
(lunch break)	
1:30 – 2:30pm	Service Metrics, Peer Institution Comparisons and Public Survey Discussion, New Programs and Services
2:30 – 3:30pm	Children's Space Work Session



Workshop 3 - Community Workshops

Preliminary Community Engagement Schedule:







Next Steps:

Oakland Main

1) Confirm Central East Date

· Hills- Participant's Choice

2) Review Community Event Dates and Determine

Central East Oakland- Eastside Arts Alliance

Deep East Oakland- East Oakland Boxing Center

Street Lab Dates

 Deep East Oakland- Arroyo Viejo Recreation Center · Hills- Montclair Village Fruitvale- Fruitvale Transit Village Chinatown- Pacific Renaissance Plaza Brooklyn Basin • Broadway Valdez- Sprouts

Visioning Summary





Visioning Summary

Vision Cone Exercise



The Design Thinking Toolbox; Lewrick, Link, Leifer











Visioning Summary

A vision for how people relate to the Library.

A place of belonging

The spot where individuals find and foster community.

A memory-keeper. Not only of cherished materials and Oakland history, but of experiences and lives shaped by the Library.

A supportive and vibrant place attracting and retaining a diverse and representative workforce.

A setting for community-led activities that support everyday resilience. A vision for how the Library serves people.

A place where people connect

The Library belongs to the people. Community is the author of these spaces.

A mix of environments in and around the Library to facilitate community-informed programs. Nimble, flexible, adaptable, inviting spaces.

A champion of all Oakland communities, with visibility in civic space. The Library reaches out to the City-both programmatically and physically.

A reliable destination during times of both celebration and crisis. A healthy and safe space-societally and environmentally.

Deep Need for Privacy and Space Focus Space (Staff and Public)

A vision for how the Library builds resillience and capacity.

A place to discover create, and learn

People feel supported and encouraged to discover: seeking solutions, sharing talents, "doing things".

Services are made visible, relevant, and available to all. Interactions are rooted in respect, equity, and consideration for individual dignity.

The Library advances literacy in all forms.

The Library facilitates skill-building and knowledge-sharing for individuals to benefit themselves and their communities.



Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study Programming Meeting Review

How does the library/reference staff connect with the space, patrons, and each other?

SPACE

- Need for more flexible spaces for the community and meetings.

- The Children's Room and Teen Zone are not large enough for high impact times or school visits.

- The TeenZone/Teen services lacks separate space, has a confusing layout.

PATRONS

- Staff is frequently intercepted by patrons throughout the building.

EACH OTHER

- Desire for connected staff areas instead of separate spaces.

- Opportunity to consolidate workspaces and reduce duplicity.



What could be done to better serve the public more?

SPACE

- Improve attractiveness and modernity of spaces.
- Enhance way-finding for patrons.
- Reduce built-in furniture.
- Improve accessibility of movable items.
- Ensure accessible bathrooms on all floors.
- Design separate areas for different age groups with appropriate resources.

PROGRAM

- Clarify the meaning of "programming" -> activities for the public.

- Consider adding cafes, vending machines, and stores.

- Create program to host displays and gallery exhibits.

- Include rotating art displays, performance stages, and coffee options



OPL Survey Results

How does your library feel connected to the community?

1. Educational Support:

- Afterschool homework help
- Computer tutoring
- Digital literacy programming
- Language exchange groups
- Early literacy skills for parents and caregivers

2. Social Services and Community Support:

- Support for housing, health, benefits, jobs, and mental health
- Free lunch and hygiene kits
- Community resource groups and mutual aid meetings
- Homelessness and housing services
- Social workers available at the library

3. Arts and Culture:

- Arts programs for adults and children
- Film screenings and author talks
- Crafts and sewing circles
- Music and movement programs
- Celebrations of different cultures

4. Technology and Computer Skills:

- Computer/tech/smartphone assistance
- Computer literacy classes
- Digital literacy clinics
- Access to online resources and applications

5. Community Engagement:

- Festivals and all-day events
- Cross-generational programming
- Meet-your-neighbor activities
- Community discussion forums
- Events for adults to meet and connect

6. Recreational and Leisure Activities:

- Gaming and movie nights
- Play cafes and sports activities
- Chess lessons and poker circles
- Gardening and outdoor play
- DIY and fix-it clinics



MD Explorations Commons at Carroll County Public Library; Westminster, MD (MW Studios)

7. Additional Services and Resources:

- Library of things (tools, instruments, cooking supplies)
- Showers and laundry facilities
- Business center and career assistance
- Expanded storytimes and book clubs
- Resource guides for specific needs (homeless, unemployed)



OPL Survey Results

What kind of spaces would allow you to serve your community better?

1. Outdoor Spaces:

- Community garden

- Covered outdoor space with seating and tables
- Outdoor kids' play space and gardening area

2. Indoor Spaces:

- Study rooms
- Performance spaces and auditoriums
- Meeting rooms and multipurpose community spaces
- Dedicated space for youth events
- Media lab w/ tech support
- Classroom-style learning spaces
- Storage spaces
- Gender-neutral bathrooms
- Spaces for preservation projects and archival collections
- Warm and welcoming spaces with better lighting and furnishings
- Quiet spaces for solitary study
- Indoor playgrounds
- Coffee and cafe areas

Other Suggestions:

- More parking spaces
- Clear external signage
- Playgrounds near the library
- Accessible spaces and renovations
- Expansion of library space on the second floor
- AC/heating for the entire branch



Didgery Control Library, Calgory, Canada



Anative Pachlie Library



OPL Survey Results

Who in your community would you like the library to try to better reach/serve?

- Seniors

- People who are differently abled
- People impacted by incarceration
- Young adults and adults without kids
- Unhoused community members
- Rich and poor Oakland residents
- People of all age groups, including families, seniors, and various generations
- Non-Chinese Asian communities in Oakland
- Marginalized groups such as low-income, illiterate, BIPOC queer and trans individuals, disabled individuals, and neurodivergent individuals
- Individuals who feel the library is not safe
- Non-English speakers, refugees and immigrants
- Families with children/teens, retirees
- Adults, teens, and caregivers at home with babies or preschool children
- Patrons in need of a quiet work space
- Local artists/performers



Workshop 3 - Service Level Analysis

Service Levels Recomendations from 2006 Master Facility Plan





RECOMMENDATION

Summary of Recommended Development Strategies

	YEAR BUILT	2005 BUILDING AREA (SF)	2000 POPULATION SERVED	2000 SF PER CAPITA	PROPOSED 2020 BUILDING AREA (SF)	PROJECTED 2020 POPULATION	2020 SF PER CAPITA
	1902	17,000	Citywide		17,000	Citywide	
	1995	8,500	6,754	1.26	10,500-11,000	10,442	1.01
	1990	4,250	8,601	0.49	7-8,000	9,141	0.77
	2003	15,000	22,732	0.66	15,000	30,095	0.50
	1980	10,000	33,080	0.30	16-19,000	35,142	0.46
	1998	9,500	25,371	0.37	16-19,000	26,799	0.60
	1949	3,220	21,087	0.15	3,220	22,605	0.14
	1918	4,260	22,866	0.19	4,260	29,773	0.14
Jr.	1970	3,800	16,849	0.23	4,200-4,700	17,787	0.25
	1949	3,800	37,920	0.10	5,800-6,300	41,193	0.14
	1916	5,300	39,822	0.13	5,300	41,970	0.13
	1930	3,800	21,112	0.18	3,800	24,386	0.16
	1932	1,700	19,174	0.09	5-10,000	19,966	0.40
	1996	15,200	9,026	1.68	17-18,000	9,598	1.67
	1918	4,260	17,654	0.24	4,260	18,636	0.23
	1977	8,000	15,366	0.52	16-19,000	18,846	0.85
	-	-	12,239		8-12,000	13,542	0.59
	-	-	40,907		16-19,000	43,495	0.37
			16,809	<u></u>	21,500	17,904	1.20
			11,921		8-10,000	13,308	0.60
	-	-	6,345		5-8,000	7,270	0.69
bd	1951	82,000	11,646	0.20	120-160,000	15,888	.2635
		117,590	417.278	0.28	208-238.340	467,784	.455
	13 2				120-160 000		25-35
		117 500	417 279	0.28	328-308 340	467 784	7-95

Population includes Emerville and Piedmont; populations based on library service area.

Population from 2000 U.S. Census; Population Projections from ABAG Projections 2000. *AAMLO total building size is 17,000 sf; 7,000 sf of this is museum.

*Main Library serves both its neighborhood population (11,646) as well as the citywide population (417,278).

Oakland Public Library Master Facilities Plan - Recommendations

35

Workshop 3 - Service Level Analysis

Service Levels Recomendations from 2006 Master Facility Plan

	2000 Service Level	Proposed Guidelines	Proposed 2020 Service Levels
Population	417,278 people		467,000 people
Collection	1,030,600 vol. 2.4 vol./capita	3 vol./capita	1,400,000- 1,550,000 vol.
Seating	913 seats 2.1 seats/1000 pop	3-4 seats/1000 pop	1,400- 1,900 seats
Computers	169 comp. .4 comp/1000 pop	1.5-1.7comp/1000pop	700-825 comp.
Storytelling	~ 150 seats 34 seats/1000 pop	25-40 seats/facility	245-350 seats
Community Rm	567 seats 2 seats/1000 pop	3-4 seats/1000 pop	1,500-1,775 seats
Group Work	0 seats	0-18 seats/branches 30-40 seat at main	130-215 seats
Library Space	170,740 sf .38 sf/capita	.79 sf/capita	325,000- 420,000 sf

Actual Numbers for Oakland from PLS 2020 data:

Population: 433,697		Less Growth than projected
Collection: 1,042,565 Physical 1,003,551 Digital	2.40 Physical Items / p 4.72 Physical + Digital Items / p	What's appropriate now including digital circulation?
Seating: ?	How can we determine these counts?	What's appropriate for modern service provision wth BYOD?
Computers: 284	0.65 comp / 1000 p	What's appropriate for modern service provision wth BYOD?
Storytelling: ?	How can we determine these counts?	What's appropriate for modern service provision wth BYOD?
Community Room Seats: ?	How can we determine these counts?	What's appropriate for modern service provision wth BYOD?
Group Work Seats: ?	How can we determine these counts?	What's appropriate for modern service provision wth BYOD?
(Total) Library Space: 195,650 sf	0.45 sf / p	



Workshop 3 - Service Level Analysis

Service Levels Recomendations from other States

(California has no State Standards)

State	Virginia (2019) https://www.lva.virginia.gov/lib- edu/ldnd/standards/PFLE.pdf	Texas (2014) https://www.tsl.texas.gov/sites/default/ files/public/tslac/plstandards/ 2014%20TLA_Standards_Final.pdf	North Carolina (2021) https://statelibrary.ncdcr.gov/north- carolina-public-library-standards/ download?attachment	Kentucky (2017) http://kpla.org/wp-content/uploads/ 2019/10/Standards-6th-edition-2016-2017- final.pdf	Oregon (2021) https://www.olaweb.org/assets/PLD/ PLDStandards/PLD-Standards- 2021update-FINAL-071921.pdf					
Collection Size	No Numeric Standard	Collection size per capita: 1.53 items per capita - 1.64 items per capita	No Numeric Standard	Essential:Spend \$2.25 per capita for collection expenditures. Enhanced: Spend \$4.50 per capita for collection expenditures. Exemplary: Spend at least \$6.75 per capita for collection materials.	No Numeric Standard					
Library Space	* = 0.6 sf /p ** = 0.7 sf /p *** = 1.0 sf /p	No Numeric Standard	Essential 0.6 square feet / p Enhanced 0.65 square feet / p Exemplary 0.7 square feet / p	Essential 0.6 square feet / p Enhanced 0.8 square feet / p Exemplary 1.0 square feet / p	No Standard, but Mean for population over 100,000 is identified at 0.53 sf / p					
Computers	No Numeric Standard	1 working computer for public use per 1,500 population served	Essential 25 PACs per 25,000 Enhanced 37.5 PACs per 25,000 Exemplary 50 PACs per 25,000	No Numeric Standard	No Numeric Standards, but policy suggestions based on Urban Libraries Council Library Edge					





Workshop 3 - Service Level Analysis

Peer Institutions from the Public Library Survey Data:

Library System Name	City	State	Population	County	County Population	Branches	Population / Branch	Central Library Name	Sq Ft
HAYWARD PUBLIC LIBRARY	HAYWARD	CA	160,311	ALAMEDA	1,662,323	1	80,156	HAYWARD PUBLIC LIBRARY	58,000
EUGENE PUBLIC LIBRARY	EUGENE	OR	171,210	LANE	382,986	2	57,070	EUGENE PUBLIC LIBRARY	93,041
BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC LIBRARY	BIRMINGHAM	AL	209,880	JEFFERSON	655,342	18	11,046	BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC - CENTRAL BRANCH	229,800
ROCHESTER PUBLIC LIBRARY	ROCHESTER	NY	210,565	MONROE	740,900	10	19,142	ROCHESTER PUBLIC LIBRARY	330,000
KANSAS CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY	KANSAS CITY	MO	218,765	JACKSON	705,925	9	21,877	CENTRAL LIBRARY	175,000
JACKSON COUNTY LIBRARY SERVICES	MEDFORD	OR	221,290	JACKSON	221,844	14	14,753	JACKSON COUNTY LIBRARY SERVICES	83,191
CAPITAL AREA DISTRICT LIBRARY	LANSING	MI	238,859	INGHAM	290,609	12	18,374	CAPITAL AREA DISTRICT LIBRARY	75,000
NORFOLK PUBLIC LIBRARY	NORFOLK	VA	246,256	NORFOLK	242,803	11	20,521	SLOVER LIBRARY	135,000
JERSEY CITY FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY	JERSEY CITY	NJ	247,597	HUDSON	671,666	9	24,760	JERSEY CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY	87,118
VENTURA COUNTY LIBRARY	VENTURA	CA	248,007	VENTURA	841,387	13	17,715	E. P. FOSTER LIBRARY	33,000
SPRINGFIELD-GREENE COUNTY LIBRARY DISTRICT	SPRINGFIELD	MO	275,174	GREENE	294,997	9	27,517	THE LIBRARY CENTER	83,000
SAINT PAUL PUBLIC LIBRARY	SAINT PAUL	MN	315,925	RAMSEY	547,903	12	24,302	ST. PAUL PUBLIC LIBRARY - CENTRAL	90,353
CITY OF ST. LOUIS MUNICIPAL LIBRARY DISTRICT	ST. LOUIS	MO	319,294	ST. LOUIS CITY	297,645	16	18,782	CENTRAL LIBRARY	190,870
ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	FORT WAYNE	IN	355,329	ALLEN	382,187	13	25,381	ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	367,000
NEW ORLEANS PUBLIC LIBRARY	NEW ORLEANS	LA	389,476	ORLEANS	389,476	14	25,965	NEW ORLEANS PUBLIC LIBRARY	146,902
CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	CLEVELAND	ОН	398,453	CUYAHOGA	1,227,883	27	14,230	CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	529,204
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH	PITTSBURGH	PA	399,948	ALLEGHENY	1,211,358	18	21,050	CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH	148,845
OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	OAKLAND	CA	433,697	ALAMEDA	1,662,323	17	24,094	OAKLAND MAIN LIBRARY	82,000
VIRGINIA BEACH PUBLIC LIBRARY	VIRGINIA BEACH	VA	454,448	VIRGINIA BEACH	451,231	9	45,445	CENTRAL LIBRARY	95,000
DAYTON METRO LIBRARY	DAYTON	ОН	458,677	MONTGOMERY	531,610	20	21,842	DAYTON METRO LIBRARY	227,425
LONG BEACH PUBLIC LIBRARY	LONG BEACH	CA	472,217	LOS ANGELES	9,943,046	11	39,351	BILLIE JEAN KING MAIN LIBRARY	94,650
SONOMA COUNTY LIBRARY	ROHNERT PARK	CA	492,980	SONOMA	489,819	14	32,865	CENTRAL LIBRARY	61,800
OMAHA PUBLIC LIBRARY	OMAHA	NE	554,594	DOUGLAS	574,332	11	46,216	W DALE CLARK LIBRARY	122,490
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC LIBRARY	MILWAUKEE	WI	587,369	MILWAUKEE	945,016	12	45,182	MILWAUKEE PUBLIC LIBRARY	457,919
ENOCH PRATT FREE LIBRARY	BALTIMORE	MD	611,648	BALTIMORE CITY	586,131	21	27,802	ENOCH PRATT CENTRAL	349,713
ALBUQUERQUE/BERNALILLO COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	ALBUQUERQUE	NM	662,564	BERNALILLO	681,666	17	36,809	ALBUQUERQUE/BERNALILLO COUNTY MAIN LIBRARY	119,050
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC LIBRARY	WASHINGTON	DC	689,545	DIST OF COLUMBIA	712,816	26	25,539	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. MEMORIAL LIBRARY	440,000
NASHVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY	NASHVILLE	TN	694,144	DAVIDSON	694,176	20	33,054	NASHVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY	300,000





Workshop 3 - Service Level Analysis

Peer Institutions from the Public Library Survey Data:

Library System Name	City	State	Population County	County	Branches Bran	lation / ch Central Library Name	Sq Ft	er Toi anita So	tal System	per Bi capita2 Et	anch Sq	anch Sq Avg per Bra	g Inch B	Book Volumes	er anita4 E-Boo	ok Volumes per	ta5 Total Collection	per T	otal Circulation p	er Vi	sits pe	r Prog	gram Pro	igrams 00 p Comp	outers /10	000 p
				ropulation								pita Size	e													
HAYWARD PUBLIC LIBRARY	HAYWARD	CA	160,311 ALAMEDA	1,662,323	1	80,156 HAYWARD PUBLIC LIBRARY	58,000	0.36	66,567	0.42	8,567	0.05	8567	168,204	1.05	451,807	2.82 310,7	31 1.94	308,694	1.93	315,926	1.97	13,470	0.08	63	0.39
EUGENE PUBLIC LIBRARY	EUGENE	OR	171,210 LANE	382,986	2	57,070 EUGENE PUBLIC LIBRARY	93,041	0.54	99,220	0.58	6,179	0.04	3090	360,145	2.10	457,328	2.67 2,448,5	91 14.30	2,104,556	12.29	792,801	4.63	41,470	0.24	127	0.74
BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC LIBRARY	BIRMINGHAM	AL	209,880 JEFFERSON	655,342	18	11,046 BIRMINGHAM PUBLIC - CENTRAL BRANCH	229,800	1.09	394,018	1.88	164,218	0.78	9123	620,680	2.96	60,213	0.29 1,380,1	18 6.58	1,007,929	4.80	798,906	3.81	71,616	0.34	254	1.21
ROCHESTER PUBLIC LIBRARY	ROCHESTER	NY	210,565 MONROE	740,900	10	19,142 ROCHESTER PUBLIC LIBRARY	330,000	1.57	426,429	2.03	96,429	0.46	9643	651,005	3.09	58,559	0.28 612,7	53 2.91	571,288	2.71	866,784	4.12	133,058	0.63	349	1.66
KANSAS CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY	KANSAS CITY	MO	218,765 JACKSON	705,925	9	21,877 CENTRAL LIBRARY	175,000	0.80	255,100	1.17	80,100	0.37	8900	601,759	2.75	119,058	0.54 1,885,3	85 8.62	1,767,182	8.08 1	111,024	5.08	71,697	0.33	196	0.90
JACKSON COUNTY LIBRARY SERVICES	MEDFORD	OR	221,290 JACKSON	221,844	14	14,753 JACKSON COUNTY LIBRARY SERVICES	83,191	0.38	176,786	0.80	93,595	0.42	6,685	348,052	1.57	64,166	0.29 2,216,7	50 10.02	1,510,007	6.82	638,783	2.89	42,413	0.19	189	0.85
CAPITAL AREA DISTRICT LIBRARY	LANSING	М	238,859 INGHAM	290,609	12	18,374 CAPITAL AREA DISTRICT LIBRARY	75,000	0.31	138,804	0.58	63,804	0.27	5,317	386,349	1.62	129,822	0.54 2,548,0	11 10.67	2,501,486	10.47 1	071,352	4.49	224,347	0.94	355	1.49
NORFOLK PUBLIC LIBRARY	NORFOLK	VA	246,256 NORFOLK	242,803	11	20,521 SLOVER LIBRARY	135,000	0.55	249,431	1.01	114,431	0.46	10,403	592,012	2.40	20,929	0.08 640,1	65 2.60	608,685	2.47	759,280	3.08	41,689	0.17	566	2.30
JERSEY CITY FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY	JERSEY CITY	NJ	247,597 HUDSON	671,666	9	24,760 JERSEY CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY	87,118	0.35	157,797	0.64	70,679	0.29	7,853	566,867	2.29	478,788	1.93 226,1	64 0.91	226,164	0.91	52,956	0.21	79,301	0.32	185	0.75
VENTURA COUNTY LIBRARY	VENTURA	CA	248,007 VENTURA	841,387	13	17,715 E. P. FOSTER LIBRARY	33,000	0.13	86,475	0.35	53,475	0.22	4,113	352,702	1.42	89,205	0.36 914,9	39 3.69	801,374	3.23	421,747	1.70	73,250	0.30	131	0.53
SPRINGFIELD-GREENE COUNTY LIBRARY DISTRICT	SPRINGFIELD	MO	275,174 GREENE	294,997	9	27,517 THE LIBRARY CENTER	83,000	0.30	184,827	0.67	101,827	0.37	11,314	350,753	1.27	460,608	1.67 3,572,1	12 12.98	2,401,724	8.73 1	355,287	4.93	74,830	0.27	220	0.80
SAINT PAUL PUBLIC LIBRARY	SAINT PAUL	MN	315,925 RAMSEY	547,903	12	24,302 ST. PAUL PUBLIC LIBRARY - CENTRAL	90,353	0.29	280,842	0.89	190,489	0.60	15,874	669,920	2.12	173,626	0.55 2,102,2	27 6.65	1,576,457	4.99	515,510	1.63	11,156	0.04	459	1.45
CITY OF ST. LOUIS MUNICIPAL LIBRARY DISTRICT	ST. LOUIS	MO	319,294 ST. LOUIS CITY	297,645	16	18,782 CENTRAL LIBRARY	190,870	0.60	410,367	1.29	219,497	0.69	13,719	2,643,721	8.28	566,262	1.77 2,369,8	50 7.42	2,128,089	6.66	972,825	3.05	97,069	0.30	218	0.68
ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	FORT WAYNE	IN	355,329 ALLEN	382,187	13	25,381 ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	367,000	1.03	514,557	1.45	147,557	0.42	11,351	2,527,197	7.11	68,523	0.19 3,273,0	14 9.21	3,149,057	8.86 1	217,409	3.43	47,970	0.14	424	1.19
NEW ORLEANS PUBLIC LIBRARY	NEW ORLEANS	S LA	389,476 ORLEANS	389,476	14	25,965 NEW ORLEANS PUBLIC LIBRARY	146,902	0.38	287,757	0.74	140,855	0.36	10,061	500,716	1.29	69,634	0.18 2,513,9	11 6 .45	1,539,496	3.95	337,678	0.87	17,187	0.04	339	0.87
CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	CLEVELAND	OH	398,453 CUYAHOGA	1,227,883	27	14,230 CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	529,204	1.33	794,247	1.99	265,043	0.67	9,816	3,189,553	8.00	912,469	2.29 6,543,4	45 16.42	4,323,315	10.85 1	668,108	4.19	141,670	0.36	611	1.53
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH	PITTSBURGH	PA	399,948 ALLEGHENY	1,211,358	18	21,050 CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH	148,845	0.37	413,804	1.03	264,959	0.66	14,720	1,236,536	3.09	48,959	0.12 4,057,8	11 10.15	3,606,590	9.02	633,937	1.59	21,752	0.05	610	1.53
OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	OAKLAND	CA	433,697 ALAMEDA	1,662,323	17	24,094 OAKLAND MAIN LIBRARY	82,000	0.19	195,650	0.45	113,650	0.26	6,685	903,826	2.08	574,334	1.32 3,102,8	41 7.15	2,871,066	6.62 1	499,772	3.46	127,394	0.29	284	0.65
VIRGINIA BEACH PUBLIC LIBRARY	VIRGINIA BEAC	CH VA	454,448 VIRGINIA BEAC	H 451,231	9	45,445 CENTRAL LIBRARY	95,000	0.21	202,304	0.45	107,304	0.24	11,923	398,052	0.88	477,957	1.05 2,344,8	22 5.16	1,920,731	4.23	863,206	1.90	74,635	0.16	245	0.54
DAYTON METRO LIBRARY	DAYTON	OH	458,677 MONTGOMERY	531,610	20	21,842 DAYTON METRO LIBRARY	227,425	0.50	502,314	1.10	274,889	0.60	13,744	782,482	1.71	795,098	1.73 4,165,5	9.08	3,445,859	7.51 1	645,240	3.59	19,683	0.04	463	1.01
LONG BEACH PUBLIC LIBRARY	LONG BEACH	CA	472,217 LOS ANGELES	9,943,046	11	39,351 BILLIE JEAN KING MAIN LIBRARY	94,650	0.20	197,770	0.42	103,120	0.22	9,375	659,018	1.40	33,399	0.07 2,600,9	02 5.51	1,305,219	2.76	727,477	1.54	47,978	0.10	321	0.68
SONOMA COUNTY LIBRARY	ROHNERT PAR	K CA	492,980 SONOMA	489,819	14	32,865 CENTRAL LIBRARY	61,800	0.13	190,547	0.39	128,747	0.26	9,196	658,185	1.34	264,632	0.54 3,681,2	53 7.47	3,187,129	6.47	838,870	1.70	130,291	0.26	364	0.74
OMAHA PUBLIC LIBRARY	OMAHA	NE	554,594 DOUGLAS	574,332	11	46,216 W DALE CLARK LIBRARY	122,490	0.22	305,252	0.55	182,762	0.33	16,615	642,213	1.16	55,249	0.10 2,841,2	60 5.12	2,322,884	4.19	499,703	0.90	26,095	0.05	230	0.41
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC LIBRARY	MILWAUKEE	W	587,369 MILWAUKEE	945,016	12	45,182 MILWAUKEE PUBLIC LIBRARY	457,919	0.78	654,674	1.11	196,755	0.33	16,396	2,062,805	3.51	167,166	0.28 1,112,3	91 1.89	987,052	1.68	583,224	0.99	31,159	0.05	527	0.90
ENOCH PRATT FREE LIBRARY	BALTIMORE	MD	611,648 BALTIMORE CIT	TY 586,131	21	27,802 ENOCH PRATT CENTRAL	349,713	0.57	566,801	0.93	217,088	0.35	10,338	2,050,682	3.35	89,582	0.15 2,619,5	54 4.28	1,793,100	2.93 1	376,411	2.25	129,169	0.21	863	1.41
ALBUQUERQUE/BERNALILLO COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	ALBUQUERQUE	E NM	662,564 BERNALILLO	681,666	17	36,809 ALBUQUERQUE/BERNALILLO COUNTY MAIN LIBRARY	119,050	0.18	324,741	0.49	205,691	0.31	12,099	831,498	1.25	67,408	0.10 4,902,4	86 7.40	3,788,392	5.72 1	586,149	2.39	76,218	0.12	355	0.54
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC LIBRARY	WASHINGTON	DC	689,545 DIST OF COLUN	MBIA 712,816	26	25,539 MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. MEMORIAL LIBRARY	440,000	0.64	800,779	1.16	360,779	0.52	13,876	201,230	0.29	38,623	0.06 5,561,4	59 8.07	4,067,352	5.90 1	852,701	2.69	237,373	0.34	200	0.29
NASHVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY	NASHVILLE	TN	694,144 DAVIDSON	694,176	20	33,054 NASHVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY	300,000	0.43	553,750	0.80	253,750	0.37	12,688	1,195,167	1.72	251,576	0.36 6,217,7	88 8.96	5,512,144	7.94 2	338,083	3.37	338,818	0.49	971	1.40
SYSTEMS BELOW THIS POINT ARE INCLUDED FOR REFERI	ENCE, BUT NOT I	NCLUDED	IN THE STATSTICAL COMPAI	RISONS BELOW BEC/	AUSE THEY ARE	INCREASINGLY LARGER SCALE																				
DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY	DETROIT	M	713,777 WAYNE	1,740,623	21	32,444 DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY	420,000	0.59	631,039	0.88	211,039	0.30	10,049	1,760,316	2.47	10,580	0.01 1,153,6	53 1.62	427,759	0.60 2	214,811	3.10	169,123	0.24	1148	1.61
DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	DENVER	CO	729,239 DENVER	735,538	25	28,048 DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	539,424	0.74	844,362	1.16	304,938	0.42	12,198	1,386,716	1.90	144,486	0.20 6,010,2	97 8.24	5,458,956	7.49 1	103,822	1.51	52,056	0.07	80	0.11
SEATTLE PUBLIC LIBRARY	SEATTLE	WA	761,100 KING	2,274,315	26	28,189 CENTRAL LIBRARY	362,987	0.48	536,169	0.70	173,182	0.23	6,661	1,391,855	1.83	533,438	0.70 8,614,7	05 11.32	7,072,721	9.29	981,000	1.29	150,528	0.20	753	0.99
MULTNOMAH COUNTY LIBRARY	PORTLAND	OR	821,730 MULTNOMAH	815,637	18	43,249 CENTRAL LIBRARY	125,000	0.15	265,702	0.32	140,702	0.17	7,817	1,460,234	1.78	481,660	0.59 14,802,8	02 18.01	14,784,837	17.99 2	469,743	3.01	181,147	0.22	702	0.85
MEMPHIS PUBLIC LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CENTER	MEMPHIS (S)	TN	824,517 SHELBY	936,017	17	45,807 MEMPHIS PUBLIC LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CENTER	330,000	0.40	543,218	0.66	213,218	0.26	12,542	1,479,804	1.79	51,122	0.06 1,630,6	16 1.98	1,206,850	1.46 1	412,428	1.71	106,514	0.13	542	0.66
INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC LIBRARY	INDIANAPOLIS	IN	877,389 MARION	966,183	23	36,558 INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC LIBRARY	476,000	0.54	791,396	0.90	315,396	0.36	13,713	1,517,177	1.73	305,604	0.35 9,127,5	32 10.40	7,077,479	8.07 1	453,156	1.66	50,849	0.06	669	0.76
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY	SAN FRANCISC	CO CA	897,806 SAN FRANCISC	O 866,606	27	32,065 SAN FRANCISCO MAIN LIBRARY	376,000	0.42	603,657	0.67	227,657	0.25	8,432	2,239,131	2.49	393,871	0.44 12,886,9	49 14.35	10,866,519	12.10 3	817,570	4.25	298,850	0.33	1314	1.46
AUSTIN PUBLIC LIBRARY	AUSTIN	TX	978,908 TRAVIS	1,300,503	21	44,496 AUSTIN PUBLIC LIBRARY	200,000	0.20	435,143	0.44	235,143	0.24	11,197	921,536	0.94	183,642	0.19 6,567,7	87 6.71	5,331,902	5.45 1	564,216	1.60	87,829	0.09	768	0.78
CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG LIBRARY	CHARLOTTE	NC	1,099,845 MECKLENBURG	G 1,128,945	19	54,992 CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG LIBRARY	156,000	0.14	499,827	0.45	343,827	0.31	18,096	786,338	0.71	154,200	0.14 14,378,5	16 13.07	5,425,540	4.93 2	565,740	2.33	449,914	0.41	764	0.69
LOS ANGELES PUBLIC LIBRARY	LOS ANGELES	CA	4,010,684 LOS ANGELES	9,943,046	72	54,941 CENTRAL LIBRARY	538,802	0.13	1,058,861	0.26	520,059	0.13	7,223	5,893,446	1.47	557,746	0.14 15,793,3	82 3.94	15,793,382	3.94 6	643,442	1.66	276,742	0.07	1475	0.37

Library Data:

https://ehdd-my.sharepoint.com/:x:/p/d_speckhard/EUaT1k9L_uhFtdobL7FfMlkBNyA97-_IIH1GqDwFX36Lg?e=ARoJI8





Workshop 3 - Service Level Analysis

Peer Institutions from the Public Library Survey Data:

Metric:	Max	Min	
Total Library Space	800,779 sf 2.03 sf / p	66,567 sf 0.35 sf / p	
Collection Size	6,543,445 items 16.42 items / p	226,164 items 0.91 items /p	
Visits / Programs	2,338,083 visits 5.08 visits / p	52,956 visits 0.21 visits / p	
Computers	1,475 PACs 2.30 PACs / p	63 PACs 0.29 PACs / 1000 p	





Median

- Mean-								
278,989 sf	0.80 sf / p							
2,123,514	items							
6.07 Iten	ns / p							
805,791	visits							
2.30 visi	ts / p							
377 PA 0.87 PACS /	ACs / `1000 p							

















New Programs and Services

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC LIBRARY, MITCHELL STREET BRANCH (WI)

As part of Milwaukee's 21st Century Library strategy, the Mitchell Street facility is located within in a mixed-use development. The library occupies the first floor, the mezzanine, and a portion of the lower level of the building, with 60 market-rate apartments on the four floors above.

The lower level includes a flexible and technologyinfused Teen Zone where "technology lockers" house a graphics workstation, 3D printer, mixing booth, and recording studio. The building includes a kitchen for educational programs on healthy eating, and in the spring, an adjacent alley is transformed into an outdoor program space that includes raised gardens where produce is grown. The building is designed to be an educational anchor for the neighborhood.



Other examples



The Burien library (WA) shares a three-story building with Burien City Hall.



Chicago Public Library + affordable housing projects open in Irving Park, Little Italy, and West Ridge.



Brooklyn's main branch at Grand Army Plaza, there's a café, an art exhibit by the library's artist-in-residence, and the book-free Info Commons.



OPL Survey Results

How does your library feel connected to the community?

1. Educational Support:

- Afterschool homework help
- Computer tutoring
- Digital literacy programming
- Language exchange groups
- Early literacy skills for parents and caregivers

2. Social Services and Community Support:

- Support for housing, health, benefits, jobs, and mental health

- Free lunch and hygiene kits
- Community resource groups and mutual aid meetings

- Homelessness and housing services

- Social workers available at the library

3. Arts and Culture:

- Arts programs for adults and children
- Film screenings and author talks
- Crafts and sewing circles
- Music and movement programs
- Celebrations of different cultures

4. Technology and Computer Skills:

- Computer/tech/smartphone assistance
- Computer literacy classes
- Digital literacy clinics
- Access to online resources and applications

5. Community Engagement:

- Festivals and all-day events
- Cross-generational programming
- Meet-your-neighbor activities
- Community discussion forums
- Events for adults to meet and connect

6. Recreational and Leisure Activities:

- Gaming and movie nights
- Play cafes and sports activities
- Chess lessons and poker circles
- Gardening and outdoor play
- DIY and fix-it clinics



MD Explorations Commons at Carroll County Public Library; Westminster, MD (MW Studios)

7. Additional Services and Resources:

- Library of things (tools, instruments, cooking supplies)
- Showers and laundry facilities
- Business center and career assistance
- Expanded storytimes and book clubs
- Resource guides for specific needs (homeless, unemployed)



New Programs and Services

PIMA COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY (AZ)

The Health Department Nurses provides services to the community through the Library Nurse Program, a collaborative initiative launched in partnership with the Pima County Public Library in 2012.

The program gives library patrons the chance to receive support, education and resources that they may not otherwise be readily able to access. A team of Public Health Nurses make rounds at County libraries, offering basic health services to parents of young children, homeless adults, those with behavioral health needs, and everyone in between.



Other examples





Public libraries in San Francisco, Denver and more than 50 other cities have added full-time licensed social workers to their staffs to help patrons experiencing homelessness, mental illness or other issues.



OPL Survey Results

How does your library feel connected to the community?

1. Educational Support:

- Afterschool homework help
- Computer tutoring
- Digital literacy programming
- Language exchange groups
- Early literacy skills for parents and caregivers

2. Social Services and Community Support:

- Support for housing, health, benefits, jobs, and mental health
- Free lunch and hygiene kits
- Community resource groups and mutual aid meetings
- Homelessness and housing services

- Social workers available at the library

3. Arts and Culture:

- Arts programs for adults and children
- Film screenings and author talks
- Crafts and sewing circles
- Music and movement programs
- Celebrations of different cultures

4. Technology and Computer Skills:

- Computer/tech/smartphone assistance
- Computer literacy classes
- Digital literacy clinics
- Access to online resources and applications

5. Community Engagement:

- Festivals and all-day events
- Cross-generational programming
- Meet-your-neighbor activities
- Community discussion forums
- Events for adults to meet and connect

6. Recreational and Leisure Activities:

- Gaming and movie nights
- Play cafes and sports activities
- Chess lessons and poker circles
- Gardening and outdoor play
- DIY and fix-it clinics



MD Explorations Commons at Carroll County Public Library; Westminster, MD (MW Studios)

7. Additional Services and Resources:

- Library of things (tools, instruments, cooking supplies)
- Showers and laundry facilities
- Business center and career assistance
- Expanded storytimes and book clubs
- Resource guides for specific needs (homeless, unemployed)



New Programs and Services

FAYETTEVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY (AZ)

This expansion to a community library redefines the traditional public library model, providing enhanced educational opportunities, services, and innovative programming for all ages.

The addition includes a flexible event center that serves as a full-function auditorium; additional meeting and group study spaces; greatly expanded youth services; an innovation center with audio recording studio, video recording studio, editing suites, virtual reality studio, photography studio, a simulation lab, and a fabrication and robotics lab; an art and movement room; an expanded children's library; a private teens-only lounge and gaming center; a green roof; a commercial teaching kitchen for cooking classes and food production; and a deli that serves the community.



Other examples









OPL Survey Results

What kind of spaces would allow you to serve your community better?

1. Outdoor Spaces:

- Community garden

- Covered outdoor space with seating and tables
- Outdoor kids' play space and gardening area

2. Indoor Spaces:

- Study rooms
- Performance spaces and auditoriums
- Meeting rooms and multipurpose community spaces
- Dedicated space for youth events
- Media lab w/ tech support
- Classroom-style learning spaces
- Storage spaces
- Gender-neutral bathrooms
- Spaces for preservation projects and archival collections
- Warm and welcoming spaces with better lighting and furnishings
- Quiet spaces for solitary study
- Indoor playgrounds
- Coffee and cafe areas

Other Suggestions:

- More parking spaces
- Clear external signage
- Playgrounds near the library
- Accessible spaces and renovations
- Expansion of library space on the second floor
- AC/heating for the entire branch



Dilgory Covinal Library, Calgory, Canada



Anative Pichlie Library



New Programs and Services

CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY, EASTMAN READING GARDEN (OH)

- Today, the garden remains a popular spot for reading, relaxing, lunching, birding and peoplewatching. Garden has wireless internet access.
- Located between the two buildings that comprise the Main Cleveland Public library
- Formerly a city park, open to public (gated access)
- Public art collection (sculpture, rotating interactive pieces, and site works, including an installation by Maya Lin)







Other examples



Richland Public Library (NC)



Fayetteville Public Library (AZ)



Tuisa City-County Central Library (AZ)


Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study

OPL Survey Results

What kind of spaces would allow you to serve your community better?

1. Outdoor Spaces:

- Community garden

- Covered outdoor space with seating and tables
- Outdoor kids' play space and gardening area

2. Indoor Spaces:

- Study rooms
- Performance spaces and auditoriums
- Meeting rooms and multipurpose community spaces
- Dedicated space for youth events
- Media lab w/ tech support
- Classroom-style learning spaces
- Storage spaces
- Gender-neutral bathrooms
- Spaces for preservation projects and archival collections
- Warm and welcoming spaces with better lighting and furnishings
- Quiet spaces for solitary study
- Indoor playgrounds
- Coffee and cafe areas

Other Suggestions:

- More parking spaces
- Clear external signage
- Playgrounds near the library
- Accessible spaces and renovations
- Expansion of library space on the second floor
- AC/heating for the entire branch



Didgery Control Library, Calgory, Canada



Anative Pachlie Library



Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study

Visioning Summary

A vision for how people relate to the Library.

A place of belonging

The spot where individuals find and foster community.

A memory-keeper. Not only of cherished materials and Oakland history, but of experiences and lives shaped by the Library.

A supportive and vibrant place attracting and retaining a diverse and representative workforce.

A setting for community-led activities that support everyday resilience. A vision for how the Library serves people.

A place where people connect

The Library belongs to the people. Community is the author of these spaces.

A mix of environments in and around the Library to facilitate community-informed programs. Nimble, flexible, adaptable, inviting spaces.

A champion of all Oakland communities, with visibility in civic space. The Library reaches out to the City-both programmatically and physically.

A reliable destination during times of both celebration and crisis. A healthy and safe space-societally and environmentally. A vision for how the Library builds resillience and capacity.

A place to discover create, and learn

People feel supported and encouraged to discover: seeking solutions, sharing talents, "doing things".

Services are made visible, relevant, and available to all. Interactions are rooted in respect, equity, and consideration for individual dignity.

The Library advances literacy in all forms.

The Library facilitates skill-building and knowledge-sharing for individuals to benefit themselves and their communities.



Oakland Public Library Main Library Feasibility Study

Draft Proposed Program

OAKLAND PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT #1004858



Draft: August 12th, 2024

Introduction

What is a Program?

A key part of evaluating the feasibility of a new and improved Main Library will be to understand what activities and requirements the Main Library needs to support to align with an updated shared vision of how the Oakland Public Library can serve the community.

In architectural design and facility planning, the process of translating activities and requirements into design criteria for a building is referred to as Architectural Programming. The Architectural Program defines a list of the spaces in a building, and enough information about the requirements for using those spaces to establish the required size and number of each type of spaces, and enough details about the furnishing and character of the spaces to allow a specialty cost consultant to develop a high level estimate of the cost to construct the project.

In developing the Draft program for the new and improved Main Library, we looked at the following sources:

1) Community Feedback from the Community Engagement Workshops

2) Community Feedback from the Community Survey

3) Reviewing OPLs goals and vision for their operations going forward, including:

a) Meetings with the OPL Executive Stakeholders

b) An All OPL Staff Survey

c) Meetings with specialty stakeholder groups within OPL

- Information Technology
- Children Library
- Teen Services

4) Reviewing the existing uses of the Oakland Main Library (by touring and reviewing drawings of the existing facility)

5) Review the programs of relevant Precedent Facilities (by reviewing drawings and published material of the existing facilities).



Summary Diagram of the Community **Engagement Feedback Results**



Wordcloud Visualization of the responses to Community Survey Question 4, with word size reflecting frequency of appearance

Community Feedback Summary:

The community feedback from the in person Community Workshops and the digital Community Survey both reflected a desire for the Main Library to maintain it's role as a resource to support reading and learning, but also to become a resource for both discovering and producing other types of media (audio, video and digital). There was also strong support for the Library to play an enhanced role in preserving and celebrating Oakland's history and culture. There was also strong support for the Library to play a role in facilitating community gatherings of many different sizes. We also saw strong interest in how changes in the Library could better connect the experience of being in the Library to natural surroundings.

The team summarized these findings in the diagram to the left, identifying three primary goals for a new and improved Main Library to serve as:

A Collaborative Gathering Place

An Empowering Resource

A Celebration of Local Culture and History

Oakland Public Library Goals:

In a number of meetings with the Oakland Public Library stakeholders, we worked through a number of potential goals for the library in a new Main Library space, as noted below.

A vision for how people relate to the Library. A place of belonging
The spot where individuals find and foster community. A memory-keeper. Not only of cherished materials and Oakland history, but of experiences and lives shaped by the
Library. A supportive and vibrant place attracting and retaining a diverse and representative workforce.
A setting for community-led activities that support everyday resilience.

Summary Oakland Public Library Staff Stakeholders Goals for a new and improved Main Library



Oakland Public Library – Existing Main Library Oakland, CA



Footprint of Oakland Main Library

Existing Program Breakdown



Total Area: 82,000 GSF Footprint: 26,000 GSF 50' -

Oakland Main Library (Oakland, California) Existing Program Breakdown



observations/findings

The existing Oakland Main Library programming prioritizes BOH

collection materials, administration areas, and public collection materials. It reserves a smaller percentages of space for meeting areas, special collections, and teen/ children areas.

Public Collection + Gathering **Environment + Green Space Exhibition + Collaboration** Administration + Staff Areas Support + Storage

Proposed New Space Types Findings

In reviewing the Community Feedback, OPL Goals and Precedent analysis, we see the following potential new program types that would align with the emerging vision of a new and improved Main Library. They are described below, grouped by the three primary goals that emerged. A selection of images from precedent project that reflect the proposed space types appears below.

A Collaborative Gathering Place

An Empowering Resource

- exhibition/event space ۲
- auditorium/theater •

- private & semi-private study areas
- children's play area
- media production space

A Celebration of Local Culture and History

- art gallery
- outdoor amenity
- indoor green space
- cafe









• media production space

Oakland Main Library Overall Square Footage Comparison

observations/findings

When comparing the existing Oakland Main Library shops, surveys, and precedent analysis. to the

proposed Oakland Main Library programming (in terms of overall square footage), there is a:

- increase in overall square footage by • 66,000 SF
- addition of programs that were not pre-• viously included, such as interior green space, children's play area, etc.

These changes—evident in the proposed Oakland Main Library programming—reflect and were informed by the results from the community work-







proposed Oakland Main Library

6

Existing Versus Proposed Oakland Main Library

Overall Square Footage Comparison and Percentages

Program Element	Existing OML		Propos	ed OML
	Area (SF)	Percentage of Total Area	Area (SF)	Percentage of Total Area
Public Meeting Rooms	1780	2.2%	5500	3.7%
Public Gathering and Reading Areas	9161	11.2%	23700	16.0%
Private & Semi-Private Study Areas	0	0.0%	1800	1.2%
Children's Play Area	0	0.0%	2000	1.4%
Special Audience: Children	2953	3.6%	8000	5.4%
Special Audience: Teens	2400	2.9%	6000	4.1%
Public Collection Materials (reference, periodicals, etc)	9726	11.9%	12000	8.1%
Special Collections (map room, history room)	2812	3.4%	9500	6.4%
Café	0	0.0%	1500	1.0%
Art Gallery	0	0.0%	1200	0.8%
Exhibition Hall / Event Space	0	0.0%	2500	1.7%
Media Lab (Music Production / Practice, Maker Space, Tool Lending Library)	0	0.0%	3500	2.4%
Auditorium / Theater	0	0.0%	4600	3.1%
Library Services (reference, circulation)	4155	5.1%	2900	2.0%
BOH Collection Materials (stacks)	15116	18.4%	1500	1.0%
Administrative Areas	10382	12.7%	25000	16.9%
Interior Green Space	0	0.0%	500	0.3%
Exterior Space	0	0.0%	4500	3.0%
Technical Services (acquisitions, cataloging, processing)	6566	8.0%	1400	0.9%
Support spaces: BOH (MEP, storage)	7545	9.2%	10400	7.0%
Circulation	9404	11.5%	20000	13.5%
Total Area	82000		148000	



Existing Oakland Main Library



proposed Oakland Main Library

Precedent Studies

What is a Precedent?

When architects and designers review the requirements and criteria for a new project, we always want to take advantage of the best thinking and knowledge available on the subject, including other projects that re already built and can serve as inspiration and comparison to the current project. We refer to these relevant comparison projects as "Precedents".

How did we Select Precedent Projects?

In selecting projects for consideration as Precedents for a new and improved Main Library for Oakland, we looked at award wining recent projects, and also reviewed projects that were suggested by OPL and community members.

Visioning Process: Precedent Projects Calgary Central Library

Overview

- Central Library for Calgary Public Library (21 branches)
- Calgary Public Library system is used by over 670,000 Calgarians (over half of the 1.2M population)
- Library is situated within a tight urban fabric (a functional light rail transit line crosses the site). The library doubles as a portal and a bridge.
- Completed 2018
- 240,000 sf (2/3 larger than previous central library), across 4 floors
- "600,000 items"





Calgary Central Library Calgary,



Austin Main Library Austin, TX



PUBLIC LIBRARY



Missoula Public Library Missoula, MO



Hayward Library Hayward, CA



Multnomah Central Library Portland, OR



How do they stack up? Footprint + Volume Comparison



Oakland Main Library Total Area: 82,000 GSF

Footprint: 26,000 GSF Floors: 5

Calgary Central Library Total Area: 240,000 GSF Footprint: 57,000 GSF Floors: 6

Hayward Library Total Area: 58,000 GSF

Footprint: 22,000 GSF Floors: 3

Austin Main Library Total Area: 198,000 GSF Footprint: 36,000 GSF Floors: 6

Missoula Public Library

Total Area: 106,676 GSF Footprint: 29,209 GSF Floors: 4



Multnomah Central Library

Total Area: 120,000 GSF Footprint: 28,864 GSF Floors: 8

Executive Summary Overall Square Footage Comparison



Muntnomah Central Library

Program Element	Existing OML	Hayward Library	Calgary Central Library	Austin Central Library	Missoula Public Library	Multnomah Central Library
Public Meeting Rooms	1780	2271	16956	3845	1971	1530
Public Gathering and Reading Areas	9161	16034	57273	16450	11699	10123
Private & Semi-Private Study Areas	0	1547	0	0	2314	314
Children's Play Area	0	1982	0	0	2668	0
Special Audience: Children	2953	7106	4756	8123	11354	2885
Special Audience: Teens	2400	1235	6126	6380	9529	0
Public Collection Materials (reference, periodicals, etc)	9726	5267	22460	33272	13764	30064
Special Collections (map room, history room)	2812	0	0	2276	0	1806
Café	0	0	0	3918	2356	0
Art Gallery	0	0	0	3071	0	2055
Exhibition Hall / Event Space	0	2262	0	4530	1740	0
Media Lab (Music Production / Practice, Maker Space, Tool Lending Library)	0	1500	804	6630	3538	2696
Auditorium / Theater	0	0	4925	1463	4933	0
Library Services (reference, circulation)	4155	798	4125	6857	4412	5185
BOH Collection Materials (stacks)	15116	577	0	19985	0	13600
Administrative Areas	10382	10955	46844	35147	16225	16908
Exterior Space	0	0	0	9982	4534	0
Technical Services (acquisitions, cataloging, processing)	6566	0	0	1213	0	3247
Support spaces: BOH (MEP, storage)	7545	2466	19326	14630	8545	9376
Circulation	20000	4000	53757	20228	7094	20211
Total Area	82000	58000	240000	198000	106676	120000





Existing Oakland Main Library

Observations Major Takeaways





Public Gathering & Reading Areas



BOH Collection Materials (stacks)



Technical Services

Program Element	Existing OML	Hayward Library	Calgary Central Library	Austin Central Library	Missoula Public Library	Multnomah Central Library
Public Meeting Rooms	1780	2271	16956	3845	1971	1530
Public Gathering and Reading Areas	9161	16034	57273	16450	11699	10123
Private & Semi-Private Study Areas	0	1547	0	0	2314	314
Children's Play Area	0	1982	0	0	2668	0
Special Audience: Children	2953	7106	4756	8123	11354	2885
Special Audience: Teens	2400	1235	6126	6380	9529	0
Public Collection Materials (reference, periodicals, etc)	9726	5267	22460	33272	13764	30064
Special Collections (map room, history room)	2812	0	0	2276	0	1806
Café	0	0	0	3918	2356	0
Art Gallery	0	0	0	3071	0	2055
Exhibition Hall / Event Space	0	2262	0	4530	1740	0
Media Lab (Music Production / Practice, Maker Space, Tool Lending Library)	0	1500	804	6630	3538	2696
Auditorium / Theater	0	0	4925	1463	4933	0
Library Services (reference, circulation)	4155	798	4125	6857	4412	5185
BOH Collection Materials (stacks)	15116	577	0	19985	0	13600
Administrative Areas	10382	10955	46844	35147	16225	16908
Exterior Space	0	0	0	9982	4534	0
Technical Services (acquisitions, cataloging, processing)	6566	0	0	1213	0	3247
Support spaces: BOH (MEP, storage)	7545	2466	19326	14630	8545	9376
Circulation	20000	4000	53757	20228	7094	20211

observations/findings

By comparing the percentage of square footage per program of our precedents to the existing Oakland Main Library programming, we can re-prioritize programs that the contemporary public desires for the future Main Library.

For the programs with the most discrepancies between existing and our precedents, here are the findings:

- Both Hayward Public Library and Calgary Central Library feature more public gathering and reading areas
- Hayward Public Library and Calgary Central ٠ Library feature more public meeting rooms
- Hayward Public Library, Calgary Central Li-

•

brary, Austin Central Library, Missoula Public Library, and Multnomah Central Library all feature less BOH collection materials (stacks) Hayward Public Library, Calgary Central Library, Austin Central Library, Missoula Public Library, and Multnomah Central Library all feature less technical services

Based on these findings, the future Oakland Main Library should accommodate less space for BOH collection (stacks) and technical service. It should allot more space for public gatherings, readings areas, and meeting rooms.

Calgary Central Library Calgary, Alberta, Canada



Total Area: 240,000 GSF Footprint: 57,000 GSF ➡ 50' 🛏

Calgary Central Library (Calgary, Alberta, Canada) Program Breakdown



observations/findings

Calgary Central Library prioritizes public gathering and readings spaces, administration areas, public meeting rooms and public collection materials. It reserves a smaller percentages of space for the media labs, auditorium/theater, and library services.



Public Collection + Gathering Environment + Green Space Exhibition + Collaboration Administration + Staff Areas Support + Storage

Hayward Public Library Hayward, CA



50'

-



Total Area: 58,000 GSF Footprint: 22,000 GSF

OP N ehdd.

Hayward Public Library (Hayward, California) Program Breakdown



observations/findings

Hayward Public Library prioritizes public gathering and readings spaces, administration areas, and children's area. It reserves a smaller percentages of space for BOH collection materials, library services, support spaces, and teen area.



Austin Main Library Austin, TX



Total Area: 198,000 GSF Footprint: 36,000 GSF

➡ 50' 🛏







Austin Main Library (Austin, Texas) Program Breakdown



terials, support spaces, and administration areas. It

Missoula Public Library Missoula, Montana





Footprint comparison to Oakland Main Library

5O'

Total Area: 106,676 GSF Footprint: 29,209 GSF

Missoula Public Library (Missoula, Montana) Program Breakdown



observations/findings

Missoula Public Library prioritizes public collection materials, administration areas, and children's space. It reserves a smaller percentage of space for study areas and public meeting rooms.



Multnomah County Central Library Portland, Oregon





Program breakdown



Total Area: 120,000 GSF Footprint: 28,864 GSF

50'

Multnomah County Central Library (Portland, Oregon) Program Breakdown



Executive Summary Percentage of Square Footage Comparison







10 5%	9.5%	72		%	
19.5%		2.5%	6	2	2%
	8%	2%	1.75	5%	1% .25%

12.25%	7%	4%	4%	6
		3.5%	2.5%	
9%	4.25%	2.75%	2%	1.5%
			1%	

6	8%	5%	4%			
		3.5%	3%	6	2.:	25%
6	7.5%	7.05%	2%	1	.5%	1%
° 1.5%		3.25%	2%		75%	.5%

9%	6.75%	4.25%	4	1%
		3.25%	2.25%	2.25%
8%	4.5%	2.5%	2%	1.5%

1%	11%	7.75	%	4.25%
70		2.75%	2.25%	6 1.75%
	8%	2.5%	1.5%	1.25% 🥳

Oakland Main Library Percentage of Program Type Breakdown

18%	13%	12%	9%	5%	3.5%
10 / 6	12%	11%	8%	3.5%	3%
	/0		070		2%

existing Oakland Main Library





proposed Oakland Main Library

observations/findings

When comparing the existing Oakland Mai brary to the proposed Oakland Main Library programm there is:

- a decrease in BOH and technical se
- an increase in public gathering spa reading areas, meeting rooms, and rior space

These changes—evident in the proposed C Main Library programming—reflect and we

in Li-	informed by the results from the community work- shops, surveys, and precedent analysis.
ning,	Programs included in proposed Oakland Main Library programming (that were not included pre- viously):
ervices	
aces,	 interior green space
d exte-	 children's play area
	 private & semi-private study areas
	 auditorium/theater
Dakland	• media lab
ere	 art gallery/exhibition/event space

Comparisons to National Data IMLS - Public Library Survey



The mission of the Institute for Museum and Library Services is to advance, support, and empower America's museums, libraries, and related organizations through grant-making, research, and policy development. As part of this mission, every year, the IMLS polls every Publicly funded Library in the United States and asked them to respond to their "Public Library Survey". The most recent data available is from the 2022 Fiscal Year. We used this data to compile statistics about the relative size of Main Libraries at comparable systems across the country.

Basis of Comparison:

To ensure that the data was relevant to Oakland Public Library, we select from the 9,248 Library Systems the respond to the survey each year as follows:

1) Select systems whose "Central" Library is large enough to be comparable in function to the existing Oakland Main Library. Unfortunately, the PLS data includes many small and rural systems that list a "Central" Library that are a small as a few hundred sq. ft. To remove these from the data set, we:

a) Retrieved the size of all "Branch" Libraries in the dataset

b) Determining a statistically relevant number for the size of the biggest branches (we used the mean size + one standard deviation) - this ended up being just over 20,000 sq.ft.

c) Select systems who's "Main" Library was larger than that large branch size.

2) Select systems whose service population area was in range to be relevant to Oakland

a) We selected systems with service populations between 100,000 and 1,000,000 people.

Based on the above, we identified 405 "relevant" Library Systems. Please see the map above right, and the partial list of systems, below right.

ch &	Compare							
y Search & C	lompare							
Explored	data arc							
Damogra	ate							
1 Maritime a	- Balance and the second by DOCT 40.			Add/Reniove	to MyLibraries		0	-
to My Lib	ran down menu to search by FSCS ID 1 Ingries	bi uticary read	te to addremove stranes	(16114)				EQ
My Libra	aries ries solected							
Search F	Search Results							9,215 enuits
FSGS ID	Library Name	Lotain	Logal Basis	PSCLPublic Ubrent	Service Area Population	Corneral Library	Branch	Blockroutiles
AM0001	ANCHOR POINT PUBLIC LIBRARY	Runel (43)	Nemprofit Association of Apericy		2.173	ž	0	0.00
AN0202	ANCHORAGE PUBLIC LIBRARY	Oty (13)	CountyParish	1.4	298,970	3.	4	.0
AK0003	ANDERSON COMMUNITY UBBARY	Runst (A3)	Municipal Government (city, town or all tope)	SV.	275	4	- 0 ⁻	0
ANODOS	KUSKOKWINI CONSORTIUM LIBRARY	7 Town (33)	Matti-jueistlictional		0.179	1	0	0
AM0007	ING LAKE PUBLIC LIBRARY	Runal (42)	Courty/Ransh		6,942	1	a	
440008	CANTWELL COMMUNITY LIBRARY	Runal (43)	Non-profit Association or Agency		190	3	0	0
AH0011	CHINIAK PUBLIC LIBRARY	Ratal (43)	Non-profit Association	N	43		Q.,	.0
	THE D DAY BHEN IT CERTAIN	Runi (43)	Non-profit Association	5 M C	26	1	0	0
AH0014	COLUMN TO A COLUMN		or apency.					
ANOD14 ANOD15	COOPER LANDING COMMUNITY	Runal (43)	or Agency Non-profit Association or Agency	ъ	471	(i)	(e)	. 0
	Explore 2 Demages Demages Demages to by Up to by Up to by Up to by Up Avcocc Avcoccc Avcocc Avcoccc Avcocc Avcoccc Avcoccc Avcoccc Avcoccc	Ration data any Comparison Units the pull down menu to search by PSCS Or to My Ubraves Wy Ubraves Second Reside Second Reside ROS ID Allow Reside Reside Model Reside Reside MODEL Reside Reside MODEL Address Reside Reside MODEL Address Point MODEL Address Point <tr< td=""><td>Basters data an: Design extra • Use the pull down meru to search by FSCB or thorary name to by Unterves • Use the pull down meru to search by FSCB or thorary name to by Unterves • Mol Dirarios • Open Results • Crock on a literary's name to view detail • MODOL Activity Research Down Point L UBBARY • Activity L UBBARY • Activity L UBBARY • Activity Research Down Point L UBBARY • Activity Research Down Point L UBBARY • <</td><td>Raptine and are Description Status • Use the pull down more to scale they FSC3 OL in library name to add/remove libraries to MU libraries • Use the pull down more to scale they FSC3 OL in library name to add/remove libraries to MU libraries • Mu libraries • Mu libraries • Exclose and library in name to view detail • Model Ancole Point Pulse Librarie • Addres Ancole Point Pulse Library • Model Ancole Point Pulse Library • Addres Ancole Point Pulse Library • Model Ancole Point Pulse Library • Model Ancole Point Pulse Library • Addres Ancole Point Pulse Library • Model Ancole Point Pulse Library </td></tr<> <td>Radios data an: Consequents Additionation (trum) • Use the pull down meru to search by FSCS 00 or library name to add/hences libraries to by Unarress Mo Libraries winched Additionation (trum) • Model Parties winched Additionation (trum) Additionation (trum) • Excess Results Excess Results Excess Results (trum) Excess Results • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Non-participation (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Non-participation (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Strumptific Assess attain or a participation (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Totain (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Totain (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation (trum) Additionation (trum) Totain (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Addi</td> <td>Balance data an: Compression Additional data means to search by FSCS 0 or filtrary name to add/tensore to branks to by Utbraves My Ubravies suitoctad Additional data means to search by FSCS 0 or filtrary name to add/tensore to branks (town) • My Ubravies to by Utbravies My Ubravies suitoctad Additional data means (town) Additional data means (town) • FSCS Monor Rame Monor Rame</td> <td>Patient extra ent Comparison Additions net an initial comparison Additions net an My Libraries (Innex) • Unit of the public down menu to search by PSCS do or library name to additionary entre to search they be compared to a search they be compared to additionary entre to search they be compared to a search they be compared to additionary in the compared to additionary in the compared to additionary in the compared to a search they be compared to a search they be compared to additionary in the compared to additin the compa</td> <td>Ration data an Description AddReside to My: Linearies (terming) AddReside to My: Linearies (terming) AddReside to My: Linearies (terming) Image: Comparison (terming) <thimage: comparison<br="">(terming) Image: Comparison (terming) <thimage: comparison<br="">(terming) Image: Comparison (</thimage:></thimage:></td>	Basters data an: Design extra • Use the pull down meru to search by FSCB or thorary name to by Unterves • Use the pull down meru to search by FSCB or thorary name to by Unterves • Mol Dirarios • Open Results • Crock on a literary's name to view detail • MODOL Activity Research Down Point L UBBARY • Activity L UBBARY • Activity L UBBARY • Activity Research Down Point L UBBARY • Activity Research Down Point L UBBARY • <	Raptine and are Description Status • Use the pull down more to scale they FSC3 OL in library name to add/remove libraries to MU libraries • Use the pull down more to scale they FSC3 OL in library name to add/remove libraries to MU libraries • Mu libraries • Mu libraries • Exclose and library in name to view detail • Model Ancole Point Pulse Librarie • Addres Ancole Point Pulse Library • Model Ancole Point Pulse Library • Addres Ancole Point Pulse Library • Model Ancole Point Pulse Library • Model Ancole Point Pulse Library • Addres Ancole Point Pulse Library • Model Ancole Point Pulse Library	Radios data an: Consequents Additionation (trum) • Use the pull down meru to search by FSCS 00 or library name to add/hences libraries to by Unarress Mo Libraries winched Additionation (trum) • Model Parties winched Additionation (trum) Additionation (trum) • Excess Results Excess Results Excess Results (trum) Excess Results • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Non-participation (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Non-participation (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Strumptific Assess attain or a participation (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Totain (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation for Provincit Library name to view detail Totain (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Additionation (trum) Additionation (trum) Totain (trum) If CLA addit (trum) If CLA addit (trum) • Addi	Balance data an: Compression Additional data means to search by FSCS 0 or filtrary name to add/tensore to branks to by Utbraves My Ubravies suitoctad Additional data means to search by FSCS 0 or filtrary name to add/tensore to branks (town) • My Ubravies to by Utbravies My Ubravies suitoctad Additional data means (town) Additional data means (town) • FSCS Monor Rame Monor Rame	Patient extra ent Comparison Additions net an initial comparison Additions net an My Libraries (Innex) • Unit of the public down menu to search by PSCS do or library name to additionary entre to search they be compared to a search they be compared to additionary entre to search they be compared to a search they be compared to additionary in the compared to additionary in the compared to additionary in the compared to a search they be compared to a search they be compared to additionary in the compared to additin the compa	Ration data an Description AddReside to My: Linearies (terming) AddReside to My: Linearies (terming) AddReside to My: Linearies (terming) Image: Comparison (terming) Image: Comparison (terming) <thimage: comparison<br="">(terming) Image: Comparison (terming) <thimage: comparison<br="">(terming) Image: Comparison (</thimage:></thimage:>



LIBRARY SYSTEM NAME	CITY	STATE	MAIN LIBRARY NAME	MAIN SF	TOTAL SF
MADERA COUNTY LIBRARY	MADERA	CA	MADERA LIBRARY	21,580	48,460
BUCKS COUNTY FREE LIBRARY	DOYLESTOWN	PA	BUCKS COUNTY FREE LIBRARY	50,000	146,107
EVERETT PUBLIC LIBRARY	EVERETT	WA	MAIN LIBRARY	54,985	66,289
HARTFORD PUBLIC LIBRARY	HARTFORD	СТ	HARTFORD PUBLIC LIBRARY	135,000	166,726
SALEM PUBLIC LIBRARY	SALEM	OR	SALEM PUBLIC LIBRARY	91,148	97,148
DELAWARE COUNTY DISTRICT LIBRARY	DELAWARE	ОН	DELAWARE COUNTY DISTRICT LIBRARY	44,000	86,096
ANDERSON COUNTY LIBRARY	ANDERSON	SC	ANDERSON COUNTY LIBRARY	96,000	145,546
MILWAUKEE PUBLIC LIBRARY	MILWAUKEE	WI	MILWAUKEE PUBLIC LIBRARY	457,919	654,674
HENRY COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	MCDONOUGH	GA	MCDONOUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY	28,181	89,081
NORTHWEST GEORGIA REGIONAL LIBRARY SYSTEM	DALTON	GA	DALTON-WHITFIELD COUNTY LIBRARY	32,148	58,292
RAMSEY COUNTY LIBRARY	SHOREVIEW	MN	ROSEVILLE LIBRARY	73,000	166,338
RUTHERFORD COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	MURFREESBORO	TN	LINEBAUGH PUBLIC LIBRARY	32,517	67,121
SCHENECTADY COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	SCHENECTADY	NY	CENTRAL LIBRARY	61,700	100,296
SEATTLE PUBLIC LIBRARY	SEATTLE	WA	CENTRAL LIBRARY	362,987	611,169
MIDLAND COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	MIDLAND	TX	MIDLAND COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	59,044	91,996
SALINAS PUBLIC LIBRARY	SALINAS	CA	JOHN STEINBECK LIBRARY	28,845	60,206
CHARLOTTE COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	PORT CHARLOTTE	FL	MID-COUNTY REGIONAL LIBRARY	42,623	87,202
FLOWER MOUND PUBLIC LIBRARY	FLOWER MOUND	ТХ	FLOWER MOUND PUBLIC LIBRARY	40,000	40,000
NICHOLSON MEMORIAL LIBRARY SYSTEM	GARLAND	ТХ	NICHOLSON MEMORIAL LIBRARY SYSTEM	59,475	120,895
CHANDLER PUBLIC LIBRARY	CHANDLER	AZ-	DOWNTOWN LIBRARY	64,000	123,974
FLAGLER COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	PALM COAST	FL	FLAGLER COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	30,000	31,152
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY	SAN FRANCISCO	CA	SAN FRANCISCO MAIN LIBRARY	376,000	603,646



Comparisons to National Data Main Library Size and Total Area





Figure 1: Distribution of Main Library Area



Figure 2: Distribution of Per-capita Main Library Area

Figure 3: Projected Service Area Population Growth

observations/findings

Figure 1 shows that Oakland's existing Main Library is smaller than the average Library in the sample, but only by about 5% (82,000 sq.ft vs. 85,304 sq.ft for the national average). However, when the Main Library Area is compared relative to the population served (in Figure 2), Oakland's existing Main Library is much more notable undersized, compared to the average of the sample (0.18 sq.ft/person for Oakland's existing Main Library vs. 0.37 sq.ft person for the national average (almost double). Considering that the Service Area Population is expected to grow to approximately 475,000 people by 2050 (see projection in Figure 3), we might expect a significantly larger Main Library based on the proposed metric of Per-capita Main Library Area.

Main Library Size (based on National Average per-capita Main Library Size and Current Service Population): Current Population: 447,938 people x 0.3718 sq. ft / person = 166,543.35 sq. ft

Proposed Main Library Size (based on National Average Population in 2050: 475,954 people x 0.3718 sq. ft / person = 176,960 sq. ft

per-capita Main Library Size and Service Population Growth):

Comparisons to National Data Main Library Size



Figure 1: Distribution of Total Library Area











Figure 4: Percentage of Main Library Area vs. **Total Library Area**

Main Library Size (based on Current Total Library Area and National Average %): Oakland Current Total Library Area: 207,510 × 0.60 Main Library / Total Library Area = 124,506 sq. ft

Main Library Size (based on National Average per-capita Total Area and percentage factor):

Oakland Service Population: 447,938 people x 0.6171 sq. ft / person = 276,422.54 sq. ft Proposed Total Area: 276,422.54 × 0.60 Main Library / Total Library Area = 165,853.5 sq. ft

Main Library Size (based on Projected Service Population and National Average per-capita Total Area and percentage factor):

Population in 2050: 475,954 people x 0.6171 sq. ft / person = 293,711.2 sq. ft Proposed Total Area: 293,711.2 × 0.60 Main Library / Total Library Area = 176,226.8 sq. ft

observations/findings

Figure 1 shows that Oakland's existing Total Library area is larger than the average Library System in the sample, by about 30%. However, when the Total Library Area is compared relative to the population served (in Figure 2), Oakland Public Library's existing Total Library Area is again notable undersized, compared to the average of the sample. (0.46 sq.ft /person for Oakland's existing Area vs. 0.62 sq.ft/person for the national average). Figure 3 identifies the relationship between Service Area Population and Total Library Area. Figure 4 shows the distribution of Area that the Main Library makes up as a percentage of the Total Area of the Library system. For example; Oakland's Main Library is 82,000 sq.ft out of the Total 207,510 sq.ft in the OPL system, which is 39.5%. As identified in the figure, this is dramatically lower than the national average of 60%.

Comparisons to National Data

Main Library Size



Existing Oakland Main Library



Proposed Oakland Main Library Area

(based on average of Metrics based Potential Areas)

Total Area: 82,000 GSF 🔌

Total Area: 148,000 GSF -



Largest Main Library Size Reviewed

(based on Projected Population, Projected Total Area and Per-capita Area Factor)

Total Area: 176,960 GSF

Precedent Study of Proposed New Program Items Private & Semi-Private Study Areas

Range of sizes: 1,547 - 2,648 SF Range of percent values: 1 - 3% of total area



Missoula Public Library Missoula, Montana



Hayward Library Hayward, California



Calgary Central Library Calgary, Alberta, Canada





1,547 SF

Precedent Study of Proposed New Program Items Children's Play Area

Range of sizes: 1,864 - 1,982 SF Range of percent values: 3% of total area





1,982 SF

Missoula Public Library Missoula, Montana



Hayward Library Hayward, California

3% of total area

Precedent Study of Proposed New Program Items *Cafe*

Range of sizes: 1,105 - 3,918 SF Range of percent values: 1 - 2% of total area



Austin Central Library Austin, Texas



1,105 SF 1% of total area

Halifax Central Library Halifax, Canada



2% of total area

Precedent Study of Proposed New Program Items Art Gallery

Range of sizes: 1,450 - 3,556 SF Range of percent values: .75 - 2% of total area





3,556 SF .75% of total area

2% of total area

Austin Central Library Austin, Texas



San Diego Public Library San Diego, California



Yonkers Public Library Yonkers, New York



OAKLAND MAIN LIBRARY | PROGRAMMING • JULY 15TH, 2024 31

Precedent Study of Proposed New Program Items *Exhibition Hall/Event Space*

Range of sizes: 1,262 - 4,530 SF Range of percent values: .75 - 4% of total area



Austin Central Library Austin, Texas



Hayward Library Hayward, California



2,262 SF 4% of total area



San Diego Public Library San Diego, California







Precedent Study of Proposed New Program Items

Media Lab (Maker Space / Tool Lending, Multimedia Production (Audio, Video, Podcast))

Range of sizes: 1,500 - 6,630 SF Range of percent values: 3% of total area



Hayward Library Hayward, California



1,500 SF 3% of total area



Missoula Public Library Missoula, Montana



3% of total area



6,630 SF 3% of total area







Precedent Study of Proposed New Program Items *Auditorium / Theater*

Range of sizes: 1,463 - 4,925 SF Range of percent values: 1 - 2% of total area





Austin Central Library Austin, Texas







4,925 SF 2% of total area


Precedent Study of Proposed New Program Items Outdoor Amenity

Range of sizes: 4,534- 9,982 SF Range of percent values: 4 - 5% of total area





4,534 SF 4% of total area

Missoula Public Library Missoula, Montana



Austin Central Library Austin, Texas





FEASIBILITY STUDIES

240812 Presentation

EXISITING LIBRARY SITE ZONING

First Community Survey - Preferred Modes of Transit



This transportation demographic data was taken from the First Community Survey (OLFS Initial Survey).

This data is being used as a guide for selecting potential locations for the new Oakland Main Library branch, based off of preferred user transportation methods.

Existing Library: Neighborhood Connectivity



Existi

Existing Oakland Main Library



Schools, Parks, Cultural Centers, Museums

- 1. American Indian Public Charter School
- 2. Lincoln Square Park
- 3. Family Bridges Lake Merritt Child Care Center
- 4. Islamic Cultural Center of Northern California
- 5. Belinda Reynolds, HeShe Music Studio

Public Parking Lots + Garages

Restaurants + Food 1. Blue Nile + Abu yemen 2. Good News Cafe 3. Gourmet Market 4. Fresh & Best II

Bus Stops

*Nearest BART Stations not shown on map: Lake Merritt + 12th Street BART Station

Commute from *BART Station to Library:

- Bus: 7 / 9 min.
- Drive: 4 / 3 min.
- Walking: 10 / 11 min.
- Biking: 5 / 3 min.

Existing Library: Zoning









Parcel Information

Parcel Number	002 008900100
APN	2-89-1
Address	125 14TH ST, OAKLAND 94612-4310
Existing Building SF	0
Lot Size SF	59,770
Primary Landuse within the Parcel	Exempt Public Agency

Zoning and General Plan

oning (Base Zone and Combining)	D-LM-4
leight - Commercial Corridor	N/A
General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan	Central Business District
Condominium Conversion Impact Area	Primary
mpact Fee Zone	Fee Zone 1
riority Development Areas	Downtown & Jack London Square

Administrative Information

City Council District	2	
Port of Oakland Jurisdiction	No	
Black Arts Movement Business District (BAMBD)	Yes	

Historic Resources Information

ocal Landmark	Local Register
ocal Historic District	Area of Primary Importance (Lake Merritt
OCHS Rating	A1+
Construction Date	1949-50
ocal Landmark	No

Environmental Information

Whipsnake Critical Habitat	No
Flood Zone	No
Liquefaction Hazard Zone	Yes, Liquefaction Severity M
Wildfire Assessment District	No

Alternative Sites: Selection Criteria

Existing Main Library Location

"I'd love for there to be more parking near the library, something I cannot find a parking spot and that keeps me from coming in."

"The Main Library feels somewhat cut off and distant, not integrated into the fabric of the city."

"...I don't always feel safe walking around near the area."

"It is an easy walk from anywhere in downtown Oakland."

Favorite Parts of Oakland to be Represented in the New Library

"Lake Merritt, the great food scene, celebrating the mix of cultures."

"Oakland based small businesses and local authors and artist's."

"Its industrial and artistic past. The look of downtown in the 20th century was beautiful."

'The multiculturalism and diversity of the city.'

Connection to regional parks/nature...

Selected Representative Responses from First Community Survey

Site Priorities and Scoring

Based on the Community survey and workshops, the following priorities were identified for selection and the evaluation of alternative site locations for the Main Library:



FUTURE PLANNING: PROSPECTIVE SITES

DOWNTOWN

125 E 12th St., Oakland 94606



- Proposed Oakland Main Library Option 1
- Schools, Parks, Cultural Centers, Museums
 - 1. Peralta Park
 - 2. Henry J. Kaiser Convention Center/Center of the Arts
 - 3. Oakland Museum of California
 - 4. Wilma Chan Park (Madison Square Park)
 - 5. Laney Community College
 - 6. La Escuelita Elementary School
 - 7. MetWest High School Dolores Huerta Campus
 8. Dewey Academy

Public Parking Lots + Garages

- Restaurants + Food
 - 1. Pho Huong Que
 - 2. Pho Vy Vietnamese Cuisine
 - 3. Mad Oak Bar 'N' Yard
- Nearest Bus Stops relative to Proposed Location

Nearest BART Station: Lake Merritt

Commute from BART Station to Proposed Location:

- Bus: 9 min.
- Drive: 2 min.
- Walking: 14 min.
- Biking: 5 min.

Commute from Existing Library to Proposed Location:

- Bus: 9 min.
- Drive: 4 min.
- Walking: 13 min.
- Biking: 5 min.

125 E 12th St., Oakland 94606









Parcel Information

Parcel Number	019 002701400
APN	19-27-14
Address	125 E 12th St, Oakland 94606-2781
Existing Building SF	0
Lot Size SF	40,276
Primary Landuse within the Parcel	Exempt Public Agency

Zoning and General Plan

Zoning (Base Zone and Combining)	D-LM-1, S-14, S-13	
Height - Commercial Corridor	N/A	
General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan	Urban Residential	
Condominium Conversion Impact Area	No	
Impact Fee Zone	Fee Zone 1	
Housing Element Opportunity Site 6th Cycle	Yes	

Administrative Information

City Council District	2
Port of Oakland Jurisdiction	No
Black Arts Movement Business District (BAMBD)	No

Historic Resources Information

Local Landmark	No
Environmental Information	
Whipsnake Critical Habitat	No
Flood Zone	No
Liquefaction Hazard Zone	Yes, Liquefaction Severity L
Wildfire Assessment District	No
Pros	Cons
Accesibile to families and schools	Isolated from downtown
Potential for a small dedicated parking lot on site	Limited parking available

Currently being used as an encampment center



1911 Telegraph Ave., Oakland 94612



- Proposed Oakland Main Library Option 2
- Schools, Parks, Cultural Centers, Museums
 1. Paramount Theater Oakland
 2. Alameda County Social Services
 3. Henry J. Kaiser Memorial Park
 4. Fox Theater / School of the Arts
 5. Oakland Ice Center
 6. Frank H. Ogawa Plaza

Public Parking Lots + Garages

Restaurants + Food

- 1. Tierra Mia Coffee
- 2. Shake Shack
- 3. Xolo Taqueria
- 4. Itani Ramen
- 5. World Famous HOTBOYS Chicken
- 6. Plenty
- 7. Shinmai

Nearest Bus Stops relative to Proposed Location

Nearest BART Station: 19th St Oakland

Commute from BART Station to Proposed Location:

- Bus: N/A
- Drive: 2 min.
- Walking: 6 min.
- Biking: 2 min.

Commute from Existing Library to Proposed Location:

- Bus: 13 min.
- Drive: 5 min.
- Walking: 19 min.
- Biking: 7 min.

Prospective Sites: Downtown - Option 2 1911 Telegraph Ave., Oakland 94612





Parcel Information

008 071605800
8-716-58
1911 TELEGRAPH AVE, OAKLAND 94612
0
45,122
Exempt Public Agency

Zoning and General Plan

oning (Base Zone and Combining)	CBD-R , S-14 , S-13	
leight - Central Business District	Height Area 6, no limit	
leight - Commercial Corridor	N/A	
Seneral Plan/Estuary Policy Plan	Central Business District	
Condominium Conversion Impact Area	No	
mpact Fee Zone	Fee Zone 1	
lousing Element Opportunity Site 6th Cycle	Yes	
Priority Development Areas	Downtown & Jack London Square	

Administrative Information

Historic Resources Information

OCHS Rating	F3	
Construction Date	1957	
Local Landmark	No	

Environmental Information

Whipsnake Critical Habitat	No
Flood Zone	No
Liquefaction Hazard Zone	Yes, Liquefaction Severity M
Wildfire Assessment District	No
Pros	Cons
Connected to downtown	Limited street parking
Local resources, food, and amenitites nearby	Not easily accessibile for families and nearby schoo
Close to public transit	

Site Criteria: Community Survey Selected Results + Scorecard



1800 San Pablo, Oakland 94612



Proposed Oakland Main Library - Option 2

Schools, Parks, Cultural Centers, Museums
 1. Paramount Theatre Oakland
 2. Alameda County Social Services
 3. Henry J. Kaiser Memorial Park
 4. Fox Theater / School of the Arts
 5. Oakland Ice Center
 6. Frank H. Ogawa Plaza

Public Parking Lots + Garages

Restaurants + Food 1. Tierra Mia Coffee 2. Shake Shack 3. Xolo Taqueria

- Itani Ramen
 World Famous HOTBOYS Chicken
- 6. Plenty

 \square

7. Shinmai

Q Nearest Bus Stops relative to Proposed Location

Nearest BART Station: 19th St Oakland

Commute from BART Station to Proposed Location:

- Bus: N/A
- Drive: 2 min.
- Walking: 7 min.
- Biking: 3 min.

Commute from Existing Library to Proposed Location:

- Bus: 15 min.
- Drive: 5 min.
- Walking: 20 min.
- Biking: 7 min.

Prospective Sites: Downtown - Option 3 1800 San Pablo, Oakland 94612





Parcel Information

Parcel Number	008 064201800
APN	8-716-58
Address	1800 SAN PABLO AVE, OAKLAND 94612
Existing Building SF	0
Lot Size SF	44,347
Primary Landuse within the Parcel	Exempt Public Agency

Zoning and General Plan

Zoning (Base Zone and Combining)	CBD-X , S-14 , S-13
Height - Central Business District	Height Area 6, no limit
Height - Commercial Corridor	N/A
General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan	Central Business District
Condominium Conversion Impact Area	No
Impact Fee Zone	Fee Zone 1
Housing Element Opportunity Site 6th Cycle	Yes
Priority Development Areas	Downtown & Jack London Square

Administrative Information

City Council District	3	_
Port of Oakland Jurisdiction	No	
Black Arts Movement Business District (BAMBD)	No	

Historic Resources Information

Local Historic Property Category	PDHP	
OCHS Rating	Eb+3	
Construction Date	1879-80	
Local Landmark	No	

Environmental Information

Whipsnake Critical Habitat	No
Flood Zone	No
Liquefaction Hazard Zone	Yes, Liquefaction Severity M
Wildfire Assessment District	No
Pros	Cons
Connection to downtown	Replacing an exisiting parking lot
Local resources, food, and amenities nearby	Not at the forefront of the main downtown stree
Close to public transit	Limited street parking

Site Criteria: Community Survey Selected Results + Scorecard



FILLING THE GAPS IN THE COMMUNITY

DISCUSSION

Current Branch Locations



FUTURE PLANNING: PROSPECTIVE SITES

EAST OAKLAND



Prospective Sites: Option 4 - East Oakland 1449 Miller Ave., Oakland 9501



Parcel Information

Parcel Number	
APN	20-153-6
Address	1449 MILLER AVE, OAKLAND CA, 95601
Existing Building SF	8,696
Lot Size SF	11,969
Primary Landuse within the Parcel	Exempt Public Agency

Zoning and General Plan

Zoning (Base Zone and Combining)	RM-2	
Height - Central Business District	N/A	
Height - Commercial Corridor	N/A	
General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan	N/A	
Condominium Conversion Impact Area	N/A	
Impact Fee Zone	N/A	
Housing Element Opportunity Site 6th Cycle	N/A	
Priority Development Areas	N/A	

Administrative Information

City Council District	5
Port of Oakland Jurisdiction	No
Black Arts Movement Business District (BAMBD)	No

Historic Resources Information

Local Historic Property Category	No	
OCHS Rating	No	
Construction Date	N/A	
Local Landmark	N/A	

Environmental Information

Whipsnake Critical Habitat	N/A.	
Flood Zone	N/A	
Liquefaction Hazard Zone	N/A	
Wildfire Assessment District	N/A	
Pros	Cons	

More residential, accesible to families and children Not central to downtown Not close to bart, but bus stops nearby Lack of local resources, food, and amenities nearby Limited street parking No connection to outdoors

Prospective Sites: Option 5 - East Oakland



Parcel Information

Parcel Number		
APN	21-244-2	
Address	E 19TH ST, OAKLAND CA, 94511	
Existing Building SF	0	
Lot Size SF	204,009	
Primary Landuse within the Parcel	City	

Zoning and General Plan

Zoning (Base Zone and Combining)	RM-2	
Height - Central Business District	N/A	
Height - Commercial Corridor	N/A	
General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan	N/A	
Condominium Conversion Impact Area	N/A	
Impact Fee Zone	N/A	
Housing Element Opportunity Site 6th Cycle	N/A	
Priority Development Areas	N/A	

Administrative Information

City Council District	5	
Port of Oakland Jurisdiction	No	
Black Arts Movement Business District (BAMBD)	No	

Historic Resources Information

Local Historic Property Category	No	
OCHS Rating	No	
Construction Date	N/A	
Local Landmark	N/A	

Environmental Information

amenities nearby
a

Library Feasibility Studies: Project Team Check In

Date: September 16, 2024



4.1. Opportunities and Constraints

Selection Criteria for Exisiting and Alternative Sites



Selected Representative Responses from First Community Survey

Preferred Modes of Transit



Summary:

The graphics on the left showcase selected responses from the First Community Survey (OFLS Inital Survey), as well as the preferred modes of transit from the current existing Oakland Main Library users.

We gathered that most users felt unsafe walking to the current location of the Main Library despite the ease of accessibility from it's proximate location to Downtown. Additionally, most users expressed a need for more parking as most users prefer to drive to the Library.

It should be highlighted that most users' favorite parts of Oakland that should be represented in the new library is it's industrial, historic, and artistic past. As well as it's significant and vast cultural connection and celebrating.

These findings were used as a guide to help determine the various priorities while finding alternative site locations.

Site Priorities and Scoring:

Based on the Community Survey and Workshops, the following priorities were identified for the selection and evaluation of alternative site locations for the Main Library. These priorites will be scored on a "(-) Negative/Minus" and "(+) Positive/Plus" scale-Positive/Plus meaning the priority was ranked high in that category, proving to be a favorable conditon for the selected alternative site.

The rankings were made on a self/peer evaluation and assumption made based off of nearby amenitites and building potential.



 \sim

Parking and Transportation		
	Close Proximity/Accessibility to Transit	
	On Site or Public Parking	
Neighborhood Amenities		
X -	Cultural Connection	
	Community Resources (Access to Social Services)	
Ψ¶	Proximity to Food/Restaurants	
Ē	Proximity to other local Amenities	
••••	Accessible to Family and Children (Nearby Schools)	
Other		
· · ··	Outdoor Space	

Safety

4.2.1. Main Library Options

Site Priorites and Scoring: Existing Library

125 14th Street, Oakland 94612



Site Criteria:

Community Survey Selected Results + Scorecard





Existing Oakland Main Library

Schools, Parks, Cultural Centers, Museums 1. American Indian Public Charter School

- 2. Lincoln Square Park
- 3. Family Bridges Lake Merritt Child Care Center
- 4. Islamic Cultural Center of Northern California
- 5. Belinda Reynolds, HeShe Music Studio



Public Parking Lots + Garages

(+)

Nearby BART station, short walk.

Limited on site parking, adjacent parking available.



Connection to Lake Merritt and other cultural centers. Not located nearby local community services. Food options nearby local community services. Near other amenities downtown. Nearby schools, accessible to children and families.



Located near Snow Park and Lake Merritt.

Reported that users felt the area could be safer.



Restaurants + Food

- 1. Blue Nile + Abu Yemen
- 2. Good News Cafe
- 3. Gourmet Market
- 4. Fresh & Best II

Bus Stops

* Nearest BART Stations not shown on map: Lake Merritt / 12th Street BART Station

Commute from *BART Station to Library: Bus: 7 / 9 min. Drive: 4 / 3 min. Walking: 10 / 11 min. Biking: 5 / 3 min.

4.2.2. Main Library Options

Site Data: Exisiting Library

125 14th Street, Oakland 94612









Parcel Information

Parcel Number APN Address **Existing Building SF** Lot Size SF Primary Landuse within the Parcel

Zoning and General Plan

Zoning (Base Zone and Combining Height - Commercial Corridor General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan

Condominium Conversion Impact Impact Fee Zone Priority Development Areas

Administrative Information

City Council District Port of Oakland Jurisdiction Black Arts Movement Business Di

Historic Resources Information

Local Landmark Local Historic District OCHS Rating **Construction Date** Local Landmark

Environmental Information

Whipsnake Critical Habitat Flood Zone Liquefaction Hazard Zone Wildfire Assessment District

	002 008900100
	2-89-1
	125 14TH ST, OAKLAND 94612-4310
	0
	59,770
10	Exempt Public Agency

g)	D-LM-4
	N/A
	Central Business District
t Area	Primary
	Fee Zone 1
	Downtown & Jack London Square

	2	
	No	
istrict (BAMBD)	Yes	

Local Register	
Area of Primary Importance (Lake Merr	itt)
A1+	
1949-50	
No	

No	
No	
Yes, Liquefaction Severity M	
No	

4.2.3. Main Library Options

Programming Option 1: Exisiting Site

125 14th Street, Oakland 94612





Total Area: 148,000 SF



4.2.4. Main Library Options

Programming Option 2: Existing Site + 1310 Oak Street





Total Area: Total Footprint:



4.2.5. Main Library Options

Site Priorites and Scoring: Option 3

1911 Telegraph Ave., Oakland 94612



Site Criteria:

Community Survey Selected Results + Scorecard





Will not drastically impact the Existing Library users' commute times.

Public parking garages available, limited street parking.



Connection to the public downtown buzz and other cultural establishments. Higher user attraction opportunity.

Near local social services and other businesses.

Plenty of food options nearby.

Central to other amenities downtown.

Central to downtown, not accessible to schools.



Located next to an existing park.



Bus Stops

Nearest bus stops relative to proposed location:

Nearest Bart Station: 19th Street Station

Commute from BART to Proposed Location: Bus: N/A Drive: 2 min. Walking: 6 min. Biking: 2 min.

Commute from Existing library to Proposed Location: Bus: 13 min. Drive: 5 min. Walking: 19 min. Biking: 7 min.

4.2.6. Main Library Options

Site Data: Option 3









Parcel Information

Parcel Number APN Address Existing Building SF Lot Size SF Primary Landuse within the Parcel

Zoning and General Plan

Zoning (Base Zone and Combining) Height - Central Business District Height - Commercial Corridor General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan Condominium Conversion Impact Are Impact Fee Zone Housing Element Opportunity Site 6th Priority Development Areas

Administrative Information

City Council District Port of Oakland Jurisdiction Black Arts Movement Business District

Historic Resources Information

OCHS Rating Construction Date Local Landmark

Environmental Information

Whipsnake Critical Habitat Flood Zone Liquefaction Hazard Zone Wildfire Assessment District

Pros

Connected to downtown Local resources, food, and amenitites Close to public transit

008 071605800	
8-716-58	
1911 TELEGRAPH AVE, OAKLAND 946	312
D	
45,122	
Exempt Public Agency	

	CBD-R , S-14 , S-13	
	Height Area 6, no limit	
	N/A	
	Central Business District	
ea	No	
	Fee Zone 1	
h Cycle	Yes	
	Downtown & Jack London Square	

	3	
	No	
ct (BAMBD)	No	

F3	
1957	
No	

	No
	No
	Yes, Liquefaction Severity M
	No
	Cons
	Limited street parking
nearby	Not easily accessibile for families and nearby schools

4.2.7. Main Library Options

Programming Option 3: 1911 Telegraph Ave.



Total Area: Toala Footprint:



Level 4

Level 3

Level 2

Level 1

4.1.1 Space Planning & Space Needs

Existing and Proposed: Area (SF) and Programming Assumptions

		Existing		Proposed		1
	PROGRAM ELEMENT	Area (SF)	Percentage of Total Area	Area (SF)	Percentage of Total Area	Delta
Public Collection	Special Audience: Children	2,953	4%	8,000	5%	5,047
Public Collection	Special Audience: Teens	2,400	3%	6,000	4%	3,600
Public Collection	Public Collection Materials (reference, periodicals, etc)	9,726	12%	12,000	8%	2,274
Public Collection	Special Collections (map room, history room)	2,812	3%	9,500	6%	6,688
Gathering	Public Gathering and Reading Areas	9,161	11%	23,700	16%	14,539
Gathering	Public Meeting Rooms	1,780	2%	5,500	4%	3,720
Gathering	Private & Semi-Private - Study Area	-	0%	1,800	1%	1,800
Exhibition	Art Gallery	-	0%	1,200	1%	1,200
Exhibition	Exhibition Hall / Event Space	-50	0%	2,500	2%	2,500
Exhibition	Auditorium / Theater		0%	4,600	3%	4,600
Collaboration	Café	÷	0%	1,500	1%	1,500
Collaboration	Children's Play Area	-	0%	2,000	1%	2,000
Collaboration	Media Lab (Music Production / Practice, Maker Space, Tool Lending Library)	-	0%	3,500	2%	3500
	Administrative Areas	10,362	1370	25,000	17.90	14,010
Staff Area	Technical Services (acquisitions, cataloging, processing)	6,566	8%	1,400	1%	(5,166)
Staff Area	BOH Collection Materials (stacks)	15,116	18%	1,500	1%	(13,616)
Staff Area	Library Services (reference, circulation)	4,155	5%	2,900	2%	(1,255)
Enviornment	Green Space - Exterior		0%	4,500	3%	4,500
Green Space	Green Space - Interior	·	0%	500	0%	500
Back Of House	Support spaces: BOH (MEP, storage)	7,545	9%	10,400	7%	2,855
Circulation	Circulation	9,404	11%	20,000	14%	10,596
	Totals	82,000		148,000		66,000

4.2.8. Potential East Oakland Site Locations





Superseded Main Library Option

Previously Proposed: Downtown

125 E 12th St., Oakland 94606

Site Criteria:

Community Survey Selected Results + Scorecard







Will not drastically imact the Existing Library users' commute times. Limted street parking.vv



Captures the connection to, and attraction of, Lake Merritt. Near Henry J. Kaiser Convention/ Center of the Arts

Lack of community resources nearby.

Lack of restaurants and food options nearby.

Lack of other local amenities.

Central to several schools ranging from elementary - community college



Across from Peralta Park and Lake Merritt

2. Pho Vy Vietnamese Cuisine 3. Mad Oak Bar 'N' Yard

Nearest BART Station: Lake Merritt

Commute from Existing to Proposed Location:

- Bus: 9 min.
- Drive: 4 min.
- · Walking: 13 min.
- · Biking: 5 min.

Superseded Main Library Option

Previously Proposed: Downtown

125 E 12th St., Oakland 94606



Parcel Information

Parcel Number APN Address **Existing Building SF** Lot Size SF Primary Landuse within the Parcel

Zoning and General Plan

Zoning (Base Zone and Combining) Height - Commercial Corridor General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan Condominium Conversion Impact Area Impact Fee Zone Housing Element Opportunity Site 6th Cycle

Administrative Information

City Council District Port of Oakland Jurisdiction Black Arts Movement Business District (BAMBE

Historic Resources Information

Local Landmark

Environmental Information

Whipsnake Critical Habitat Flood Zone Liquefaction Hazard Zone Wildfire Assessment District

Pros

Accesibile to families and schools Potential for a small dedicated parking lot on si

019 002701400 19-27-14 125 E 12th St, Oakland 94606-2781 0 40,276 **Exempt Public Agency**

D-LM-1, S-14, S-13 N/A **Urban Residential** No Fee Zone 1 Yes

	2			
	No			
D)	No			

No

Cons

	Isolated from downtown
ite	Limited parking available
	Currently being used as an encampment cente
Superseded Main Library Options

Previously Proposed: Downtown

1800 San Pablo, Oakland CA 94612



Site Criteria:

Community Survey Selected Results + Scorecard

	Parking and Transportation (-)		
	Close Proximity/Accessibility to Transit		Will not drastically imact the Existing Libr users' commute times.
	On Site or Public Parking		Public parking garages available, limited s parking.
	Neighborhood Amenities		
¥-	Cultural Connection		Connection to the public downtown buzz cultural establishmnets. Higher user attrac opportunities. Nott at the forefront of the town area.
	Community Resources (Access to Social Services)		Near local social services and other busine
11	Proximity to Food/Restaurants		Plenty of food options nearby.
P	Proximity to other local Amenities		Central to other amenities downtown.
;	Accessible to Family and Children (Nearby Schools)		Central to downtown, not accessible to so
	Other		
¢.	Outdoor Space		Parks and Lake Merritt nearby.
6	Safety		
Pro Sch 1 2 3 4 5 6	posed Oakland Main Library - Option 3 ools, Parks, Cultural Centers, Museums Paramount Theatre Oakland Alameda County Social Services Henry J. Kaiser Memorial Park Fox Theater / School of the Arts Oakland Ice Center Frank H. Ogawa Plaza	 Restaurants + Food 1. Tierra Mia Coffee 2. Shake Shack 3. Xolo Taqueria 4. Itani Ramen 5. World Famous HOTBOY 6. Plenty 7. Shinmai Nearest Bus Stops relative to 	'S Chicken Proposed Location
Pub	lic Parking Lots + Garages	Nearest BART Station: 19th S	t Oakland
		Commute from BART Station to Proposed Location: • Bus: N/A • Drive: 2 min. • Walking: 7 min. • Biking: 3 min.	Commute from Existing Lib to Proposed Location: • Bus: 15 min. • Drive: 5 min. • Walking: 20 min. • Biking: 7 min.



OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY | MAIN LIBRARY FEASIBILITY STUDY • DECEMBER 20, 2024

Superseded Main Library Options

Previously Proposed: Downtown

1800 San Pablo, Oakland CA 94612



Parcel Information

Parcel Number APN Address **Existing Building SF** Lot Size SF Primary Landuse within the Parcel

Zoning and General Plan

Zoning (Base Zone and Combining) Height - Central Business District Height - Commercial Corridor General Plan/Estuary Policy Plan Condominium Conversion Impact Area Impact Fee Zone Housing Element Opportunity Site 6th Priority Development Areas

Administrative Information

City Council District Port of Oakland Jurisdiction Black Arts Movement Business District

Historic Resources Information

Local Historic Property Category **OCHS** Rating Construction Date Local Landmark

Environmental Information

Whipsnake Critical Habitat Flood Zone Liquefaction Hazard Zone Wildfire Assessment District

Pros

Connection to downtown Local resources, food, and amenities r Close to public transit

008 064201800	
8-716-58	
1800 SAN PABLO AVE, OAKLAND 94612	
0	
44,347	
Exempt Public Agency	

	CBD-X , S-14 , S-13	
	Height Area 6, no limit	
	N/A	
	Central Business District	
3	No	
	Fee Zone 1	
Cycle	Yes	
	Downtown & Jack London Square	

	3	
	No	
(BAMBD)	No	

PDHP
Eb+3
1879-80
No

No
No
Yes, Liquefaction Severity M
No
Cons

	Replacing an exisiting parking lot
nearby	Not at the forefront of the main downtown stree
	Limited street parking

Superseded Main Library Option

Previously Proposed: East Oakland

710 73rd Ave., Oakland, CA 94621



Site Criteria:

Community Survey Selected Results + Scorecard





Potential for onsite outdoor space.



Bus Stops

Nearest bus stops relative to proposed location:

Nearest Bart Station: Coliseum Bart Station

Commute from BART to Proposed Location: Bus: N/A Drive: 2 min. Walking: 5 min. Biking: 2 min.

Commute from Existing library to Proposed Location: Bus: 23 min. Drive: 16 min. Walking: 1h 55m min. Biking: 28 min.

Superseded Main Library Option

Previously Proposed Option: Downtown

710 73rd Ave., Oakland, CA 94621







Precedent Studies

Mixed Use Apartment Complex - 1911 Telegraph Ave.

https://sfyimby.com/2021/12/notice-of-availability-for-1911-telegraph-avenue-downtown-oakland.html



The Oakland Planning Commission has given public notice for developers to submit plans for 1911 Telegraph Avenue, Downtown **Oakland.** Previously called Uptown Parcel 4, the 1.04-acres of undeveloped land could see the construction of a new mixed-use apartment complex with hundreds of apartments. The noticing period ended on January 4th of 2022.

Mid-rise apartment proposal or 1911 Telegraph Avenue, developed by Sares Regis Group

According to the city, "at least 25% of proposed residential units must be affordable to lowerincome households." The city also advises that the proposals be mixed-use with housing and ground-floor retail. This is a revision from previous notices of availability when the city had suggested that a hotel component be built.

1911 Telegraph Avenue spans 45,120 square feet. The maximum density for the property is currently zoned for 90 square feet per dwelling unit, and there is no height limit. The base proposal could reach 501 units, though the project could conceivably exceed zoning with the State Density Bonus program. There is not a developer in place for this site currently.



1911 Telegraph is located on the same lot as the Henry Kaiser Memorial Park, across from the Uptown Apartments, Fox Theater, and a block away from the 19th Street BART station. Many AC Transit bus stops are also available nearby.

4.2.7 Main Library Options

Program Options 3: 710 73rd Ave.



Site Criteria:

Community Survey Selected Results + Scorecard

	Parking and Transportation
	Close Proximity/Accessibility to Transit
	On Site or Public Parking
	Neighborhood Amenities
*	Cultural Connection
-	Community Resources (Access to Social Services)
Ψ¶	Proximity to Food/Restaurants
冊	Proximity to other local Amenities
44	Accessible to Family and Children (Nearby Schools)
	Other
*	Outdoor Space
6	Safety
9	Proposed Oakland Main Library
0	Schools, Parks, Cultural Centers 1. Oakland Coliseum
0	
Y	Public Parking Lots + Garages
9	Restaurants + Food 1. Coliseum Burger n Piz
	Ũ



Potential for onsite outdoor space.



Bus Stops

Nearest bus stops relative to proposed location:

Nearest Bart Station: Coliseum Bart Station

Commute from BART to Proposed Location: Bus: N/A Drive: 2 min. Walking: 5 min. Biking: 2 min.

Commute from Existing library to Proposed Location: Bus: 23 min. Drive: 16 min. Walking: 1h 55m min. Biking: 28 min.

4.2.7. Main Library Options

Programming Option 3.1: 710 73rd Ave.





Total Area: 33,000 SF



4.2.7. Main Library Options

Programming Option 3.2: 710 73rd. Ave.







4.2.7. Main Library Options

Programming Option 3.3: 710 73rd Ave.







4.1.1 Space Planning & Space Needs

Existing and Proposed: Area (SF) and Programming Assumptions

		Existing		Proposed		
	PROGRAM ELEMENT	Area (SF)	Percentage of Total Area	Area (SF)	Percentage of Total Area	Delta
Public Collection	Special Audience: Children	2,953	4%	8,000	5%	5,047
Public Collection	Special Audience: Teens	2,400	3%	6,000	4%	3,600
Public Collection	Public Collection Materials (reference, periodicals, etc)	9,726	12%	12,000	8%	2,274
Public Collection	Special Collections (map room, history room)	2,812	3%	9,500	6%	6,688
Gathering	Public Gathering and Reading Areas	9,161	11%	23,700	16%	14,539
Gathering	Public Meeting Rooms	1,780	2%	5,500	4%	3,720
Gathering	Private & Semi-Private - Study Area	-	0%	1,800	1%	1,800
Exhibition	Art Gallery	2	0%	1,200	1%	1,200
Exhibition	Exhibition Hall / Event Space	.50	0%	2,500	2%	2,500
Exhibition	Auditorium / Theater	-	0%	4,600	3%	4,600
Collaboration	Café	÷	0%	1,500	1%	1,500
Collaboration	Children's Play Area	-	0%	2,000	1%	2,000
Collaboration	Media Lab (Music Production / Practice, Maker Space, Tool Lending Library)	-	0%	3,500	2%	3500
Administration	Administrative Areas	10,382	13%	25,000	17%	14,618
Staff Area	Technical Services (acquisitions, cataloging, processing)	6,566	8%	1,400	1%	(5,166)
Staff Area	BOH Collection Materials (stacks)	15,116	18%	1,500	1%	(13,616)
Staff Area	Library Services (reference, circulation)	4,155	5%	2,900	2%	(1,255)
Enviornment	Green Space - Exterior		0%	4,500	3%	4,500
Green Space	Green Space - Interior	•	0%	500	0%	500
Back Of House	Support spaces: BOH (MEP, storage)	7,545	9%	10,400	7%	2,855
Circulation	Circulation	9,404	11%	20,000	14%	10,596
	Totals	82,000		148,000		66,000

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY | MAIN LIBRARY FEASIBILITY STUDY • NOVEMBER 4, 2024 35

R ehdd.

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY | MAIN LIBRARY FEASIBILITY STUDY • DECEMBER 20, 2024

Oakland Public Library Main Library Feasibilty Study

First Community Survey Results Summary

OAKLAND PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT #1004858

First Draft: June 14th, 2024 Second Draft: July 15th, 2024

Introduction:



Purpose:

Community Survey Number 1 was an online (Digital) survey designed to connect with the entirety of the Oakland Public Library user base. The survey was designed to be breif enough to be quick to complete, while touching on the range of topics and issues the study team considered important for this preliminary (wide) survey. The intent was to gauge the communities current reasons for using the Library, things that might be preventing or limiting current use, and possible ways that the Library could better support the community.

Survey Design:

The study team workshoped questions with the OPW / OPL team representatives, and solicited feedback from the Study Advisory Committee. The questions were designed to be clear enough to prompt responses, but open-ended enough to avoid limiting the range of responses. The final list of questions is represented to the right. In addition, the study team requested participants to fill out demographic questions after they responded to the survey questions.

Attracting Respondents:

The study team used the project mailing list to invite anyone who had registered to complete the survey. The study team also promoted the survey at community workshops and street lab visits during the period that the survey was open, and also promoted on social media and in local physical digital signage. The OPL also promoted the survey via their monthly newsletter.



Results:

The initial survey was opened October 11th, 2023 and ran through May of 2024. Please see the summary of the statistics for the online activity below:

Views	1,946	
Starts	951	(Conversion Rate: 48.86%)
Submissions	569	(Completion Rate: 59.8%)

The average time to complete the survey was just under 16 minutes, indicating that the goal to keep the time to repsond reasonable was fairly sucessful

The survey was presented using the online tool Typeform (www.typeform.com). Samples of the response screens are represented above and to the right. Analysis of the responses are visualized on the following pages, and the complete list of responses will be attached to this report as an Appendix. The study team used Microsoft Power BI to visualize the survey data and open source Python / Jupyter notebook based Text Summary to produce visualizations and Geographic Analysis software to visualize the response zipcodes.

In addition, please see the distinct summary and analysis of the Demographic date that was collected on page 13.

1 → How often do you visit the Main Library? A Daily @ Weekly @ Monthly: @ Yearly. @ I don't visit the Main Library @ I don't visit the Main Library	6. What are your favorite parts of Oakland that should be represented more in the Main Library? Type your answer here OK Reversity Type
3+> Why might you choose to visit the future Main Library instead of your local branch library? Type your answer here	■→ How could the Main Library help in times of crisis? Type your answer here OK

Survey Questions:

instead of your local branch library?

or why not?

at the Main Library?

represented more in the Main Library?

communities?



- *Question 1: How often do you visit the Main Library?*
- *Question 2: What keeps you from visiting the Main Library?*
- Question 3: I think the Library is a good place for...
- Question 4: Why might you choose to visit the future Main Library
- Question 5: Does the Main Library feel accessible and inclusive? Why
- Question 6: What additional activities or services would you like to see
- *Question 7: What are your favorite parts of Oakland that should be*
- Question 8: How could the Main Library better connect with Oakland
- Question 9: How could the Main Library help in times of crisis? *Question 10: Is there anything else you'd like to let us know?*

Question 1: How often do you visit the Main Library?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 1 served to gauge the current use on the Main Library among the survey audience.

Results:

All of the survey respondents had to answer Question 1 to continue.

Analysis:

With 31% of the respondents reporting that they visit yearly, and 18% reporting that they don't visit, roughly half of the survey respondents do not regularly visit the Main Library.



Key Takeaways:

 Many survey respondents are not visiting the Main Library as regularly as in the past

Question 2: What keeps you from visiting the Main Library?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 2 served to gauge the reasons that might be limiting use of the Main Library among the survey audience.

Results:

103 out of 569 responses = 18% percent (Low)

467 words in responses (4.5 words / response)

Top words used in responses: branch, library, parking, closer, visit, live, use, main, books

Analysis:

With only 18% of the audience reporting that they don't visit the Main Library (Q1), it's clear that the survey audiance may be over-represented with current Library users, which is likely an explanation for the limited number of responses to this Question (only 18% response rate). However, the feedback of what limited the respondant's use does align with feedback in some of the other Questions (including no longer needing access to physical books, preference to visit closer branches, and concerns about the Downtown location).

Selected Representative Responses:

"It's very old and dated. It's out of the way for me, so I go to my branch, which is Piedmont Ave."

"Crime, parking, branch library is closer."

"No requirement to go to library. The programming isn't appealing."

"Live near San Leandro, in Oakland. I go to my local branch."

"Inconvenient. I use the on line services. Post lock down I was put off by reinstating the mask mandate."

"I no longer read physical books."

"There are closer library branches that meet my needs."

Key Takeaways:

- Library users are are consuming more books electronically.
- Some current Library users are not being drawn to the Main Library by it's larger collection, and prefer to visit and get books delivered to their local branches.
- Crime and Safety concerns, as well as transportation and parking, impact users interest in visiting the Main Library



Wordcloud Visualization of the responses to Question 2, with word size reflecting frequency of appearance



Question 3: I think the Library is a good place for...

Response Summary

Purpose:

This open ended question was designed to let users identify what the Library could be, in addition to allowing for an unstructured opportunity to provide feedback about the current strenths of the Library.

Results:

565 out of 569 responses = 99 percent (High)

2,921 words in responses (5.2 words / response)

Top words used in responses: books, community, finding, reading, research, getting, learning, new, studying, information

Analysis:

Even though the Question was phased in an open ended way, most of the top ten responses focussed on books, research, information and learning. The next most common group of responses focussed on culture, community and events.

Selected Representative Responses:

"Having a safe space, getting all the books!"

"Studying, doing homework, just a safe place"

"Reserving/borrowing books."

"Public Programs"

"Finding books, doing research, consulting with experts."

"A quiet place to be in public. Attending interesting events. Learning."

"I work or read my own book there."

"Culture, curiousity."

"Being a part of your community and outlet for books."

Key Takeaways:

- Most responses either focus on books, reading, studying, learning or access to expert help in finding information
- Next most common topics are events, programs and culture



Wordcloud Visualization of the responses to Question 3, with word size reflecting frequency of appearance

Question 4: Why might you choose to visit the future Main Library instead of your local branch library?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 4 was designed to identify the respondent's vison for the Main Library as distinct from the local Branches.

Results:

565 out of 569 responses = 99 percent (High)

3,094 words in responses (5.4 words / response)

Top words used in responses: books, selection, branch, events, local, history, room, larger

Analysis:

The three most common groups of responses centered around:

1) The wider range of collection items (including special collections like the History and Music rooms)

2) Special Programs and Events

3) A sub-set of respondants who highlighted that the Main is their local branch, based on proximity / location.

Selected Representative Responses:

"Main library offers more children events."

"Like tools or fancy printers?: Or at least, local" but more visitable than Embarcadero. For finding books which aren't carried in the branch library."

"For exhibits and talks. A wider selection of books and historical information."

"The main library is my local branch. The main library is closest to me."

"Community Events, author events"

"Open in the evening"

"The special collections."

"Event programming"

Key Takeaways:

- Enhanced Children and Teen Programs are major draws.
- Adult events and programs are draws as well.
- Expanded Collection and Special Collections (including the History and Map Rooms) and the special expertise of the staff that support them are also attractions





Question 5: Does the Main Library feel accessible and inclusive? Why or why not?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 5 was intended to understand the respondant's feelings about accessibility and inclusivity of the Main Library.

Results:

550 out of 569 responses = 96.6 percent (High)

4,236 words in responses (7.7 words / response)

Top words used in responses: yes, accessible, feels, inclusive, library, parking, feel, people, main

Analysis:

The most frequent response included "yes" (234 out of the 565 responses, or 42%).

Selected Representative Responses:

"For example, story time is often in multiple languages."

"It is an easy walk from anywhere in downtown Oakland."

"Lovely friendly staff"

"Yes, plenty of space to sit and relax"

"Handicapped ramp makes it easy to get in."

"Oakland crime is the issue."

"Could be more serene and inviting"

"Yes. I like how open and airy the space is."

"It's pretty good. Same stains on the walls for months at a time. And the door buttons don't always work."

Key Takeaways:

- Main positive answers highlight location, multi-lingual services and staff
- Main negative answers focus on facilities and maintenance





with word size reflecting frequency of appearance

Question 6: What additional activities or services would you like to see at the Main Library?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 6 was designed to attract responses about services and programs that might attract more visits to the Main Library

Results:

482 out of 569 responses = 84.7 percent (Medium)

3,833 words in responses (7.9 words / response)

Top words used in responses: events, community, book, space, activities, programs, services, author

Analysis:

Three of the most common words in responses (events (#1), activities (#4) and programs (#5) plus a fourth one (classes) are present in more than a quarter of responses which center around goals for more regular and more engaging programming / events. There is a significant minority of responses that highlight interest in author talks / redings (expecially local authors).

Key Takeaways:

Consider how best to support regular, engaging events and programs.

Selected Representative Responses:

"Especially incorporating a seed bank like the Golden Gate Branch has. More advertising of services."

"Movie showings, also, how about zine-making services (not just one-off workshops)? Proud representation of the 99%."

"More author talks or programs in the afternoon" or weekends. Tables for group work. The Main Austin Library (in Austin, Texas) would be a good model. Tool library would be great too."

"Larger kids area"

"More multicultural activities for the larger" community. Special computer areas instead of in the middle of the stacks."

"Activated outdoor space."

"Services there are broad and meet a variety of needs."



with word size reflecting frequency of appearance

Question 7: What are your favorite parts of Oakland that should be represented more in the Main Library?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 7 was designed to explore areas that the survey audience might see as under-represented in the current Library, or new areas to explore for representation.

Results:

462 out of 569 responses, 81 percent (Medium)

2,958 words in responses (6.4 words / response)

Top words used in responses: history, diversity, art, culture, local, community, people, love, neighborhood, music

Analysis:

Response to this question was split, with some respondants recommending areas for representation, while others responded that representation should not be prioritized over the core functions of providing access to books and information.

Selected Representative Responses:

"The history room does a great job now."

"I love how strong the community is, especially the arts" community in Oakland. It would be incredible to see that more reflected in the Main Library."

"Focus on books, not parts of Oakland."

"The beauty and history of our great city."

"Lake Merritt, the great food scene, celebrating the mix of cultures"

"Diversity. Population Statistics. Music, music history, access to music machines"

"History of the city and region. It's all about the books," which are currently displayed well."

"Oakland based small businesses and local authors and artists.'

"Oakland folks have transformed the world. Maybe being welcomed by hello is 50 different languages would be cool."

Key Takeaways:

Consider how to showcase the artistic and musical history and culture of Oakland in the Main Library



with word size reflecting frequency of appearance

Question 8: How could the Main Library better connect with Oakland communities?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 8 served to explore the survey respondants views on how the Library can connect better.

Results:

452 out of 569 responses, 79 percent (Medium)

3,698 words in responses (8.18 words / response)

Top words used in responses: event, community, people, local, outreach, space, better, sure, school, program

Analysis:

The most common words in responses all highlighted either the Library organizing events to encourage more engagement at the Library, or the Library participating in community events, including at schools. "Sure" appeared in the top ten, almost exclusively linked to "not sure" responses.

Selected Representative Responses:

"More activities to invite the community to."

"I know many people who don't know where the libraries are."

"Main is isolated and downtown is dirty. *Consider a seed library, or a get together of some* sort."

"Have a great online portal"

"School trips to local libraries. Let community groups know about free meeting spaces. A "What's at the Library" page should have a prominent link right in front. Earlier hours for school field trips. Again, I really like the events, offer many sessions of the same event."

"People from the branches don't like traveling there because of lack of parking."

Key Takeaways:

How can the facilities support both Library and Community events?



Wordcloud Visualization of the responses to Question 8, with word size reflecting frequency of appearance

Question 9: How could the Main Library help in times of crisis?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 9 was intended to focus on the role Libraries often play in supporting communities during difficult times, with out being so specific as to limit the possible responses.

Results:

468 out of 569 responses, 82 percent

3,775 words in responses (8.07 words / response)

Top words used in responses: resource, information, provide, place, community, shelter, crisis, people, food, service

Analysis:

The majority of respondants hilighted that the Library could serve the community in times of crisis by providing inormation and pointing people to resources. A group of responses also envisioned the Library providing more supporting services on site, either directly or in conjunciton with other agencies. A small group of respondants questioned the idea that the Libary should serve any role beyond providing books and information.

Selected Representative Responses:

"Childcare"

"The library is the home of public information. *Like in the teen area they have tampons, water,* snacks, etc."

"Hosting community resources for tabling events." Let your love light shine, sisters!"

"Continue to offer food and space for the low" income and homeless. This is a great question. distribute food and water. Hold a safe space for those in need."

"Clearly there is a need to help the homeless." How is Oakland Library dealing with rising unhorsed and property crime?"

"The staff are telling you they are in crisis. It can be a place of refuge and safety for those who need it."

"Do what libraries do best: provide information."

Key Takeaways:

- Clear support for the Library to (continue) to serve as a information resource during times of crisis
- Consider how the Library facilities can support people's pyhsical needs in both everyday and rare moments of crisis



with word size reflecting frequency of appearance



Question 10: Is there anything else you'd like to let us know?

Response Summary

Purpose:

Question 10 was an open ended question to allow for unprogrammed responses that weren't identified with the other survey questions.

Results:

397 out of 569 responses, 70 percent (Medium)

4,472 words in responses (11.26 words / response)

Top words used in responses: love, need, people, Thanks, libraries, building, book, space, community, great

Analysis:

99 of the respondents (or almost a third) took this question as an opportinuty to express their love of OPL, or Libraries more generally. A significant minority took the opportunity to highlight their support of either the current building, or at least the current location.

Key Takeaways:

• The OPL is beloved in the community!

Selected Representative Responses:

"I think a vital main library is important. The main library site is a constant in our city's history."

"OPL Main has a GREAT collection- maybe you need to publicize this. Appreciate everything you do!"

"Too many homeless. Need for a place to chill out while waiting ."

"Please don't move the Oakland Main Library from the 14th street location. That would be horrible for the community."

"I love the main library!"

"We are excited to support the Main Library as a newly re-imagined resource."

"Collaborate with the Oakland Museum in the use of their green space."



Wordcloud Visualization of the responses to Question 10, with word size reflecting frequency of appearance

Content Questions Summary

Key Takeaways:

Many survey respondents are not visiting the Main Library as regularly as in the past

Library users are are consuming more books electronically.

Some current Library users are not being drawn to the Main Library by it's larger collection, and prefer to visit and get books delivered to their local branches.

Crime and Safety concerns, as well as transportation and parking, impact users interest in visiting the Main Library

Most responses to "I think the Library is a good place for..." either focus on books, reading, studying, learning or access to expert help in finding information. Next most common topics are events, programs and culture

Enhanced Children and Teen Programs are major draws. Adult events and programs are draws as well.

Expanded Collection and Special Collections (including the History and Map Rooms) and the special expertise of the staff that support them are also attractions.

Consider how best to support regular, engaging events and programs.

Consider how to showcase the artistic and musical history and culture of Oakland in the Main Library

How can the facilities support both Library and Community events?

Consider how to showcase the artistic and musical history and culture of Oakland in the Main Library

Clear support for the Library to (continue) to serve as a information resource during times of crisis

Consider how the Library facilities can support people's pyhsical needs in both everyday and rare moments of crisis.

Proposed Changes to Main Library: Private and Semi-Private Study / Work Spaces Auditorium / Theater Art Gallery / Exhibition Hall Coffee Shop / Cafe Maker / Tool Space **Interior Green Space Exterior Green Spaces**





Geographic Coverage

Analysis

450 out of 569 (or 79%) of respondants elected to provide their zip code. The survey received responses from all of the ZIp Code that make up Oakland, and strong responses from Emeryville and Piedmont, so covered the areas that make up the OPL service district. In additon, there were responses from a number of neighboring zip codes, including Berkely, San Francisco, and also responses from as far away as Santa Monica and Washington State.



Count of Zip Code by What do you call the neighborhood you live in?

Respondants by Zip Code





Survey Demographic Data



Race



Household Size



Language



ehdd



Demographic Data: Race

Age (OLFS Initial Survey)

Age (US Census Bureau ACS Survey 2020)





Age Group

Demographic Data: Age



ehdd

Demographic Data: Transportation

Transporation (OLFS Initial Survey)

$18 \rightarrow$ How do you get to the Main Library?



Motorcycle 0.28%

🐕 ehdd.

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY | MAIN LIBRARY FEASIBILITY STUDY • DECEMBER 20, 2024





HISTORIC RESOURCE ASSESSMENT OAKLAND MAIN LIBRARY

125 14TH STREET OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA [20164]

PREPARED FOR EHDD June 2, 2023

DRAFT



This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
Methodology	1
Summary of Findings	1
II. EXISTING HISTORIC STATUS	3
National Register of Historic Places	3
California Register of Historical Resources	3
California Historical Resource Status Codes	3
City of Oakland Landmarks	4
Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey Ratings	4
Previous Evaluations	6
III. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION	7
Exterior	7
Interior	16
Site Features	22
Surrounding area	22
IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT	25
Brief History of Oakland	25
Oakland Public Library	29
The Oakland Civic Center	32
Architects Chester H. Miller and Carl I. Warnecke	35
Late Moderne Architectural Style	37
V. SITE HISTORY	39
Site Development	39
Design and Construction	41
Alterations	47
Ownership and Occupant History	48
VI. EVALUATION	53
California Register of Historical Resources	53
Integrity	55
CEQA Status of 125 14 th Street	58
Character-Defining Features	59
VII. CONCLUSION	60
Preparer Qualifications	60
VIII. REFERENCES	61

I. INTRODUCTION

This Historic Resource Assessment (HRA) of the Oakland Main Library at 125 14th Street in Oakland (APN 002-009800100) has been prepared for the City of Oakland as part of the Main Library Feasibility Study. Completed in 1951 and designed by architects Miller and Warnecke, the building occupies a rectangular shaped 1.37-acre parcel bounded by 14th, 13th, Madison, and Oak streets, within the City of Oakland's Lake Merritt Area of Primary Importance (API). The concrete building was designed by architects Chester Miller and Carl Warnecke.

Methodology

This report provides a summary of the current historic status of the Oakland Main Library at 125 14th Street, a brief building description, historic context, evaluation according to the eligibility standards for the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), and list of character-defining features. Page & Turnbull prepared this report using research collected at various local repositories, including the Oakland Planning & Building Department and the Oakland Public Library's Oakland History Center, as well as various online sources including Ancestry.com, the California Digital Newspaper Collection, and Newspapers.com. Page & Turnbull staff conducted site visits to 125 14th Street on September 15 and December 30, 2022. All photographs in this report were taken on those dates unless otherwise noted.

Summary of Findings

Page & Turnbull assessed the existing historic status of the Oakland Main Library, located at 125 14th Street, and evaluated the building for eligibility for listing in the California Register. The Main Library building appears to be significant under California Register Criterion 1 (Events) for its association with postwar civic development in Oakland and Criterion 3 (Architecture) as a good example of a library designed in a Late Moderne style. It retains all aspects of integrity, and has a period of significance of 1951, the year of its completion. Additionally, the building is included in Oakland's Local Register of Historical Resources (Local Register) and is a contributor to the Lake Merritt API. As such, the Main Library Building at 125 14th Street is considered a historical resource for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Its retained exterior and interior characterdefining features, including its construction materials, fenestration patterns, associated site features, and central hall finishes convey the building's 1951 construction date and significant associations.



Figure 1: Aerial view of 125 14th Street, library building shaded red. Source: Google Maps, 2022, edited by Page & Turnbull.



Figure 2: Assessor's map, parcel of 125 14th Street shaded red. Source: Alameda County Assessor's Office, edited by Page & Turnbull.

II. EXISTING HISTORIC STATUS

The following section examines the national, state, and local historic status currently assigned to the Main Library building at 125 14th Street.

National Register of Historic Places

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the nation's most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level.

125 14th Street is not listed in the National Register.

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places.

125 14th Street is not listed in the California Register.

California Historical Resource Status Codes

Properties listed or under review by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation are listed within the Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD) and are assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code (Status Code) of "1" to "7" to establish their historical significance in relation to the National Register or California Register.¹ Properties with a Status Code of "1" or "2" are either eligible for listing in the California Register or the National Register, or are already listed in one or both of the registers. Properties assigned Status Codes of "3" or "4" appear to be eligible for listing in either register, but normally require more research to support this rating. Properties assigned a Status Code of "5" have typically been determined to be locally significant or to have contextual importance. Properties with a Status Code of "6" are not eligible for listing in either register. Finally,

¹ California State Office of Historic Preservation, Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD), Alameda County, updated March 2020.
a Status Code of "7" means that the resource has not been evaluated for the National Register or the California Register or needs reevaluation.

125 14th Street is not currently listed in the BERD database for Alameda County with a status code. The most recent update to the BERD database is dated September 23, 2022.

City of Oakland Landmarks

City of Oakland Historic Landmarks are the most prominent historic properties in the city. They may be designated for historical, cultural, educational, architectural, aesthetic, or environmental value. They are nominated by their owners, the City, or the public and are designated after public hearings by the Landmarks Board, Planning Commission, and City Council. According to the Historic Preservation Element of Oakland's General Plan, adopted 1994, properties eligible for landmark status include those which are assigned a rating of A or B through evaluation according to the City of Oakland Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Evaluation Sheet for Landmark Eligibility.² Developed prior to establishment of the California Register, the criteria for landmark eligibility closely correspond to the National Register criteria for significance, as well as requirements for integrity.

125 14th Street is not listed as a City of Oakland Landmark.

Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey Ratings

The Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS), established in 1981, evaluates the historic significance of individual properties in the city according to a five-tiered alphanumeric system. The categories, ratings, and guidelines for interpretation that are used by the OCHS closely parallel those presented in *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, Section IV, "How to Identify the Type of Significance of a Property;" and Section V, "How to Determine if a Property has Integrity."³

The alphabetical portion, the Individual Property Rating, is based on evaluation of a property according to the following four criteria:

• <u>Visual Quality/Design</u>: Evaluation of exterior design, interior design, materials and construction, style or type, supporting elements, feelings of association, and importance of designer.

² City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan: Historic Preservation Element (Oakland, October 1993), Appendix D.

³ National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1997).

Historic Resource Assessment – Draft Project Number 20164

- <u>History/Association</u>: Association of person or organization, the importance of any event, association with patterns of history, and the age of the building.
- <u>Context</u>: Continuity and familiarity of the building within the city, neighborhood, or district.
- <u>Integrity and Reversibility</u>: Evaluation of the building's condition, its exterior and interior alterations, and any structural removals.

Evaluated properties are assigned an Individual Property Rating corresponding to their ability to meet these criteria as follows:

- A. Highest importance (Outstanding architectural example or of extreme historical importance);
- B. Major importance (Fine architectural example or of major historical importance);
- C. Secondary importance (Superior or visually important architectural example, or very early);
- D. Minor importance (Representative architectural example);
- E. Of no particular interest; and
- F. Less than 45 years old or modernized.

A building's rating in its existing condition is expressed as a capital letter. Contingency ratings, expressed after the rating as a lower-case letter, indicate a potential rating under certain conditions. Contingency ratings may be applied to buildings whose rating would change with restoration or increased age, or for which additional information is needed.

A property's relationship to an Area of Primary or Secondary Importance is expressed as part of its rating in numeric form as follows:

- 1. Located in an Area of Primary Importance or National Register quality district;
- 2. Located in an Area of Secondary Importance, or district of local interest; and
- 3. Not located in a historic district.

City of Oakland Areas of Primary Importance, or APIs, and Areas of Secondary Importance, or ASIs, are defined by the city's Historic Preservation element as follows:

<u>Area or Primary Importance (API).</u> A historically or visually cohesive area or property group identified by the Reconnaissance or Intensive Surveys which usually contains a high proportion of individual properties with ratings of "C" or higher. At least two thirds of the properties within an API must be contributory to the API, i.e. they reflect the API's principal historical or architectural themes. Properties which do not contribute to the API because of alterations, but which would contribute if restored are considered noncontributors for purposes of the two-thirds threshold.

APIs appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places either as districts or as historically related complexes.

<u>Area of Secondary Importance (ASI).</u> Similar to Area of Primary Importance except that (1) an ASI does not appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and (2) altered properties which do not now contribute to the ASI but would- if restored are counted as contributors for purposes of the two-thirds threshold.⁴

Individual properties that are contributors to an API or ASI are assigned a "+", non-contributors a "-", and potential contributors are assigned a "*" as part of their numeric rating.

Any property that has at least a contingency rating of C ("secondary importance") or contributes or potentially contributes to a primary or secondary district, may "warrant consideration for possible preservation" according to the City of Oakland. All properties meeting these minimum significance thresholds (and have not already been designated) are called Potential Designated Historic Properties (PDHPs). "PDHP" is not a designation, but rather a category based on the OCHS ratings.

The City of Oakland's Local Register of Historical Resources (Local Register) includes all Designated Historic Properties (Landmarks, Heritage Properties, Study List Properties, Preservation Districts, and S-7 and S-20 Preservation Combining Zone Properties) as well as all PDHPs with an existing rating of "A" or "B" or which are located within an Area of Primary Importance.⁵

125 14th Street is not listed as a City of Oakland Designated Historic Property or Heritage Property. The property has been assigned an OCHS rating of A1+, indicating that it is a property of Highest Importance and is a contributor to the Lake Merritt API.⁶ It is included in the Local Register.

Previous Evaluations

In 1997, the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey prepared a State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record for the Main Library building including the following brief

 ⁴ City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan: Historic Preservation Element (Oakland, October 1993), Appendix A.
⁵ City of Oakland, CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, December 16, 2020, Appendix A: Guidance on Historical Resources.

⁶ City of Oakland, "Planning and Zoning Map," electronic resource at

https://oakgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=3676148ea4924fc7b75e7350903c7224.

evaluation: "The building is in excellent condition; its integrity is excellent. Its Survey rating of "*a" reflects its interest as an architecturally outstanding product of the postwar expansion of Oakland's library system."⁷ This evaluation did not provide a period of significance or list of character-defining features.

The Main Library property is identified as a "key asset" located at the northern portion of the plan area for the *Lake Merritt Station Area Plan*, completed in 2014.⁸ This document does not identify the Main Library as an "opportunity site." The Public Review Draft of the *Downtown Oakland Specific Plan*, dated August 28, 2019, identifies the Main Library as an "opportunity site" for potential adaptive reuse, including the potential to "add new floors on top of the historic structure, insofar as these additions adhere to preservation guidelines and do not detract from the character of the contributing building."⁹

III. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The Oakland Main Library at 124 14th Street is a two-story, painted concrete building with a partially exposed basement and mezzanine. The building features Late Moderne style design elements including blocky, rectangular massing, vertical fenestration patterns, smooth exterior walls, and a flat roof with plain parapet. Typical windows that extend across the first and second stories consist of rectangular divided-lite steel sash set in vertically oriented, slightly recessed openings which span the first and second stories. Each opening contains four stacked sets of large, fixed rectangular lites flanked by stacked pairs of casement lites. Window openings are typically set between engaged, rectangular concrete columns. Typical ground floor fenestration consists of rectangular metal windows set in slightly recessed openings, with a fixed, center lite flanked by stacked pairs of casement lites.

Exterior

Primary (Northeast) Façade

The northeast primary façade, facing 14th Street, consists of 11 bays. Five bays, each containing one typical window that extends across the first and second stories, are set on each side of the wide, central main entrance bay (**Figure 3**). The entrance bay is set within a stepped recess and is fully glazed in an aluminum window system that extends through the first and second stories (**Figure 4**). Five rows of rectangular fixed aluminum glazing are stacked, each consisting of two larger central

⁷ Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey, State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record for 125 14th Street (City of Oakland, 1997), 2.

⁸ City of Oakland, Lake Merritt Station Area Plan (Oakland, December 2014), 1-8.

⁹ City of Oakland, Downtown Oakland Specific Plan, Public Review Draft (Oakland, August 28, 2019), 200-201.

and two narrower outer openings. At the ground level, the two central openings include a glazed two-leaf door at the left (east) side and a glazed single leaf door with narrow sidelites at the right (west) side. Flat panels on either side of the main entrance feature contemporary painted murals and signage; the original raised metal identity signage of "OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY" flank the main entry. The main entrance is accessed from the 14th Street pedestrian right-of-way by a wide concrete staircase with non-original aluminum handrails centered between concrete planters. The curved retaining wall of a non-original accessibility ramp intrudes upon the right (west) side of the stairway. This ramp extends parallel to and across the west side of the primary façade, obscuring ground floor fenestration. Both the staircase and ramp have metal railings. Most bays contain typical ground floor painted steel windows. The third bay from the left (east) has a below-grade utility room entrance with a partially glazed wood door with wired glass transom and sidelites, accessed by a concrete staircase **(Figure 5).**



Figure 3: Northeast (primary) façade, view southwest across 14th Street.



Figure 4. Main entrance, view southwest. Entrance ramp at right of staircase.



Figure 5. Exposed basement entrance to utility room at east side of northeast facade, view southwest.

Historic Resource Assessment – Draft Project Number 20164 Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA

Southeast Façade

The southeast façade overlooks Oak Street and faces a paved side courtyard. The façade consists of seven bays, each with a typical window that extends across the first and second stories. Typical ground-floor windows are set in the first, second, third, fifth, and sixth bays (from the left, or south). The central, fourth bay features a glazed metal door with rectangular sidelites and transom. At the ground floor of the seventh, northernmost bay, a recessed entrance consists of partially glazed metal doors with narrow partial sidelites set above metal panels and a rectangular transom.



Figure 6. Southeast facade, view southwest.



Figure 7. View north across southeast facade from near southeast corner of building.

Southwest Façade

The southwest, rear façade consists of 13 bays, with the first and second stories set slightly back from a below-grade ground floor. Each bay has a typical window that extends across the first and second stories. At the third bay from each side of the building, a metal fire escape staircase is set over the window. A pedestrian door is set below the window, at the base of the staircase at these bays. At the ground floor, the three central bays are occupied by below-grade entrances, with two wide utility entrances at the right (east) and two metal pedestrian doors at the left (west), one single and one double. The utility entrance doors are paneled wood, each with 12 square lites set in two rows near the top. The utility entrance at the far right (east) has a wood pedestrian door set to the left of center, with glazing and panels aligned with those of the larger door. Ground floor windows at the outer five bays on either side of the entrances are different from typical ground floor windows elsewhere on the building, and consist of a fixed rectangular central lite set between stacked sets of paired casement windows. The entrances are accessed by a U-shaped driveway with two entrances from 13th Street.



Figure 8. Southwest facade, view north.



Figure 9. Southwest facade, view northeast toward loading dock.



Figure 10. Below-grade loading dock entrance at southwest facade, view northeast.

Northwest Façade

The southeast façade overlooks Madison Street and faces a paved side courtyard set below the surrounding grade. The façade consists of seven bays, each with a typical window that extends across the first and second stories. Typical ground-floor windows are set in the five bays at the right (south) of the facade. The two bays at the left (north) of the ground floor each contain a deeply recessed set of paired, unglazed metal entrance doors. The patio adjacent to the northwest façade is accessed by paired staircases adjacent to the Madison Street pedestrian right-of-way.



Figure 11. Northwest façade, view south.



Figure 12. Courtyard adjacent to northwest facade, view southwest.



Figure 13. View southeast from top of staircase toward northwest facade.

Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA

Roof

The flat roof of 125 14th Street includes the tops of piers projecting from within the building, capped with copper sheet metal casing.



Figure 14. Rows of piers at roof, view southeast.

Interior

The interior of the Main Library building consists of two stories, mezzanines, and a ground floor level. The ground floor is accessed through several entrances, including the loading dock entrances at the southwest side, two entrances at the north end of the southeast façade, two entrances at the north end of the northwest façade, and one entrance at the east side of the northeast façade. A Children's Room is located at the southeast side of the ground floor and is accessed from the exterior through the southernmost door at the southeast façade (Figure 15). Utility rooms, including heating and electrical equipment, are located at the northeast side of the ground floor, accessed from the exterior through the below-grade door at the east side of the northeast façade. An auditorium and meeting space is located at the northwest corner of the ground floor, accessed by the two doors at the north side of the northwest façade. The south portion of the ground floor is occupied by the loading docks and circulation department, with book receiving and processing areas and offices at the perimeter walls. The center of the ground floor is occupied by stack rooms. The first floor level, accessed by the main entrance facing 14th Street, includes the entrance lobby at the northeast side, a central hall, a narrow elevator lobby, a U-shaped series of reading rooms at the northwest, southwest, and southeast perimeter of the building, offices, and stack rooms at either side of the elevator lobby (**Figure 16 through Figure 20**). Finishes at the main floor feature wood paneling in a modern style that includes wood reveals at the entrance lobby, central hall, and elevator lobby. The ceiling at the entry lobby is of light color painted plaster with a center louvered light that simulates a skylight, there is a rectangular shaped ring of fluorescent lights that surround the ceiling. The reading rooms have high ceilings and wood bookshelves parallel to all perimeter walls and in perpendicular rows at the interior walls, there is a wood wainscot at the columns with the wainscot matching the height of the bookshelves so that there is a consistent wood panel architectural treatment throughout the reading rooms. The upper two thirds of the walls and columns are painted plaster. The ceilings are painted plaster with linear arrangements of fluorescent lighting and intermittent circular mechanical diffusers. Flooring consists of terrazzo and resilient tile with marble-like patterns.

The mezzanine level includes a balcony at the northeast side of the building, visible through the primary façade entrance glazing, as well as office spaces at the southeast and northwest side of the central stack rooms which overlook the first floor reading rooms (**Figure 20**).

The second floor level, with public access via a staircase at the west side of the main entrance lobby at the northeast side of the building, includes a local history room, "teen" room, periodical room, and offices set at the perimeter of the building, accessed by a U-shaped hall at the northeast, southeast, and northwest sides of the level **(Figure 21 through Figure 23)**. The center of the second floor is occupied by stack rooms, storage rooms, and staff rooms.



Figure 15. Children's Room, Ground Floor



Figure 16. Central hall, entrance at left. First floor.

Historic Resource Assessment – Draft Project Number 20164



Figure 17. Entrance, first floor and mezzanine.



Figure 18. View through elevator lobby toward entrance lobby, first floor.



Figure 19. Reading room, first floor.



Figure 20. Reading room, first floor, viewed from mezzanine

Historic Resource Assessment – Draft Project Number 20164



Figure 21. Local history room, second floor.



Figure 22. West hallway and entrance to "Teen Room," second floor.



Figure 23. Periodicals room, second floor.

Site Features

As noted above in discussion of the northwest and southeast facades, site features at 125 14th Street include paved plazas adjacent to secondary building entrances. The north entry features a central stair that is original to the building, a more recent addition is an access ramp that runs parallel to the north wall with the lower access point at the Madison Street side of the building and a termination at the center stair. The east plaza is at street level and accessible from the sidewalk at Oak Street. The west plaza is sunken below the adjacent grade, and is accessed from the Madison Street pedestrian right-of-way by a split staircase. In addition to these courtyards, low concrete walls, including freestanding and retaining walls, with integrated planting beds are located at the northeast (primary), northwest, and southwest sides of the building.

Surrounding area

The library is situated in what was conceived of as a Civic complex for Oakland. The surrounding neighborhood consists of a mix of civic, institutional, and commercial buildings. The Alameda County Superior Courthouse at 1225 Fallon Street, built ca. 1935-1936, is located across 13th and Oak streets to the southeast **(Figure 24)**, and the Alameda County Administration building at 1221 Oak Street, completed in 1962, is located across 13th Street to the southwest **(Figure 25)**. The curvilinear, modernist Alcopark Parking Garage, built in 1962, is across 13th and Madison streets to the

southwest **(Figure 26)**. To the north at 136-144 14th Street are a two-story commercial building completed ca. 1923-1924 and a contemporary 12-story Alameda County administrative building at 1401 Lakeside Drive **(Figure 27)**.



Figure 24. Alameda County Superior Courthouse, 1225 Fallon Street.



Figure 25. Alameda County Administration Building, 1221 Oak Street.



Figure 26. Alcopark Parking Garage, view southwest from 13th and Madison streets. Source: Google Street View.



Figure 27. Northeast side of 14th Street opposite library building, view east. Source: Google Street View.

IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT

Brief History of Oakland

Native Americans' settlement in Oakland predates the arrival of Spanish explorers in the eighteenth century by more than one thousand years. Huchiuin and Jalquin tribes of Ohlone Indians lived in settlements along the banks of local creeks dating from at least the sixteenth century, including the areas now occupied by the Holy Names College campus and in Indian Gulch, now known as Trestle Glen. Between these two former villages, Dimond Canyon contains Sausal Creek.¹⁰

In 1772, a small exploration party from the Spanish garrison at Monterey, led by Don Pedro Fages, paused in their travels on a high hill overlooking the site of the future city. Despite Father Juan Crespi's description recorded in his journal of the beauty of this place, the exploration party opted to travel on, and the area went untouched by Europeans for nearly 50 years. In 1820, the Spanish government granted 44,000 acres to Luis Maria Peralta upon his retirement from the military. Peralta's grant extended from the shore of San Francisco Bay to the crest of the Oakland hills, and from San Leandro Creek to "El Cerrito," or the little hill (most likely Albany Hill). Peralta used the land as a cattle ranch, which he sub-divided and bequeathed to his four sons in 1842. The area around Dimond Canyon was within the portion of *Rancho San Antonio* granted to Antonio Maria Peralta.

The 1849 Gold Rush that dramatically influenced San Francisco's development also brought fortuneseekers to Oakland. Miners, lumbermen, businessmen, bankers, speculators, and opportunists settled across the bay in what was then known as Contra Costa, or "the other coast." In 1850, three East Coast men arrived in Contra Costa: Horace W. Carpentier, Edson Adams, and Andrew J. Moon. Each man leased 160 acres of land from Vicente Peralta and opened the area to squatters. The town of Oakland was incorporated on March 25, 1852. Oakland saw rapid growth and improvement after transportation connections were established with other communities. Ferry service to San Francisco began in 1854, and the small settlements of San Antonio and Clinton east of Lake Merritt were connected with Oakland by a bridge built in 1856. Commercial and industrial businesses were established near the wharves, and the Central Pacific Railroad ran through downtown Oakland by 1863.

In 1868, Oakland was chosen as the western terminus for the Transcontinental Railroad. Beginning in 1869, the train brought tourists and workers to California and made Oakland a major port city and manufacturing center.¹¹ West Oakland became a shipping hub for western U.S. factories and a processing and manufacturing center for raw commodities such as agricultural products and lumber.

¹⁰ Eleanor Dunn, "A Short History of Diamond Canyon and Sausal Creek," *The Montclarion*, March 24, 1998, Electronic resource at <u>https://fruitvaleoakland.wordpress.com/category/history/</u>, accessed April 25, 2022.

¹¹ Lois Rather, Oakland's Image: A History of Oakland, California (Oakland, CA: The Rather Press, 1972), 53-54.

As Oakland became an increasingly popular industrial core, residential and commercial communities expanded within the city limits. In 1873, Oakland became the county seat of Alameda County.¹² By 1880, the city's population rose to 34,555, more than 20 times what it had been in 1860.¹³ Many of the new residents were San Francisco commuters drawn by Oakland's relatively low density and the ferry service across the bay. Promotional materials advertised Oakland's "world-renowned" climate, the prosperity of its citizens, its paved streets, and extensive streetcar lines.¹⁴ It was home to several colleges, including the College of California (the precursor of the University of California, Berkeley), Mills Seminary (later Mills College), and St. Mary's College, located at 30th and Broadway.

The city expanded by annexing existing settlements and developing new districts.¹⁵ Brooklyn, which had encompassed the smaller settlements of Clinton, San Antonio, and Lynn, was annexed in 1872, pushing Oakland's eastern city limits out to 36th Street.¹⁶ The small Temescal community, located in north Oakland, expanded in the 1860s with the installation of a telegraph line down present-day Telegraph Avenue and the establishment of a streetcar line to the University of California, Berkeley. Neighborhoods north of Lake Merritt were annexed in 1891, and Temescal, Golden Gate, and other north Oakland neighborhoods were annexed in 1897.¹⁷ By 1900, Oakland's population numbered almost 67,000.

The 1906 earthquake and fire displaced thousands of San Francisco residents to the East Bay for temporary and permanent housing. Oakland continued to grow geographically, increasing to nearly its present size by 1909, with the annexation of the hills area, Fruitvale, Melrose, Elmhurst, and the area south to San Leandro. With those additions, the city's area increased from 22.9 to 60.25 square miles. The city experienced a surge of commercial and civic development in the downtown area after the earthquake, as well, including construction of a new city hall, which was the first in the United States designed as a skyscraper. In 1910, the City of Oakland assumed control of its waterfront, which previously had been held by private entities. The change of ownership prompted the expansion of the Port of Oakland.¹⁸ During World War I, Oakland's shipyards provided a "fleet of steel and concrete ships that...within the short space of a year put the Oakland estuary in the national limelight."¹⁹ By 1918, at least 50,000 people were employed by the shipyards.

¹² City of Oakland, Oakland General Plan: Historic Preservation Element (Oakland, October 1993), 1-5.

¹³ Beth Bagwell, *Oakland, The Story of a City* (Oakland, CA: Oakland Heritage Alliance, 1982), 59.

¹⁴ Rather, Oakland's Image: A History of Oakland, California, 63.

¹⁵ Bagwell, Oakland, The Story of a City, 59.

¹⁶ City of Oakland, Historic Preservation Element, 1-5.

¹⁷ City of Oakland, Historic Preservation Element, 1-7.

¹⁸ City of Oakland, Historic Preservation Element, 1-7.

¹⁹ Florence B. Crocker, *Who Made Oakland*? (Oakland, CA: Clyde Dalton, 1925), quoted in Rather, *Oakland's Image: A History of Oakland, California*, 87.

The 1920s saw continuing prosperity in Oakland.²⁰ Civic works abounded, including the installation of a new lighting system and procurement of land for an airport. Development slowed during the Great Depression, but Oakland grew into a major shipbuilding center during World War II.²¹ The city's population expanded with wartime workers, including many African Americans who migrated from the southern states seeking employment. The Bay Bridge, which opened in 1936, eased the commute between Oakland and San Francisco. In 1945, the city's population was 405,301.

The post-World War II emphasis on the automobile led to increased suburban development and new freeways to reach outlying areas.²² While freeway construction and redevelopment enticed some businesses and residents away from the city center, in many cases businesses and residents were forced to relocate as the historic commercial and residential fabric of downtown and West Oakland was replaced and disconnected by growing freeway systems. Increased economic and racial segregation were byproducts of this transportation and suburban development pattern, and through the 1960s and 1970s Oakland experienced infrastructure decline associated with entrenched poverty, deindustrialization, and a weak urban tax base.²³

A tight real estate market in San Francisco in the early 1980s sparked new development and preservation projects in Oakland, especially downtown, and the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, which damaged many of Oakland's older buildings, spurred replacement and rehabilitation through the 1990s.²⁴ The city's population has remained relatively steady in recent decades and was estimated to be 450,533 in 2022.²⁵

Lake Merritt

The lands surrounding Lake Merritt were originally part of Rancho San Antonio, the land grant given to Luis Maria Peralta in 1820. Following the California Gold Rush, much of the land was sold, including a large tract acquired by Dr. Samuel Merritt in 1854. Shortly thereafter, Merritt erected a substantial house along the shoreline of a wide slough that connected what is now Lake Merritt with the Oakland estuary.

In the 1860s, Merritt was appointed mayor of Oakland by the City Council, and proposed the construction of a dam at the lower end of the slough along the line of 12th Street. It was envisioned that the dam would convert the upper end of the slough into a lake, while also improving its water quality. At the time, much of the raw sewage generated by Oakland was being fed into the slough,

²⁰ Rather, *Oakland's Image: A History of Oakland, California*, 89.

²¹ City of Oakland, Historic Preservation Element, 1-9.

²² City of Oakland, Historic Preservation Element, 1-9.

²³ Robert O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003). ²⁴ Bagwell, *Oakland, The Story of a City*, 260-262.

²⁵ United States Census Bureau, Quick Facts: Oakland city, California. Electronic resource at <u>https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/oaklandcitycalifornia#</u>.

leading to widespread complaints about the odor.²⁶ Concurrently, Merritt lobbied the state legislature to declare the lake a wildlife refuge, and in 1870 it became the first such refuge in North America.

With Merritt's backing, the land around the lake's southern and western shore was soon developed as one of Oakland's most fashionable residential districts. However, a large tract of land nearby owned by Edson Adams, which divided the northern shore of the lake in two parts, remained pastureland until the turn of the twentieth century. In 1907, portions of Adams' tract (today known as Adams' Point), as well as several other parcels along the lake's shoreline, were purchased by the City of Oakland as part of a bond measure for park improvements.²⁷ Within a short time, a winding drive was graded through "Lakeside Park," and several recreational facilities were constructed along the shore, including the boat house and the Embarcadero pergola.

Through the early 20th century, a network of roads and streetcar lines began to coalesce around the lake, including an extension of Lakeshore Avenue, the construction of Lakeside Drive between Oak and Harrison Streets, and the installation of a streetcar line along Grand Avenue. Oakland's population was also booming, almost doubling between 1910 and 1930. In particular, the 1920s were a period of explosive growth, during which much of land north of the lake was subdivided— including the Grand Lake and Peralta Heights areas. As a major thoroughfare, Grand Avenue above McArthur Boulevard developed as a thriving commercial district during the 1920s, with the Grand Lake Theater as its focal point. Many three and four-story flats were constructed along Grand Avenue, while nearby hillsides were typically built out with one- or two-story single-family residences.²⁸

During this period of residential and commercial growth, the blocks at the southwest side of Lake Merritt between Fallon and Jackson streets south of 14th Street were developed with a mixture of single- and multi-family residential, light industrial, and commercial buildings. The Oakland Civic Auditorium, a massive Beaux Arts-style edifice, was completed in 1914 overlooking the south side of the lake. To the north of 14th Street, multi-family residences in a variety of architectural styles were developed between 1906 and the late 1920s within what comprises today's Lakeside Apartment District API.²⁹

²⁶ Richard W. Longstreth, *A Short History of Lake Merritt*, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Qualifying Examination, (University of California, Berkeley: School of Environmental Design, 1974), 5.

²⁷ Ibid: 14-15.

²⁸ Richard W. Longstreth, *A Short History of Lake Merritt*, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Qualifying Examination, (University of California, Berkeley: School of Environmental Design, 1974), 21.

²⁹ Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey, State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Historic Resources Inventory forms for the Lakeside Apartment District (Oakland: Prepared for the City of Oakland, 1985.)

The growth stimulated by construction activities at Grand Lake and Peralta Heights led to a considerable increase in value of land near the lake. As Richard Longstreth observed in his history of Lake Merritt, upper-middle class housing "increasingly took the form of high-rise apartment houses."³⁰ By the early 1920s, lakeside property values stimulated the building of the Regillus Apartments (1922-1923) designed by Willis C. Lowe, which occupied the former site of the August Schilling estate.³¹ According to Longstreth, "A host of like projects were advanced during the remaining boom years varying both in size and quality."³² These included the dramatic Bellevue-Staten apartments (1929) in Adams' Point, as well as several "somewhat more elaborate multi-unit apartment houses" constructed on higher ground in the Grand Lake area, which offered views of Lake Merritt.³³

By the time of the Main Library building's completion, civic and governmental buildings at the southwest side of Lake Merritt included the Alameda County Courthouse, completed in 1936 near 13th and Oak streets, a State Employment Office building 1924 at 12th and Oak streets, and a post office garage at 10th and Oak streets.

Today, the City of Oakland's Lake Merritt API encompasses the lake itself and adjacent park areas, and includes many civic, institutional, residential, and commercial properties within the blocks facing the water. Contributors to the district reflect the development of the area in the first half of the twentieth century.

Oakland Public Library

The earliest library in Oakland was established by private citizens of the Oakland Library Association in 1868 as a subscription-based reading room which operated at three locations in downtown Oakland between 1869 and 1878. Following State of California legislation allowing the use of tax revenues for library facilities, the service was taken over by the City of Oakland in 1878 as a "taxpayer-funded institution open to all residents."³⁴ This library operated at the Oakland Library Association's third location, a two-story wood-frame building at the site of the current Oakland City Hall, until 1902. The earliest branch library, the West Oakland Reading Room, opened in 1878 near 7th and Willow streets, followed by the East Oakland Reading Room on East Central Avenue.³⁵ The

³¹ "Restoring 1922 Oakland Building." *Oakland Tribune*. March 10, 2003.

³⁰ Richard W. Longstreth, *A Short History of Lake Merritt*, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Qualifying Examination, (University of California, Berkeley: School of Environmental Design, 1974), 23.

³² Richard W. Longstreth, *A Short History of Lake Merritt*, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Qualifying Examination, (University of California, Berkeley: School of Environmental Design, 1974), 23. ³³ Ibid: 21.

³⁴ Emily Foster "143 Years of Oakland Public Library History," Oakland Public Library, November 5, 2021, Accessed October 19, 2022, https://oaklandlibrary.org/blogs/post/143-years-of-oakland-public-library-history/.

³⁵ Emily Foster "143 Years of Oakland Public Library History."

first City Librarian, Ina Coolbrith, served in this role from 1874-1894 and is "often remembered today as a mentor to young Jack London and Isadora Duncan, and as a friend of Bret Harte, Joaquin Miller, and Ambrose Bierce. She was also a well-known poet who later became California's first Poet Laureate."³⁶ A new Main Library building, funded by Andrew Carnegie, was completed in 1902 at 14th Street and Grove Street (now Martin Luther King Jr. Way) **(Figure 28)**. Several new branch locations, including three with new buildings funded by Carnegie at Alden (now Temescal), Melrose, and Golden Gate, opened by 1920.



Figure 28: Circulation room at the second Oakland Main Library, 1904. Source: Oakland Public Library, Oakland History Center.

In 1945, Oakland voters approved a bond measure to fund the construction of a new Main Library and four branch libraries. Architects Miller and Warnecke proposed improvements to the City of Oakland's library system beginning shortly after passage of the bond measure, writing in 1945 that:

The Main Library building was constructed in 1902, together with four branch libraries, as a gift from Andrew Carnegie. While these buildings are still in useful condition, there is a need for a new Main Library to house the administrative offices and central units of the branch library system. To provide library facilities in newly developed residential areas it

³⁶ "Early Librarians," Oakland Library, Accessed November 18. 2022, <u>https://oaklandlibrary.org/blogs/post/143-years-of-oakland-public-library-history/</u>.

is recommended that four new branch libraries be constructed, to be known as the Lakeview branch, West Oakland Branch, Laurel Branch and the Rockridge Branch.³⁷

After its opening in 1951, in keeping with the library system's programs, the Main Library offered more to patrons than books and other reading materials separated into "children's" and "adult's" departments. The "teen-age" room, part of the Main Library since its design, had a record player, games, and magazines.³⁸ Adult education programs offered through the Adult Education Division of the Oakland Public Library held lectures in topics such as international affairs and the growth of automation in industry at the Main Library's auditorium.³⁹ In the 1950s, community groups and agencies utilized the auditorium for a variety of adult educational programs, from the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary's 10-week boat handling course in 1952 which aimed to provide a trained civilian emergency response force, to a six-week series of panels on urban planning titled "Eastbay – Where Do We Go From Here?" moderated by architect Robert Anshen in 1954.⁴⁰ The Adult Education offerings evolved with broader social and political changes – a 1960 discussion focused on "Obscenity Civil Liberty," and a 1965 meeting focused on problems with conditions in the Oakland Housing Authority's public housing developments.⁴¹ A 1970 panel explored attitudes toward the legalization of marijuana.⁴² The Second Start Adult Literacy Program, founded in 1984, trained volunteer tutors to assist patrons 16 and older seeking to improve their reading skills.⁴³

When the new Main Library was dedicated in 1951, the Oakland Public Library system had 22 branches serving neighborhoods across the city.⁴⁴ Beginning in the 1960s and 1970s, larger programs within the Oakland Public Library system grew and operated in these branch and mobile locations. A "Latin American Branch," with collections at the Miller and Fruitvale branch libraries, was established in 1966, now centered at the Cesar Chavez Branch.⁴⁵ The Asian Community Library, founded at the Park Boulevard Branch library in 1975, was temporarily located at the Main Library

³⁷ Warnecke & Miller, March 2, 1945, Warnecke Archives)

³⁸ Oakland Tribune, photographs of the "teen-ager" room at the Oakland Public Library's Main Library, July 5, 1951.

³⁹ Oakland Tribune, "Course in World Affairs Offered," October 15, 1951; "Automation Problem Up To Leaders, Panel Says," January 14, 1955.

⁴⁰ Oakland Tribune, "Boat Handling Course is Offered," February 7, 1952; Oakland Tribune, "Panel Series to Weigh Eastbay Growth Issues," January 5, 1955.

⁴¹ Oakland Tribune, "Obscenity Civil Liberty to be Studied," January 6, 1960; "Panel Blasts City's Public Housing Rules," November 9, 1965.

⁴² Oakland Tribune, "Town Meetings on Dope," December 11, 1970.

⁴³ Oakland Tribune, "Tutor Training," May 25, 1985; Oakland Tribune, "A World of Knowledge at the Oakland Public Library," September 9, 2009.

⁴⁴ "New Oakland Main Library," commemorative brochure for dedication of library building, 1951, collection of the Oakland Public Library.

⁴⁵ *Oakland Tribune*, "A World of Knowledge at the Oakland Public Library," September 9, 2009.

building between 1978 and 1980 before relocating to Oakland's Chinatown.⁴⁶ This federally funded program provided library staff, resources, and programs intended to "serve the 25,000 Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Filipino, Vietnamese, Thai, and other residents" of Oakland.⁴⁷ Initiated in 1979 as a bookmobile, the American Indian Library was located by the early 1990 at the Dimond Branch Library.⁴⁸ With funding initiated through a ballot measure in 1994, the African American Museum and Library at Oakland was temporarily located at the Golden Gate Branch before moving in 2002 to the rehabilitated previous main library building, built in 1902.⁴⁹

The Oakland Civic Center

By late 1946, the main branch location was still undecided with three options under consideration: city park property at the northeast corner of 19th and Harrison streets, a property between 1st Avenue and Lakeshore drive, "north of the Christian Science church," and the block bounded by 13th, 14th, Oak, and Madison streets. The latter two were located in what was being developed by City of Oakland planners as a Civic Center site which would concentrate the city's governmental and cultural buildings in a single area.⁵⁰ The blocks at the south end of Lake Merritt had been envisioned as a potential civic center from the second decade of the twentieth century, at the time the Oakland Civic Auditorium was designed to be part of a larger complex east of Fallon Street. By the time of its design and construction, the Main Library building was intended to be part of a later civic center concept located adjacent to Lake Merritt, proposed by the City in 1947 to include:

[...] an ambitious two-part center at the lower end of the lake. The Municipal Auditorium would be framed by two groups of buildings: to the west, the exiting courthouse and a new library; and, on the east side of the lake, a new opera house, art gallery, and museum. Additionally, a governmental civic center would rise around a new three-block plaza between 11th and 12th Streets and Jackson and Fallon Streets; it would be framed by the existing courthouse and post office as well as a new city hall, justice building, state building, county building, and municipal building.⁵¹

⁴⁶ *Oakland Tribune*, "\$290,000 Grant to Asian Library," May 23, 1975; "Asian Library is Moving to a New Home," October 5, 1980.

⁴⁷ Oakland Tribune, "\$290,000 Grant to Asian Library," May 23, 1975'; "Asian Library Plans Open House," June 22, 1978; "Filipino Culture Program," March 14, 1980; "Asian Film Programs," May 9, 1980.

⁴⁸ Beverly Hunt, "American Indian Library Celebrates 15 Years," *Oakland Tribune*, November 14, 1994.

⁴⁹ George Kelly, "Citizens Putting Their Votes Behind Measure O, Libraries," *Oakland Tribune*, June 8, 1994.

⁵⁰ Miller and Warnecke, Letter to John F. Hassler, City Manager, Re: Oakland Public Library Main Library Building, December 4, 1946. Warnecke Archives.

⁵¹ Mitchell Schwarzer, Hella Town: Oakland's History of Development and Disruption (Oakland: University of California Press, 2021), 139.

The *Oakland Tribune* in May 1947 and *Architect and Engineer* in September 1951 noted that the new building was located on the "key" block of the planned civic center **(Figure 29 and Figure 30)**.⁵² Though some civic and governmental buildings were later erected in the plan area, including the Alameda County Administration Building (1962, **Figure 31**) and Oakland Museum (1969), the plan was not fully realized with a relocated City Hall, State, and Federal buildings.



Figure 29. Detail from "Area in Vicinity of Civic Center," by the City Planning Commission, Oakland, California by Earl O. Mills, Planning Consultant, September 1946. Image source: Erica Fischer, https://www.flickr.com/people/walkingsf/.

⁵² Oakland Tribune, "Plans Accepted for Libraries," May 12, 1947; Architect and Engineer, "Recently Completed Public Library, Oakland, California," September 1951, 21.

Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA



Figure 30.Revised Civic Center area map, from Proposed Amendment of the Civic Center and Lake Merritt Improvement Section of the Oakland Master Plan, October 1956. Image source: Erica Fischer, https://www.flickr.com/people/walkingsf/.



Figure 31. Detail from composite oblique aerial photograph with model showing planned Alameda County Administration Building and parking garage circled, with the existing Main Library at the center of the frame, ca. 1960. Oakland Public Library.

Architects Chester H. Miller and Carl I. Warnecke

The architecture firm of Miller and Warnecke, active from 1917 to 1951, consisted of partners Carl Ingomar Warnecke (1891-1971) and Chester Herbert Miller (1890-1953). Warnecke, born in Montreal, moved with his family to California in 1901. He began his career in architecture as a draftsman working for Bakewell and Brown, Chester H. Miller, and John J. Donovan before establishing his partnership with Miller in 1917.⁵³ Though he pursued courses at l'Ecole des Beaux Arts in 1914, this formal education was curtailed by the wartime evacuation of many Americans from France. Chester H. Miller was a native of Oakland whose training in architecture was acquired vocationally rather than through formal education.⁵⁴

A 1937 feature in the *Architect and Engineer* highlighted the firm's East Bay residential commissions, which included early Ranch, Mission Revival, Colonial Revival, and Tudor Revival styles.⁵⁵ Also noted were mortuary and commercial buildings in Oakland, the East Oakland High School (completed in 1929, now known as Castlemont High School), and the individually National Register-eligible Hill Castle Apartments at 1431 Jackson Street, Oakland (1930). As a partnership, Miller and Warnecke designed numerous private residences as well as civic and institutional buildings such as three branches of the Oakland Public Library: the Piedmont (1931-32), the Lakeview branch (1949), and Elmhurst (1949) branches (**Figure 32 and Figure 33**).⁵⁶ Miller and Warnecke also designed the Hayward Public Library, completed in 1951 (**Figure 34**).⁵⁷

After Miller's 1951 retirement, Carl I. Warnecke partnered with his son, architect John Carl Warnecke Sr., in the firm of Warnecke and Warnecke. Other libraries designed by Warnecke and Warnecke beginning in the 1960s, such as the College of San Mateo College Heights Campus Library (1963) and Skyline Campus Library (ca. 1969), College of the Desert, Palm Desert library (ca. 1966), UC Santa Cruz Library (ca. 1966), and J. Henry Meyer library at Stanford University (ca. 1966) were designed by John Carl Warnecke.⁵⁸

⁵³ Pacific Coast Architectural Database, "Carl Ingomar Warnecke," electronic resource at <u>http://pcad.lib.washington.edu/person/3366/</u>, accessed December 5, 2020.

⁵⁴ Pacific Coast Architectural Database, "Chester Herbert Miller (Architect)," electronic resource at

http://pcad.lib.washington.edu/person/1656/, accessed December 5, 2020.

⁵⁵ Harris C. Allen, "Toward a Contemporary Type – A Modern Development of the California Tradition," *Architect and Engineer*, September 1937, 19-30.

⁵⁶ Pacific Coast Architectural Database, "Miller and Warnecke," electronic resource at

http://pcad.lib.washington.edu/firm/2530/, accessed December 5, 2020.

⁵⁷ "Libraries" portfolio, ca. 1964-1965, collection of the Warnecke Archives.

⁵⁸ "Libraries" portfolio, ca. 1964-1965, collection of the Warnecke Archives.



Figure 32. Architects' sketch of the Lakeview Branch Library, published in the Oakland Tribune, May 12, 1947.



Figure 33. Architects' sketch of the Elmhurst Branch Library, published in the *Oakland Tribune*, May 12, 1947.



Figure 34. Hayward Public Library (built 1951). Source: Hayward Area Historical Society.

Late Moderne Architectural Style

Designed in a restrained Late Moderne style, the massing , materials, and fenestration of the Main Library building explicitly echo that of the larger Alameda County Courthouse building located across 13th and Oak streets to the southeast of the library **(Figure 24)**. Completed in 1936 and designed by architects William Corlett, Henry Minton, James Plachek, William Schirmer, and Carl Werner, the Alameda County Courthouse is a monumental example of the WPA Moderne architectural style.⁵⁹ Combining the simplicity and rectangular massing of Moderne buildings with a stripped neoclassicism, WPA Moderne institutional and civic buildings at once convey the economy of the Depression years with the authority long associated with the more elaborate Beaux Arts classicism of earlier decades.

Art Moderne, also known as Streamline Moderne, is a late Art Deco architecture style that emerged in Germany from the work of the New Objectivity artists and architects of the German Werkbund, led by Hermann Muthesius.⁶⁰ Taking cues from the Werkbund, American industrial designers and architects of the 1930s began stripping Art Deco of its excessive ornamentation, focusing instead on a streamlined aesthetic and amplifying the effects of geometry and volume. This style was

⁵⁹ Living New Deal Project, "Alameda County Courthouse – Oakland, CA," electronic resource at https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/alameda-county-courthouse-oakland-ca/.

⁶⁰ Alastair Duncan, Art Deco (World of Art), (London: Thames & Hudson, 1988), 96.

developed in the midst of the Great Depression, and the ability to remove excess, expensive decoration, and focus on the role of efficiency in design, materials, and form was particularly appealing. In addition, the Art Moderne style was associated with the concepts of efficiency, speed, and aerodynamic forms; it expressed a fascination with technological achievement and espoused faith in the future. ⁶¹ The style became pervasive in both architecture and the design of everyday objects, and included the first buildings that incorporated electric lighting in architectural structure.

During the Great Depression in the United States, the Art Deco style was adapted for building projects funded by the New Deal's Public Works Administration program to form a substyle known as PWA Moderne. As such, the PWA Moderne style is most commonly displayed on public and institutional buildings, such as courthouses, libraries, post offices, museums, city halls, and schools. that were constructed under the PWA between 1933 and 1944. Known alternatively as Federal Moderne, Depression Moderne, Stripped Classicism, or Starved Classicism, the style combined a restrained expression of the decoration and geometry of the Art Deco style with the formality, monumentality, and classical arrangements of Beaux Arts design. PWA Moderne buildings frequently displayed the strong vertical lines and sculpted, cubic massing reminiscent of the Art Deco style, moderated by classically balanced and symmetrical building forms, angular piers, windows arranged as vertical recessed panels, and smooth flat stone or stucco wall surfaces devoid of decoration. The combination of elements from the forward-looking Art Deco style with more sober and traditional design concepts were intended to evoke feelings of civic pride and broadcast a feeling of progress toward the future, while also projecting a sense of stability, security, and confidence at a time when Americans across the country were grappling with anxiety and mistrust in public institutions. In building interiors, emphasis was placed on the use of quality materials rather than elaborate decoration to create a sense of dignity. The popularity of the PWA Moderne, or Depression Moderne style, decreased after World War II as New Deal-era programs ended and the International Style rose in popularity.

In the years during and after World War II, the exuberance of the Streamline Moderne gave way to the more restrained Late Moderne style, at the same time that the International Style and Modern Movement was gaining traction. Derived from Streamline Moderne but with an emphasis on sharp angularity rather than curves, Late Moderne was prominent from the mid-1940s until the late 1950s. The style was often used for hospitals, fire stations, and other civic and institutional buildings.⁶² Characteristics of the style are strong horizontal elements, use of spare surfaces, and intersecting volumes that reinforced the style's angularity. A signature feature is the bezeled window or horizontal window groupings surrounded with a projecting flange or frame.

⁶¹ Marcus Whiffen, *American Architecture Since 1780: A Guide to the Styles, Rev. Ed*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), 241. ⁶² Paul Gleye, *The Architecture of Los Angeles*, (Los Angeles: Rosebud Books, 1981), p. 149-52.

Historic Resource Assessment – Draft Project Number 20164 Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA

The Oakland Main Library building expresses Late Moderne features of rectangular angularity and unadorned surfaces, with direct references to the nearby WPA Moderne-style Alameda County Courthouse in its pattern of narrow, rectangular two-story windows at all facades. Lacking the stacked massing and classical and Art Deco adornment of the courthouse building, the Main Library design embraced a simplicity required by the limited available budget.

Other Bay Area examples of Late Moderne architecture include the Crocker Bank building designed by Milton Pflueger and completed ca. 1950-1952 at 393 13th Street, Oakland and the Marine Firemen's Union Headquarters building at 240 2nd Street, San Francisco, designed by Olof Carl Malmquist and complete in 1957 **(Figure 35 and Figure 36)**.



Figure 35. Crocker Bank building, ca. 1952, 393 13th Street, Oakland. Source: Google Earth, 2021.



Figure 36. Marine Firemen's Union Headquarters building, 1957, 240 2nd Street, San Francisco. Source: Google Earth 2022.

V. SITE HISTORY

Site Development

Before acquisition of the site for construction of the library, the parcel bounded by 13th, Oak, 14th, and Madison streets was developed with two- and three-story residential buildings, as well as a fourstory concrete commercial building at the corner of 13th and Madison streets which had previously operated as the "Polytechnic College of Engineering." ⁶³ (Figure 37) A photograph from the late 1940s, taken from a nearby building, shows three extant, aging Victorian houses and the four-story corner building shortly before construction of the library building (Figure 38).

⁶³ Sanborn Map Company, Fire Insurance Map for Oakland, California, Volume 2, Sheet 167, 1911.
Historic Resource Assessment – Draft Project Number 20164 Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA



Figure 37. Detail of Sanborn Map Company map for Oakland, California, Volume 2, Sheet 167, dated 1911. Current building footprint outlined in dashed red. Source: Historical Information Gatherers Fire Insurance Maps Online, via the San Francisco Public Library, edited by Page & Turnbull.



Figure 38. Previous development at the site of the current Main Library building, view northwest from corner of 13th and Oak streets, late 1940s. Collection of Oakland Public Library.

Design and Construction

In 1946, the architectural firm of Chester H. Miller and Carl I. Warnecke was selected by the City of Oakland to design the new Main Library and four branches funded by the 1945 bond measure.⁶⁴ In developing the Main Library building's design, the architects researched current approaches to library planning and layout, consulting recent publications of the American Library Association which provided guidance specific to library design, including *The American Public Library Building*, by Joseph L. Wheeler and Alfred Morton Githens, published in 1941 and *Pointers for Public Library Building Planners*, by Russel J. Schunk, published in 1945.⁶⁵ In the spring of 1946, Warnecke wrote to the American Library at Baltimore, the Brooklyn Library, the Toledo Library, and others in the vicinity of Washington, New York, Boston and Detroit."⁶⁶ The influence of this research is clear in the design of Oakland's Main Library, which echoes the massing, materials, and fenestration rhythms, albeit in a simplified fashion, of the libraries in Toledo, Baltimore, and Brooklyn (**Figure 39 through Figure 42**). Warnecke also reached out by letter in advance of the trip to the Architectural Forum offices in New York, Hahn & Hayes Architects (who designed the library in Toledo), and John B. Kaiser, Director of the Newark Public Library.



Figure 39. Main Library, Toledo, Ohio, completed 1940, designed by Hahn & Hayes. Source: Ohio History Connection



Figure 40. Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Maryland, completed 1933, designed by Clyde N. Friz. Source: Baltimore Heritage.

⁶⁴ Due to construction costs, only two of the four planned branches were built, the Lakeview and Elmhurst branches, completed in 1949.

⁶⁵ Miller and Warnecke, Letter to the American Library Association, April 4, 1946. Warnecke Archives.

⁶⁶ Miller and Warnecke, Letter to the American Library Association, April 4, 1946. Warnecke Archives.

Historic Resource Assessment – Draft Project Number 20164 Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA



Figure 41. Brooklyn Central Library, Brooklyn, New York, completed 1941, designed by Githens and Keally. Source: Brooklyn Public Library.



Figure 42. Main lobby of Brooklyn Central Library, Brooklyn, New York, completed 1941, designed by Githens and Keally. Source: Brooklyn Public Library.

In a letter to John B. Kaiser, Director of the Newark, New Jersey Public Library, Warnecke wrote that he "would like to design the building along a reasonably simple type of modern design, and if possible avoid all old traditional classic, expensive materials, etc."⁶⁷ Consistent with this statement, the architects provided an economical design which adhered to the budgetary constraints of the bond measure, and which allowed for future expansion of the facility. The structural system of the building, with piers protruding above the surface of the roof, was designed to accommodate the later addition of another floor.⁶⁸ Accommodation of the library's materials was a primary design concern. Within the concrete building's two floors and high basement, the central core housing the stacks includes six tiers of shelf storage.⁶⁹ Comments about a preliminary sketch of the library facilities reviewed by the Library Bureau Division of Remington Rand, Inc., who provided library shelving and furnishings, illuminate the concern for card catalog space in this and any library: "If they are going to have 600,000 volumes in this building and assuming that they would have an average of four cards per title, they might ultimately have 2,400,000 cards, which would require 2,400 trays or about 109 lineal feet on each face of a card catalog case arranged 12 trays high."⁷⁰

The City of Oakland accepted Warnecke's plans for the library in the spring of 1947 (**Figure 43**).⁷¹ The contract for construction of the building was awarded to Stolte, Inc. in November 1948, the

⁶⁷ Carl Warnecke to John B. Kaiser, March 29, 1946, Collection of Warnecke Archives.

⁶⁸ Architect and Engineer, "Recently Completed Public Library, Oakland, California," September 1951, 21.

⁶⁹ "New Oakland Main Library," commemorative brochure for dedication of library building, 1951, collection of the Oakland Public Library.

⁷⁰H. R. Datz, Library Bureau Division of Remington Rand, Inc., Letter to Dorothy Cunningham, Remington Rand Inc., San Francisco, RE: Oakland Public Library, Oakland, California, December 10, 1946.

⁷¹ Oakland Tribune, "Plans Accepted for Libraries," May 12, 1947.

Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA

cornerstone was laid in May 1949, construction was substantially complete in October 1950, and the new building was dedicated in January 1951.⁷² Landscaping at the library was installed by the City of Oakland Park Department, who completed the work in late June 1951.⁷³



Figure 43. Warnecke & Miller's sketch of the proposed Main Library building, ca. 1947. Published in pamphlet prepared for the cornerstone ceremony, May 1949. Collection of the Oakland Public Library.

In its September 1951 issue, the Architect and Engineer's description of the new building focused on its simple, modern appurtenances: "The exterior and interior of the new Library building are modern in all respects. Rooms and book storage areas are illuminated with fluorescent electric fixtures; the building is completely steam heated and air conditioned to provide proper temperatures indoors irrespective of what outside weather conditions might be; and general use of a policy of simple and straight forward design, color and decorations has been used throughout."⁷⁴ Interior furnishings, most of which were within the architects' scope to select, consisted of "light gray steel and light blond oak wood furniture, with easy chairs and bright colored upholstering."⁷⁵ The completed building demonstrated the principles economy-driven simplicity planned by the architects (**Figure 44 through Figure 49**).

⁷² Oakland Tribune, "City Accepts New Library Building in Civic Center," October 11, 1950; Architect and Engineer, "Recently Completed Public Library, Oakland, California," September 1951, 21.

⁷³ William Penn Mott, Jr., Superintendent of Parks, City of Oakland Park Department, Letter to Peter T. Conmy, Librarian, City of Oakland, June 11, 1951. Warnecke Archives.

⁷⁴ Architect and Engineer, "Recently Completed Public Library, Oakland, California," September 1951, 23.

⁷⁵ Architect and Engineer, "Recently Completed Public Library, Oakland, California," September 1951, 23.

Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA



Figure 44. Southeast and northeast (primary) facades of the Main Library building, view southwest from corner of 14th and Oak Streets, 1951. Collection of the Oakland Public Library



Figure 45. Southeast façade of Main Library building, with Children's Room entrance at center of ground floor. View northwest from corner of 13th and Oak streets. Collection of the Oakland Public Library.



Figure 46. Main Library building dedication ceremony, January 7, 1951. Photograph shows original entrance glazing and doors.



Figure 47. Central hall of Main Library, ca. 1951, with card catalog cabinets. Entrance vestibule and mezzanine at left. Photographed by Ron Partridge, collection of the Warnecke Archives.



Figure 48. First-floor reading room of Main Library, ca. 1951. Photographed by Ron Partridge, collection of the Warnecke Archives



Figure 49: Ground-floor Children's Room at the Main Library, 1954. Collection of the Oakland Public Library.

Alterations

Alterations to the Main Library building since its completion in 1951, particularly at the exterior, have overall been minimal. The large vertically-oriented steel sash windows at all façades are original, as is the aluminum glazing system at the primary entrance.

Perhaps the most noticeable visual change, the 36' x 14' murals at the front entrance to the library were painted by artist Ed Cassel in 1978, and repainted by the artist in 1991. The accessibility ramp at the primary entrance was installed in 1999. Improvements to the Children's Room completed ca. 2003 renovated the interior facilities, and created indoor "window seats" by moving the glazing in the ground floor windows at the southeast façade closer to the plane of the exterior façade. Exterior metal awnings were installed above these windows as part of this project.

The limited number of permits on file at the City of Oakland Planning & Building Department are summarized in Table 1.

Date Filed	Permit App. #	Contractor	Work
10/19/1988	E8803514		Computer room Main Library
2/3/1999	DR99026 OR	Lam Tom and	ADA improvements including outdoor
	B9900412	Associates	ramp and remodel bathrooms.
11/21/2002	B0205485	Hung Construction	Children's reading room improvements.
7/7/2011	B1102388	Rockridge Builder	Create conference, classroom and public
		DBA	room within existing magazine/ newspaper
			room.
7/7/2011	B1104247		Add doorway to access 2 nd floor
			mezzanine.
11/17/2014	M1400526		Replace boiler

Table 1. Building permits for alterations to 125 14th Street, on file at the City of Oakland Planning and Building Department. Electrical, plumbing, mechanical, and expired permits have been excluded.

Comparison of floor plan drawings prepared by Miller and Warnecke in 1948 with existing conditions drawings prepared by RPR Architects in 2022 provides information about changes in space use and circulation at the Main Library building. Though minor functional changes have occurred at the ground floor, the use of the northeast portion of the floor for children's services, the southern portion of the level for book acquisition and cataloguing services, and the northwest corner as a public auditorium, have remained stable **(Figure 50 and Figure 51)**. At the first floor, the entrance sequence into the central hall has not been altered. The card catalogues within this hall have been replaced by media racks, a desk to the west of the entrance has been removed and partitions at the northeast side of the level have been slightly altered. Additional functions have

been added to the northern part of the reading rooms, with a reference area at the northeast and computer lab at the northwest. Two offices and a conference room have been subdivided from the southern reading room, at the southern wall of the central stacks. Despite these changes, the first floor generally retains the original overall pattern of circulation and use (Figure 52 and Figure 53). Similarly, the mezzanine retains its original overall circulation and subdivisions of space (Figure 54 and Figure 55). In the 1948 design for the second floor, and today, the space is more subdivided than the first floor with offices at the north and east side, and special use and collection rooms at the west and south sides. Since construction the "art and picture department" has been partially replaced by the relocated teen room, the periodical room enlarged, and the music department replaced by the Oakland History Center. The "Second Start" program office is now in the former location of the periodical room. Staff restrooms and locker rooms occupy a portion of the center of the second floor, adjacent to the stack room (Figure 56 and Figure 57). At all levels, in the original design and currently, the central core of the building is devoted to staff-only stack areas with rows of metal shelving.

Ownership and Occupant History

The Main Library building at 125 14th Street has been owned by the City of Oakland and operated as the main library of the Oakland Public Library system since its completion in 1951.

Historic Resource Assessment – Draft Project Number 20164 Oakland Main Library 125 14th Street Oakland, CA



Figure 50. Main Library building ground floor plan, Miller and Warnecke, 1948. Collection of Oakland Public Library.



Figure 51. Main Library building ground floor plan, RPR Architects, 2022.



Figure 52. Main Library building first floor plan, Miller and Warnecke, 1948. Collection of Oakland Public Library



Figure 53. Main Library building first floor plan, RPR Architects, 2022.



Figure 54. Main Library building mezzanine plan, Miller and Warnecke, 1948. Collection of Oakland Public Library



Figure 55. Main Library building mezzanine plan, RPR Architects, 2022.



Figure 56. Main Library building second floor plan, Miller and Warnecke, 1948. Collection of Oakland Public Library



Figure 57. Main Library building second floor plan, RPR Architects, 2022.

VI. EVALUATION

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places. In order for a property to be eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found significant under one or more of the following criteria.

- **Criterion 1 (Events):** Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
- **Criterion 2 (Persons):** Resources that are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
- **Criterion 3 (Architecture):** Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values.
- **Criterion 4 (Information Potential):** Resources or sites that have yielded or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

The following section examines the eligibility of 125 14th Street for individual listing in the California Register.

Criterion 1 (Events)

The Oakland Main Library at 125 14th Street was completed in 1951, designed by architects Miller and Warnecke for use as the Main Library of the Oakland Public Library system. Though it is the longest-serving location for the city's Main Library, it was not the first purpose-built facility; a Carnegie-funded Main Library was built in 1902 at 659 14th Street. That building still operates as part of the city's library system as the African American Museum and Library at Oakland. Though not the earliest example of the development and expansion of Oakland's library system, the current building at 125 14th Street relates to a post-war period of city planning and development which envisioned the blocks at the south end of Lake Merritt as a Civic Center. It was the first building constructed as part of the Civic Center and Lake Merritt Improvement unit of the Oakland Master Plan of 1947 and, though the Civic Center was not completed, the library represents this era of the city's planned urban development. In the last half of the twentieth century, the Oakland Public Library system initiated several programs which recognized the diversity of Oakland's population and expanded the reach of the library to the city's Latino, Asian American, Native American, and African American communities with dedicated branches, collections, and staff. These programs were predominantly implemented at branches, and thus the Main Library does not appear to be closely associated with their activities.

The Main Library building at 125 14th Street <u>appears</u> to be significant under California Register Criterion 1 at the local level for its association with postwar urban development in the City of Oakland, particularly the planned Civic Center.

Criterion 2 (Persons)

While numerous prominent individuals in Oakland have patronized and worked within the Oakland Public Library System, research did not identify individuals significant to history at the local, state, or national level who were associated with the library in a way which would confer significance under this criterion. The City Librarian at the time of the library's construction, Peter T. Conmy, was longserving and well-respected in the role, but does not appear to have been individually important in the City's broader historical development.

The Main Library building at 125 14th Street <u>does not appear</u> to be significant under California Register Criterion 2.

Criterion 3 (Architecture)

At its exterior and interior, the Oakland Main Library building embodies characteristics of the Late Moderne style as applied to a public library building. Popular in the decade following World War II, Late Moderne architecture tempered the optimism of the Art Moderne and Streamline Moderne styles with restraint and practicality necessitated by Depression-era and World War II-era constraints. While far simpler than the earlier WPA Moderne Alameda County Courthouse to which the Main Library refers, and the libraries in Toledo, Baltimore, and Brooklyn which inspired its design, the Main Library building at 125 14th Street is a coherent expression of the Late Moderne style as applied to a prominent civic building in Oakland. With symmetry and angularity expressed at all façades, the Main Library building is a fuller expression of the style than other Bay Area examples built as infill in urban blocks or as renovations of earlier structures.

Architects Miller and Warnecke were prolific builders in the San Francisco Bay Area, designing many residential and institutional buildings for more than three decades between 1917 and 1951. The firm's work was recognized during their careers in publications such as *Architect and Engineer*, and extant examples of their work in Oakland have been found to be eligible for the National Register. Their notable residential, institutional, and commercial designs embraced popular revival styles of the 1920s and 1930s, including examples of Tudor Revival, Mission and Spanish Colonial Revival, and Medieval influence. Though prolific and responsible for some individually noteworthy buildings, Miller and Warnecke are not generally recognized as architects of merit for the purposes of evaluation under the California Register. Their work tended to reflect broader movements in style, such as the period revivalism of the 1920s and 1930s, rather than initiating or influencing new developments in architecture.

The Main Library building at 125 14th Street <u>appears</u> to be significant under California Register Criterion 3 at the local level as a good example of Late Moderne civic architecture.

Criterion 4 (Information Potential)

The "potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of California" typically relates to archaeological resources, rather than built resources. When California Register Criterion 4 (Information Potential) does relate to built resources, it is relevant for cases when the building itself is the principal source of important construction-related information. Constructed using building materials and approaches typical of the postwar period in the United States, the Main Library building at 125 14th Street does not hold the potential to provide important information through future study, and thus <u>does not appear</u> to be significant under California Register Criterion 4.

The Main Library building at 124 14th Street meets significance Criteria 1 and 3 for the California Register, for its association with the postwar development of a planned Civic Center south of Lake Merritt and as a good example of Late Moderne civic architecture. Its period of significance is 1951, the year of the building's completion.

Integrity

In order to qualify for listing in any local, state, or national historic register, a property or landscape must possess significance under at least one evaluative criterion as described above and retain integrity. Integrity is defined by the California Office of Historic Preservation as "the authenticity of an historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance," or more simply defined by the National Park Service as "the ability of a property to convey its significance."⁷⁶

In order to evaluate whether the property retains sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance, Page & Turnbull used established integrity standards outlined by the *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Seven variables, or aspects, that define integrity are used to evaluate a resource's integrity—location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. A property must possess most, or all, of these aspects in order to retain overall integrity. If a property does not retain integrity, it can no longer convey its significance and is therefore not eligible for listing in local, state, or national registers.

The seven aspects that define integrity are defined, and discussed relative to the Main Library building at 125 14th Street as follows:

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.

<u>Discussion</u>: The Main Library building at 125 14th Street has remained situated at its location of original construction since its opening in 1951. The building therefore <u>retains</u> integrity of location.

<u>Setting</u> addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationships of the building(s).

Discussion: 125 14th Street is located within the Lake Merritt API, overlooking Lake Merritt to the northeast, civic and institutional buildings to the south, and mixed commercial and residential development spreading from the edge of downtown Oakland to the west. While individual businesses have changed and new buildings, such as the Alameda County Administration Building and cylindrical Alcopark garage to the south, have been constructed since the library's completion, the overall character of its urban setting has remained consistent. Within the parcel, the Main Library building's associated landscape and circulation features, which extend to the boundaries of the city block within which it sits, have substantially been retained. The building therefore <u>retains</u> integrity of setting.

<u>Design</u> is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of the property.

⁷⁶ California Office of Historic Preservation, *Technical Assistance Series No. 7: How to Nominate a Resource to the California Register of Historical Resources* (Sacramento: California Office of State Publishing, 4 September 2001) 11; U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1995) 44.

Discussion: 125 14th Street was completed in 1951 in a Late Moderne style. Exterior changes and alterations to the main public areas have been minimal, and have been consistent with the building's continued use as a public library. The flat roof, smooth concrete surfaces, plain straight parapet, large entry, and two-story windows and colonnades are retained. The interior of the library has kept the same design program, with reading and special use rooms within publicly accessible areas at the first story, mezzanine, and parts of the second story. Interior design features such as the wood paneling at the central hall and mezzanine, resilient tile flooring, and high-ceilinged first floor reading rooms with large windows maintain the library's interior character, while card catalogues have been replaced by computers and digital media racks. Minor exterior alterations such as the changes to ground floor windows at the southeast façade, installation of small metal awnings, and substantial interior alterations to the ground floor Children's Room and second floor Periodical Room, Teen Room, and Oakland History Center, are consistent with the library's program, and do not impact the building's integrity of design overall. The building therefore <u>retains</u> integrity of design.

<u>Materials</u> refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form the historic property.

<u>Discussion</u>: 125 14th Street retains its original concrete structure and the majority of its original metal windows. At the interior, the building retains wood paneling and flooring at the central hall and mezzanine, as well as tile flooring. Although some interior materials have been replaced, a substantial amount of original material remains at the interior, and all original material remains at the exterior. The building overall <u>retains</u> integrity of materials.

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.

<u>Discussion</u>: Workmanship at the Main Library building at 125 14th Street is expressed in the design features which convey its Late Moderne style and date of construction, including the concrete construction of the building, wood paneling at the interior central hall and mezzanine, and multi-lite metal windows. As with the building's materials and design, alterations which have been made to the exterior and public interior spaces of the building have not overall diminished its ability to convey its significance. Therefore,125 14th Street <u>retains</u> integrity of workmanship.

Feeling is the property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.

<u>Discussion</u>: 125 14th Street retains the original scale and proportions of its primary, northeast façade as well as secondary facades; and circulation pattern from the main entrance to the lobby, reading rooms, mezzanine, and second floor. In addition, many stylistic elements related to the building's Late Moderne style remain at the exterior and interior. Overall, the building is

legible as a central public library, built in a Late Moderne architectural style in 1951. Therefore, 125 14th Street <u>retains</u> integrity of feeling.

<u>Association</u> is the direct link between an important historic event or person and the historic property. <u>Discussion</u>: As with its integrity of design and feeling, 125 14th Street has retained exterior and interior design elements and circulation patterns which convey its original design and use as a library designed in a Late Moderne style. The building's exterior features, including its massing, height, and primary façade embellishment, contribute to its legibility as a 1951 building designed to serve as a city's main library within an area consisting predominantly of civic and cultural institutions. The interior configuration and circulation pattern communicate its original and current use. 125 14th Street therefore <u>retains</u> integrity of association.

Integrity Summary: The Main Library building at 125 14th Street retains all seven aspects of integrity.

CEQA Status of 125 14th Street

Per the City of Oakland's Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, an historical resource under CEQA is a resource that meets any of the following criteria:

- 1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources;
- 2) A resource included in Oakland's Local Register of historical resources, unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant;
- 3) A resource identified as significant (e.g., rated 1-5) in a historical resource survey recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523, unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant;
- 4) Meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources; or
- 5) A resource that is determined by the Oakland City Council to be historically or culturally significant even though it does not meet the other four criteria listed above.⁷⁷

The Main Library building at 125 14th Street was previously assigned an OCHS rating of A+ and is therefore included in Oakland's Local Register. The evaluation provided in this report finds that the building is eligible for the California Register for its association with the development of Oakland and architectural style. The property therefore meets Criteria 2 and 4 of the thresholds for status as a historical resource under CEQA within the City of Oakland.

⁷⁷ City of Oakland, CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, December 16, 2020, Appendix A: Guidance on Historical Resources.

Character-Defining Features

For a property to be eligible for national or state historic designation, the essential physical features (or character-defining features) that enable the property to convey its historic identity and reason for significance must be evident. These distinctive character-defining features are the physical traits that commonly recur in property types and/or architectural styles, or that convey an association with significant persons or patterns of events. Characteristics can be expressed in terms such as form, proportion, structure, plan, style, materials, and spatial relationships. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. The character-defining features of 125 14th Street include, but are not limited to the following:

Exterior Character-Defining Features:

- Site within planned Civic Center area, oriented toward 14th Street.
- Reinforced concrete construction
- Two-story plus basement height
- Rectangular massing
- Fenestration patterns, including configuration of lites and materials of original steel and aluminum sash windows on all four facades
- Flat roof with plain flat parapet
- Smooth concrete exterior walls with minimal ornamentation
- Prominent central entrance with two-story glazing and stepped surround at northeast façade
- Concrete retaining walls with integrated planters at northeast, northwest, and southwest sides (does not include accessibility ramp added 1999)
- Sunken courtyard at northwest side with staircase accessed via the Madison Street pedestrian right-of way.
- Paved patio at southeast, Oak Street side.
- Basement loading dock accessed by vehicle ramp at southwest side.
- Metal "Oakland Public Library" signage at primary entrance.

Interior Character-Defining Features:

- Circulation pattern from main entry through central hall to reading rooms
- Wood paneling in central hall, mezzanine, staircase, elevator lobby, and reading rooms
- Aluminum handrail at staircase west of entrance lobby
- Green terrazzo and red and green resilient tile floors
- High ceilinged first floor spaces, including the central hall and reading rooms

The murals at either side of the main entrance, painted by artist Ed Cassel in 1978, have not been included as character-defining features as they post-date the building's 1951 period of significance. The murals are less than 50 years of age and do not appear to have gained historic significance in their own right, from the perspective of evaluation of eligibility for designation as historic resources at the local, state, or national level. This does not imply that the murals lack significance to stakeholders and the local community as works of art or contributors to the visual character of the library and its surroundings.

VII. CONCLUSION

The building at 125 14th Street was designed beginning in 1946 by architects Miller and Warnecke and completed in 1951 for use as the Main Library of the Oakland Public Library system. At the time of its design, the library was intended to be a key building of a planned Civic Center development which would concentrate city, county, state, and federal government buildings and cultural institutions within the blocks at the southern end of Lake Merritt. Designed in a Late Moderne architectural style, the Main Library building refers to the nearby Alameda County Courthouse building to its immediate southeast, completed in 1936, while conveying the comparative restraint of Modernism-informed postwar architecture. The building has been used as Oakland's Main Library since its completion.

The property has previously been assigned an OCHS rating of A+ and is included in Oakland's Local Register. Page & Turnbull evaluated the building for eligibility for listing in the California Register and found that it is significant under Criterion 1 (Events) for its association with the post-war development of Oakland's civic institutions and under Criterion 3 (Architecture) as a good example of a Late Moderne civic building. The building retains all aspects of integrity relative to its 1951 period of significance. As it appears eligible for listing in the California Register and is included in Oakland's Local Register, the property is a historical resource for the purpose of CEQA.

Preparer Qualifications

This Historic Resource Assessment was prepared by Page & Turnbull of Oakland, California. Page & Turnbull staff responsible for this report include Ruth Todd, FAIA, Principal-in-charge; Christina Dikas Associate Principal; Stacy Kozakavich, Cultural Resources Planner, project manager and primary author; and Sarah Kefalas, Cultural Resources Planner and contributor, all of whom meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Historic Architecture, Architectural History, or History.

VIII. REFERENCES

Allen, Harris C. "Toward a Contemporary Type – A Modern Development of the California Tradition." *Architect and Engineer*. September 1937.

Architect and Engineer, "Recently Completed Public Library, Oakland, California." September 1951, 21.

Bagwell, Beth. *Oakland, The Story of a City*. Oakland, CA: Oakland Heritage Alliance, 1982.

City of Oakland. CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, December 16, 2020, Appendix A: Guidance on Historical Resources.

- _____. *Downtown Oakland Specific Plan*, Public Review Draft. Oakland, August 28, 2019).
- _____. *Lake Merritt Station Area Plan.* Oakland, December 2014.
- _____. Oakland General Plan: Historic Preservation Element. Oakland, October 1993.
- Datz, H. R. Library Bureau Division of Remington Rand, Inc., Letter to Dorothy Cunningham, Remington Rand Inc., San Francisco, RE: Oakland Public Library, Oakland, California, December 10, 1946.

Duncan, Alastair. Art Deco (World of Art). London: Thames & Hudson, 1988.

Dunn, Eleanor. "A Short History of Diamond Canyon and Sausal Creek." *The Montclarion*, March 24, 1998. Electronic resource at <u>https://fruitvaleoakland.wordpress.com/category/history/</u>.

Foster, Emily. "143 Years of Oakland Public Library History." Oakland Public Library, November 5, 2021. Electronic resource at <u>https://oaklandlibrary.org/blogs/post/143-years-of-oakland-public-library-history/</u>.

Gleye, Paul. The Architecture of Los Angeles. Los Angeles: Rosebud Books, 1981.

Hunt, Beverly. "American Indian Library Celebrates 15 Years." Oakland Tribune, November 14, 1994.

- Kelly, George. "Citizens Putting Their Votes Behind Measure O, Libraries." *Oakland Tribune*, June 8, 1994.
- Living New Deal Project. "Alameda County Courthouse Oakland, CA." Electronic resource at https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/alameda-county-courthouse-oakland-ca/.
- Longstreth, Richard W. *A Short History of Lake Merritt*. Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Qualifying Examination. University of California, Berkeley: School of Environmental Design, 1974.

Miller and Warnecke. "Libraries" portfolio, ca. 1964-1965. Warnecke Archives.

Letter to John F. Hassler, City Manager, Re: Oakland Public Library Main Library Building, December 4, 1946. Warnecke Archives. Letter to the American Library Association, April 4, 1946. Warnecke Archives. Letter from Carl Warnecke to John B. Kaiser, March 29, 1946, Warnecke Archives. Mott, William Penn Jr., Superintendent of Parks, City of Oakland Park Department. Letter to Peter T. Conmy, Librarian, City of Oakland, June 11, 1951. Warnecke Archives. National Park Service. National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1997. National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior. 1995. Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record for 125 14th Street. City of Oakland, 1997. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Historic Resources Inventory forms . for the Lakeside Apartment District. Oakland: Prepared for the City of Oakland, 1985. Oakland Public Library. "Early Librarians." Electronic resource at

https://oaklandlibrary.org/blogs/post/143-years-of-oakland-public-library-history/.

_____. "New Oakland Main Library." commemorative brochure for dedication of library building, 1951, collection of the Oakland Public Library.

Oakland Tribune. "A World of Knowledge at the Oakland Public Library." September 9, 2009.

- _____. "Restoring 1922 Oakland Building." March 10, 2003.
- _____. "Tutor Training." May 25, 1985.
- _____. "Asian Library is Moving to a New Home." October 5, 1980.
- _____. "Asian Film Programs." May 9, 1980.
- _____. "Filipino Culture Program." March 14, 1980.
- _____. "Asian Library Plans Open House." June 22, 1978.
- _____. "\$290,000 Grant to Asian Library." May 23, 1975.
- _____. "Town Meetings on Dope." December 11, 1970.
- _____. "Panel Blasts City's Public Housing Rules." November 9, 1965.
- _____. "Obscenity Civil Liberty to be Studied." January 6, 1960.
- _____. "Automation Problem Up To Leaders, Panel Says." January 14, 1955.
- _____. "Panel Series to Weigh Eastbay Growth Issues." January 5, 1955.
- _____. "Boat Handling Course is Offered." February 7, 1952.
- _____. "Course in World Affairs Offered." October 15, 1951.
- _____. Photographs of the "teen-ager" room at the Oakland Public Library's Main Library. July 5, 1951.
- _____. "City Accepts New Library Building in Civic Center." October 11, 1950
- _____. "Plans Accepted for Libraries." May 12, 1947.

- Pacific Coast Architectural Database, "Carl Ingomar Warnecke." electronic resource at http://pcad.lib.washington.edu/person/3366/.
 - ___. "Chester Herbert Miller (Architect)." electronic resource at <u>http://pcad.lib.washington.edu/person/1656/</u>, accessed December 5, 2020.

Rather, Lois. Oakland's Image: A History of Oakland, California. Oakland, CA: The Rather Press, 1972.

- Schwarzer, Mitchell. *Hella Town: Oakland's History of Development and Disruption*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2021.
- Self, Robert O. *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- State of California Office of Historic Preservation. Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD), Alameda County, updated March 2020.
- _____. Technical Assistance Series No. 7: How to Nominate a Resource to the California Register of Historical Resources. Sacramento: California Office of State Publishing, 2001.
- United States Census Bureau. Quick Facts: Oakland city, California. Electronic resource at https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/oaklandcitycalifornia#.
- Whiffen, Marcus. *American Architecture Since 1780: A Guide to the Styles, Rev. Ed.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992.

This page intentionally left blank.



Imagining change in historic environments through design, research, and technology

170 MAIDEN LANE, 5TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94108 TEL 415-362-5154 523 WEST 6TH STREET, SUITE 1013 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, 90014 TEL 213-221-1200 2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 120 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, 95816 TEL 916-930-9903 75 EAST SANTA CLARA STREET, SUITE 900 SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113 TEL 408-320-7911



Chain link and bollard at parking, typ.
Concrete paving with mortar set brick border
Newsrack
Book drop
Retaining wall, with guardrail, painted boardform concrete, typ.
-Birdbath, marble
Stairs and landings, concrete, with handrail, metal, typ.
-Lawn area, typ.
-Shrub area, typ.
-Valve box, typ.
Concrete walkway
Waste receptacle, typ.

1	EXISTING LANDSC/ HARDSCAPE ELEM	APE MAJOR ENTS	L1.1
	DRAWING	ISSUED	DATE:
RCHITECTS	SCALE: 1" = 40'-0'		11/18/22



odesk Docs://Oak Main Library-EHDD-21-11460/OakMainLibrary-Landscape-F

1/18/2022 4:42:26 PM

5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 ye	ars							
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
		CONDITION								
		5 4 3 2 1						Yes	No	COMMENTS /
										RECOMMENDED ACTION

	LANDSCAPE INSPECTION	Photo (as needed)						
1.	 Site furniture: Bike racks Galvanized Steel inverted-u, surface mounted racks on sidewalk and on site (4) Concrete bike racks, on site 	<u>A DA</u>	X				X	Metal racks are functioning, a more theft-resistant style such as square shaped inverted u-rack. Concrete bike racks are damaged with poor functionality and should be removed.
2.	Site furniture: Waste receptacles on site and on sidewalk		x		x		x	Functioning; graffiti on mosaic art waste receptacles. Doors on one receptacle at sidewalk have been removed, exposing damaged metal cans. Replace with Bigbelly high- capacity unit that has larger capacity and supports recycling. https://bigbelly.com/products/kiosk/
3.	Site furniture: Marble bird bath in concrete pedestal		Х			Х		Clean; complement with new planting.
4.	Site furniture: Library return book drop	X	X			Х		Functioning; Add new location on the property; double banked drop at Madison Street has cosmetic wear and graffiti, but functioning
5.	Site furniture: Metal bollard and chain link with padlocks at parking lots and back driveway			Х		X		Functioning; graffiti. Steel beginning to rust.

5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 ye	ars	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years						
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
		CONDITION								
			5	4	3	2	1	Yes	No	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDED ACTION

6.	Site furniture: Table with attached seating		Х				Х	Good condition. Recommend
7.	Site furniture: Raised concrete planter				Х	х		Functioning, minor chips.
8.	Site furniture: Raised galvanized steel planters	х	х			Х		Some graffiti.
9.	Site furniture: Flagpole and base		Х			Х		
1.	Signage: Metal signs with either metal or wood posts; or mounted to exterior building wall.			Х	X		x	Graffiti; paint wearing off on posts. Mostly legible. Posts remaining where signs have been removed should either replace sign or remove post.
2.	Landscape retaining walls: Metal railing at retaining wall, note visual appearance rated only, structural not observed.			X			X	Painted retaining walls have moderate chipping and soil buildup. Minor cracking. Recommend repainting or coating with slurry coat if they are to remain
3.	Landscape enclosure: dumpster enclosed in chain link fence with vinyl slats and barbed wire; posts direct bury in asphalt.	X				Х		Functional, consider upgrade with alternative to barbed wire.

5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 ye	ars							
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
		CONDITION								
		5 4 3 2 1						Yes	No	COMMENTS /
										RECOMMENDED ACTION

4.	Landscape fencing: metal, painted	X		Х		Uneven painting of fence at boiler room entry. No replacement needed.
5.	Handrails meet accessibility standards.				X	Handrails do not consistently meet CBC accessibility standards in placement, angle, rail type and extension. Replace with handrails that meet accessibility code.
6.	Exterior stairs: concrete, with metal handrails.		x		x	Treads worn out at main entry stair. Treads non-existent in stairs to western courtyard. Handrails show moderate cosmetic wear. Differential settlement at the base of eastern stairs leading to boiler room and main entry; grind down tripping hazard. Stairs are not meeting accessibility requirements in several ways including: riser heights and runs, handrails design and extension, stair nosing, level landings.

NEW	NEW New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years								
GOOD	DD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
FAIR	AIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
POOR	POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
CRITICAL	ITICAL Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
Yes/No	'es/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
		CONDITION							
		5 4 3 2 1					Yes	No	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDED ACTION
	GOOD FAIR POOR CRITICAL Yes/No	INEW New of line new, no issues to report, no expected itiliates, number 10 yet GOOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace w POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 CRITICAL Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not it to implement.	GOOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 yea FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 yea CRITICAL Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the to implement.	GOOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years CRITICAL Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal to implement. CON 5 4	INEW New of like new, no issues to report, no expected familes, number 10 years GOOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years CRITICAL Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal state to implement. CONDITION 5 4 3	INE W Retriction multiple intensity, no instance or report, no expected intensity, no intensity and intensity and intensity. GOOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years CRITICAL Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal to implement. CONDITION 5 4 3 2	INEW New of like new, no issues to report, no expected functes, number 10 years GOOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years CRITICAL Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement. CONDITION 5 4 3 2 1	INE W Rew of file field (160 mile field) for issues to report, if the Capterical function, if the Capterical functis function, if the Capterical function, if the Capterical functio	INE W New of fine freely, the issues of tepper, the expected fundres, if unit of the years Image: Construction of the period GOOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years Image: Construction of the period FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years Image: Construction of the period <

7.	Exterior ramp: concrete, with metal handrail		X				See civil engineer review.
8.	Landscape curbs: concrete		X		Х		Curbs with chipping in some areas, elsewhere completely intact.
9.	Pedestrian pavements: Concrete sidewalks			x		x	In general sidewalks are showing some wear, cracking, and lifting, tripping hazards should be ground down. Asphalt patching in the concrete sidewalk. Recommend full replacement of cracked sidewalks evaluating for root barrier installation or evaluating sub grade deficiency which is likely the cause for cracks and not the tree roots.

5	NEW	NEW New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years								
4	GOOD	OOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years									
1	CRITICAL Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years									
	Yes/No	Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
			CONDITION							
			5 4 3 2 1						No	COMMENTS /
										RECOMMENDED ACTION

10.	Pedestrian pavement: Detectable warning pavers				Х		X	Functionality is unclear. Extensive damage. Recommend remove and replace with concrete.
11.	Pedestrian pavement: Concrete paving with mortared brick border		x			Х		Minimal cracking.
12.	Vehicular pavement: Asphalt at parking lots and driveway			x			x	Parking striping worn partially or entirely. Light to moderate cracking. Recommend restriping.
13.	Trees – health - NIC- This should be conducted by an arborist						x	Tree health assessment is by arborist and not provided as part of this inventory. See existing tree identification plan for tree species and size. Trees recommended for removal: Liquidambar styraciflua; Calocedrus decurrens.

5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years]	
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years									
3	FAIR	Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years									
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Repla	ce when funds are available 2	– 4 ye	ars						
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP	within 2 years								
	Yes/No	Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action r	equired. No – not exist or not	up to t	he go	al stat	ed; goa	al is			
		to implement.		1							
				-				1	Vac	No	CONANAENITS /
				5	4	3	2	1	res	INO	
											RECOMMENDED ACTION
1.	Trees: Proxir adequate sp maintenance	nity of trees to building provides acing for tree growth and e of building.								X	All the trees are adequately placed from building façade except for the incense cedar and Mexican fan palm. Consult arborist to prune back so that tree does not overhang facility roof.
2.	Trees: Trees health.	has adequate soil volume for tree								X	Trees in lawn and shrub areas have adequate soil volume. Street trees have inadequate soil volume and the sidewalk should be redesigned to allow for more volume or consider placing trees at back side of sidewalk. All street trees are stunted in growth.
3.	Tree wells in	sidewalk – bare soil, grass					x			X	Tree wells lack proper mulching or material surfacing; recommend replenishing with 3" depth of mulch. Replace trees where trees have been removed.
4.	Tree stumps		1045							X	There are at minimum 7 tree stumps on site; remove all to 18" below grade.

5	NEW New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years									
4	GOOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years									
3	FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years									
2	POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years									
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.									
	CONDITION									
			5	4	3	2	1	Yes	No	COMMENTS /
										RECOMMENDED ACTION

5.	Planting: Lawn, overall health		x	x		Overall, the health of the lawn is uneven, between excellent and poor. There are some weeds but that is typical. There are some patches where soil is exposed and where the lawn has been replaced with mulch. Maintenance is doing a good job of mowing and irrigating.
6.	Planting: Lawn, turf is limited to recreational use areas				x	Currently there is lawn directly adjacent to trees; replace with ring of mulch. Generally, review lawn areas and consider keeping just the lawn area on the west side of the library as recreational area. The lawn represents a challenge to maintenance with frequent mowing required as well as high water consumption. Recommend that the lawn areas on the northern and eastern sides of the building be converted to low water use and low maintenance shrub and groundcover plantings. Evaluate lawn areas at the front entry for further reduction.

5	NEW	NEW New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years								
4	GOOD	OD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	POOR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
	CONDITION									
			5	4	3	2	1	Yes	No	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDED ACTION

7.	Planting: Biofiltration				X	In the sloped area of lawn on the west side consider pulling back lawn further away from tree roots to allow for better tree growing conditions. None exists. Future renovations will likely require for compliance with				
						stormwater management if a new building is constructed, if existing building remains will likely not be needed.				
8.	Planting: Shrub beds, overall health			x	x	Shrub beds are mostly comprised of hedges (in lawn or in planters) or filled with overgrown with grasses. Shrub beds, especially where drought-tolerant shrubs are present, are typically healthy. Beds with overgrown weeds in place of shrubs should be replanted.				
9.	Planting: Species are drought-tolerant and in compliance with current water conservation measures; native or climate-adapted plants are planted				X	Plantings are mostly lawn and so consider reducing lawn for water conservation measures. However, we do not recommend eliminating all if it if some is being used for recreational				
5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years								
---	-----------	---	--	--	--	--	-----	----	----------------------------------	--
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
		CONDITION								
	5 4 3 2 1						Yes	No	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDED ACTION	

						purposes it can remain as the water efficiency code allows for this. This should be discussed with City and library staff to see what is desired and needed for programming.
10.	Planting: Spacing and shearing of shrubs allow for shrubs to grow to their natural size and are not being sheared				X	Shrub spacing is generally adequate and is not close to the building. Some hedges are grown too close to the building or retaining walls. Some shrubs require shearing and as shrubs are replaced, they should be replaced with shrubs that do not require this extra maintenance.
11.	Planting: Shrub and groundcover areas are mulched with 3 inches of mulch				x	Recommend covering shrub areas with 3" thickness of arbor waste wood mulch for weed suppression & water retention. Recommend tree plantings surrounded by mulch bed.
12.	Planting: No invasive plants are planted			X		Washingtonia robusta (Mexican fan palm) is considered Moderate on the Cal-IPC Rating system. Recommend avoid planting other invasive plants.
13.	Planting: A diverse number of species are planted				Х	Most of the plantings are lawn with some shrub areas; disproportionate number of boxwood and Indian

5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 ye	ars							
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	AIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
		CONDITION								
	5 4 3 2 1					Yes	No	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDED ACTION		

								hawthorn. New tree and shrub plantings contribute to diversity. Recommend removing lawn that cannot be used for recreational purposes and planting with up to 16 species of shrubs.
14.	Planting: Health of existing soils			X		X		Visual inspection of the soils shows them to be relatively uncompacted in planting areas; exceptions for the tree wells and lawn areas with bare soil patches, where compaction exists. Soils test could be performed for analyzing nutrient needs and future fertilization.
15.	Planting: At least 50% of west facing building is shaded with deciduous trees						Х	Provide shade in future tree plantings.
16.	Planting: Shade at least 50% of paved areas						Х	Provide shade in future tree plantings. Currently not provided.
	ATION INSPECTION	11	1		I	1	1	
1.	Irrigation system summary.							In general, the system is in adequate condition. For basic maintenance, the

5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 ye				
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6				
3	FAIR	Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace w				
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2	– 4 years			
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years				
	Yes/No	Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not to implement.	up to the goal stated; goal is			
			CONDITION			
			5 4 3 2 1	Yes	No	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDED ACTION

					leading concern is a broken wire that
					prevents operation of Valve #1,
					adjacent to the rear parking lot. The
					irrigation controller is an electronic
					unit with multiple program capability.
					as renovation occurs elsewhere, it
					should be replaced with a Calsense
					satellite controller that can
					communicate with the city's central
					system. This would allow many
					system programming and monitoring
					functions, and eliminate the need for
					field personnel to make periodic
					schedule adjustments on site. In
					order to gain all features of the
					Calsense system, a flow sensor and
					master valve should be installed
					immediately downstream of the
					irrigation backflow preventer.
					Together, these components allow
					monitoring of system flows as well as
					leak detection and alerts. Once set up
					properly, maintainers would receive
					cell phone alert when a leak or break
					is detected. The system would also

5	NEW	V New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years								
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	IR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
	CONDITION									
	5 4 3 2 1						Yes	No	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDED ACTION	

					be able to stop operation of an individual zone, or the entire system, if a major break occurs. New irrigation heads were installed in the turf areas in 2022. We would recommend elimination of turf at the library, these projects should be accompanied by conversion of the turf sprinkler zones to durable drip irrigation to accompany new ground cover and shrubs.
2.	Irrigation- point of connection separate water meter			X	Could not confirm, there should be a separate meter for irrigation and will be required for any new construction.
3.	Irrigation- system in compliance with current WELO and mandated water conservation practices		X		Not compliant, much of the lawn functions as planting and is not for recreational purposes. Shrub areas are irrigated by spray systems in narrow spaces, which is no longer a complaint. Renovation of more than 500 sf will require upgrading the irrigation type and system to comply with current Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) codes.

5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years								
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6	– 8 ye	ars						
3	FAIR	Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
		CONDITION								
			5	4	3	2	1	Yes	No	COMMENTS / RECOMMENDED ACTION

4.	Irrigation- system general observations & age of system	X			System is operable. New spray heads at lawn areas were replaced in 2022 and maintainers report mainline is in functioning condition.
<u>с</u>	Irrigation- Water source			v	Not exist recommend installation
7.	Irrigation- static pressure at backflow	x		X	Within recommended range for sprinklers used.
8.	Irrigation- master valve			Х	Not exist, recommend installation.
9.	Irrigation- controller model				Unknown, could not gain access.
10.	Irrigation- is controller is a SMART Self adjusting controller that utilizes ET or soil moisture sensing			X	For WELO compliance, recommend upgrade to city Calsense system. This upgrade is not required by code until 500 sf or more of landscape is replaced.
11.	Irrigation- controller zone map & schedule set up			X	Maintain controller map and schedule in cabinet.
12.	Irrigation- manuals in controller			Х	Maintain irrigation manuals in the controller cabinet.
13.	Irrigation- visual detection of leaks at mainline, valves & quick couplers – note no below ground exploration will be conducted	X	X		No leaks observed.
14.	Irrigation- spray heads- have check valves installed, if not is low head drainage visible			X	New spray heads were being installed at time of inspection in 2022, check valves are required.

5	NEW	EW New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 years								
4	GOOD	OOD Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6 – 8 years								
3	FAIR	FAIR Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace within 4 – 6 years								
2	POOR	OR Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2 – 4 years								
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	S/NO Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
		CONDITION								
	5 4 3 2 1							Yes	No	COMMENTS /
									RECOMMENDED ACTION	

15.	Irrigation- spray heads- have pressure regulation installed			X	New spray heads were being installed at time of inspection in 2022, check valves are required.
10.	Arc Spray Nozzles (HE-VAN) approved			^	HE-VAN approved.
17.	Irrigation- is excessive overspray or run off visible onto non-permeable surfaces or onto fences or buildings		X	X	Recommend regular review and adjustment of sprinklers to avoid overspray. Many thin planting areas are spray irrigated, which means overspray is difficult to mitigate. These areas the spray heads appeared to be non-functioning.
18.	Irrigation- are spray heads set 24" away from non- permeable surfaces			x	Not required for existing landscapes per 2015 WELO. If landscape is renovated this will need to be upgraded in the areas that are renovated.
19.	Irrigation- are spray heads blocked by shrubs, signage, or light poles and causing wasted water			x	Recommend future system be a subsurface drip system.
20.	Irrigation- are filters installed at each drip zone			X	NA- not existing, but should be implemented.
21.	Irrigation- a low volume irrigation system that will meet CAWELO and EBMUD requirements			x	System is not low volume

Date: November 18, 2022

5	NEW	New or like-new; No issues to report; No expected failures; Plan 8 – 10 ye	ars							
4	GOOD	Good Condition; No reported issues or concerns; Consider replacement 6	– 8 ye	ars						
3	FAIR	Average wear for building age; not new but no issues to report; Replace w	ithin 4	- 6 y	ears					
2	POOR	Worn from use; End of expected life. Replace when funds are available 2	– 4 yea	ars						
1	CRITICAL	Extremely worn or damaged. Replace ASAP within 2 years								
	Yes/No	Yes/No Condition - noted. Yes - Exists & no action required. No – not exist or not up to the goal stated; goal is to implement.								
				CO	NDIT	ION				
			5	4	3	2	1	Yes	No	COMMENTS /
										RECOMMENDED ACTION

22.	Irrigation- are any drip lines exposed	x	NA- not exist. Recommend that future renovation projects install drip within shrub areas.
23.	Irrigation- are adequate flush valves installed and placed in valve boxes		NA – not exist. Recommend in future renovations
24.	Irrigation- is spray being used in areas 10 feet or narrower	x	All spray is installed in areas that are 10 feet wide or wider. Current code stipulates that any planting or lawn areas less than 10 feet wide cannot use spray irrigation.
25.	Irrigation- are hydrozones irrigated separately by one or more irrigation valves	x	Separate all hydrozones/water use of plants by hydrozones.

NOT INCLUDED – Assessment of ADA path of travel, Newspaper rack on sidewalk; parking meters or signage; bus shelter; street traffic lights or street lighting.

Feasibility Study

Oakland Main Library Feasibility Study Draft 2021-0843

Prepared for:

EHDD Architecture

Prepared by:

Yee Cheung, LEED AP, PE Kyle L Hughes, PE Daniel Chen, LEED AP Ed Dizon Calvin Karsch, CET, CFPS Jarod Myrick, CET,

October 28, 2022



Table of Contents

Project Description	1
Mechanical System Evaluation	1
Plumbing System Evaluation	3
Fire Protection System Evaluation	6
Electrical Systems Evaluation	7
Fire Alarm System Evaluation1	0

Project Description

PROJECT LOCATION

125 14th Street, Oakland, California 94612

BUILDING/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The intent of this study is to evaluate the existing systems currently installed for the existing 82,500 SF Oakland Main Library and determine the Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing and Fire/Life Safety system impacts of adding an additional 40,000-80,000 SF.

The Oakland Main Library consists of 4 stories that combine to a total area approximately 82,500 SF. The building was originally built in 1951.

Mechanical System Evaluation

SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

Steam Boiler Plan

The current steam generator plant is composed of three (qty. 3) 1,511 MBH Peerless Steam Boilers. The boilers appear to be 9 years old and in good working order. The steam and condensate piping, boiler flue and combustion air intake around the boilers also appear to be in good condition. Other boiler plant components including the blowdown tank and condensate receiver are functioning properly.

Steam generated from the boiler system are piped to duct mounted steam coils and finned tube radiators. The duct mounted steam coils are located on the discharge side of supply fans. The steam coils temper the air for space ventilation. Meanwhile, the finned tube radiators address the perimeter heat loss and are installed below exterior windows.

Ventilation Supply Fans

Supply fans are installed in the ground floor mechanical room. Duct from exterior louvers to the inlet side of the fan provide ventilation air to the building. Outside air is filtered and tempered with steam heating coils. Discharge air from the fan discharge is routed to overhead supply diffusers. Overall, the ventilation air side equipment appears to be old and part of the building's original construction. The supply fans, heating coils, and air devices are beyond their useful life and in need of replacement.

Controls System

Pneumatic controls are currently used for the HVAC controls system. The air compressor, tubing, thermostats, and actuators appear to be part of the original construction, and beyond their useful life. The state of their functionality and accuracy is unknown, but faulty components are suspected.

EQUIPMENT LIFE SPAN

The supply fans, exhaust fan, heating coils, finned tube radiators and air devices are well beyond the anticipated life span according to ASHRAE. The units should be evaluated to determine if they are still functioning properly. The unit's lifespan could be increased by replacement of failing components. However, older equipment typically requires more maintenance and periodic replacement of failing components.

TITLE 24 AND ECAP

The Equitable Climate Action Plan eliminates the use of natural gas for new buildings by 2030 and existing buildings to be all electric by 2040. The existing boiler system use natural gas for steam generation. The boiler should be replaced with electric steam boilers. Alternatively, phasing out the steam boiler plant and piping system and installing split heat pump equipment is another option.

CONSIDERATION FOR BUILDING ADDITION

Given the state of the existing mechanical system and the future removal of natural gas from the ECAP, IEI recommends two mechanical systems for the addition. The first option expands upon the existing steam boiler system and uses equipment in a similar fashion. The second option uses packaged or split system heat pumps. This option can eventually replace the existing steam system by phasing new equipment in its place. Further information on the two options is detailed below.

The existing steam boiler system has a total heating capacity of 4,500 MBH. Assuming 30 BTU/SF of building heat loss, the boiler plant appears to have enough capacity to heat the current building and an 80,000 SF addition. However, it is unknown if one of the boilers operate as redundant or if the existing steam and condensate piping are sized for all 3 boilers operating simultaneously. Regardless, assuming the boiler plant and piping can serve the addition without infrastructure changes, replacement of the ventilation fans, coils, radiators, and air devices are still needed. Further, by the year 2040, the natural gas steam boilers need replaced by an electric steam boiler due to requirements by ECAP.

Instead of expanding the steam boiler plant, packaged or split system heat pumps can heat and cool the 80,000 SF addition. Packaged heat pumps can locate on the roof or ground and distribute air via ductwork to the addition. Alternatively, split system heat pumps can route refrigerant piping from an outdoor heat pump to indoor fan coil units or large air handling units. Again, the outdoor heat pump will need to locate on the roof or ground. The split system technology offers several options for the indoor fan coil units, including ceiling cassettes, vertical air handlers, wall mounted, ground mounted, and above ceiling ducted units. Ventilation air can be achieved by filtered supply fans, energy recovery ventilators, or a dedicated outdoor air system (DOAS).

IEI recommends serving the addition with heat pump fan coils and/or air handlers. With flexibility of refrigerant piping, the system can more easily be installed in the existing building. If planned properly, the heat pump system can phase into the existing building and slowly decommission the steam boiler system. In addition to its flexibility, and unlike the steam boiler system, the heat pump system offers cooling and dehumidification control. IEI believes this system gives the most flexibility and comfort, is cost effective, and addresses the future requirements by ECAP.

Plumbing System Evaluation

SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

Domestic Cold Water

The building is served by a 3" domestic water that enters the building at the boiler room located on the ground floor. It is provided with a relatively new double check backflow preventer. The water lines from the street are copper and connects to galvanized steel lines downstream of the backflow preventer. Pipes were not labeled. City water pressure appears to be sufficient to serve the most remote fixture. No domestic water pump system is installed.

Domestic Hot Water System

Domestic hot water is served by a gas fired water heater rated at 199,000 BTUs (British Thermal Units) input with 197.1 GPH (gallons per hour) recovery rate at 100°F rise. It has 100-gallon storage capacity is also located in the boiler room. Circulation is provided thru an inline recirculating pump. Based on the serial number the heater appears to be manufactured in December 2017. No code required seismic bracing was provided to the equipment provided. Pipes to and from the heater are copper and transitions to galvanized steel to supply the fixtures. Similar to the domestic cold water, no labels were noticed. Pipe insulations were also missing.

Sanitary Sewer and Vent System

There are no plumbing as-builts available and pipe main size and connection to the street were not verified. Exposed pipes in the boiler room shows hub and spigot cast iron pipes. They were covered with silver paint and have no labels.

Storm Drainage System

The building has a flat roof with four internal roof drains. The dome strainers are rusted but sill functional. Pipe materials are assumed to be the same as the sanitary and vent system. Overflow is provided by scupper drains on the south side of the building. Existing storm and overflow drain system complies with code.

Natural Gas System

Natural gas originates from the gas meter with 5,000 CFH (cubic feet per hour), capacity located on the southeast exterior of the building. It is enclosed with concrete and steel cover. It serves the three (3) space heating boilers each at 1,860,000 BTUH and the water heater at 199,000 BTUH in the boiler room. Supply pressure appears to be the standard 7" WC. Pipe material is black steel for interior and galvanized steel at the exterior. Pipes appear to be in fair condition. Pipes are not labeled.

Plumbing Fixtures

Level 1 - Ground Floor

Staff and children's fixtures are provided at this level. Four (4) single occupancy children's restrooms (Restrooms 012, 013, 029 and 030) have floor mounted tank with elongated bowl, type vitreous china toilets and wall hung vitreous china lavatories with wrist blade faucets. The fixtures appear to be low flow

models and are in fair to good condition. The toilets appear to be accessible for the children. There is also a floor drain and hose bib inside the toilets. Code required insulation to p-trap and supplies are missing. Also missing are point of use thermostatic mixing valves (TMV) at the lavatories.

Men 014 and Women 021 Staff toilets are also located at this level. Toilets and lavatories are similar to the children's toilets but size and heights for adults. Wall mounted flush valve vitreous china urinals are located in the Men's room. Floor drains and hose bibs are present as well. Insulation and TMV are also missing. All fixtures are low flow models and appear to be in good condition. There are no accessible toilet stalls in both toilets.

A dual height stainless steel drinking fountain is located in the Children's Reading Room 005 and appears new.

There is a counter mounted stainless steel sink with lever handle faucet in the Mail 011 and appears outdated.

Janitor's sinks were noted in the Boiler Room 007 and Janitor 004. Both are wall hung enameled cast iron. The sink located in the boiler room look antiquated and no longer in service while the one in the janitor's room is at the end of if's useful life.

Level 2 – First Floor

A dual height stainless steel drinking fountain is observed at the Reference Area 118E and appears new. A single height electric water cooler is located is located near the Reading Room 118B. The fixture appears to be older than the drinking fountains and in fair condition.

A single occupancy non-accessible staff toilet Restroom 110 is located at the southwest end of the Main Lobby. It has standard height tank type with elongated bowl floor mounted tank toilet and wall mounted vitreous china lavatory with wrist blade faucet. Code required insulation to p-trap and supplies are missing. Also missing are point of use thermostatic mixing valves (TMV)at the lavatory. The fixtures are low-flow models and in fair to good conditions.

Level 3 – Mezzanine

Men 127 and Women 128 public toilets are located at this level. Toilets are floor mounted, vitreous china with elongated bowls and flush valves while lavatories are wall vitreous china with wrist blade faucets. Wall mounted flush valve vitreous china urinals are located in the Men's room. Floor drains and hose bibs are present as well. Insulation and TMV are also missing. All fixtures are low flow models and appear to be in good condition. There are no accessible toilet stalls in both toilets.

Level 5 – Second Floor

Men 229 and Women 211 Staff toilets are located at this level. Toilets are tank type, floor mounted, vitreous china with elongated bowls while lavatories are wall vitreous china with wrist blade faucets. Wall mounted flush valve vitreous china urinals are located in the Men's room. Floor drains and hose bibs are present as well. Insulation and TMV are also missing. All fixtures are low flow models and appear to be in good condition. There are no accessible toilet stalls in both toilets.

The Staff Room 227 has a non-accessible undercounter mounted stainless steel sink with a wall mounted wrist blade faucet. The fixtures look old but still functional.

Another sink is located in the Photo Room 225. It is a non-accessible counter mounted enamel cast iron with a wall mounted wrist blade faucet. The fixture looks antiquated. A similar sink with the same conditions was noted in Office 220.

There is a dual height stainless steel drinking fountain is located at Hallway 231. It appears to be in good condition.

Fixtures in Bathroom 205 a closet near Office 209 were not observed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Domestic Cold-Water System

The existing galvanized steel pipe portion of the system appears to have been installed when the building was built in 1951. Life expectancy of these pipes is 40 to 70 years. Lead content of galvanized steel pipes exceeds the current coed maximum weighted average lead content of 0.25%. Depending on when it was installed, solder and flux used for the copper pipes may exceed the maximum 0.2 percent allowed by the current code. California AB1953 Lead Free law took effect on January 1, 2010. Due to age and lead content, it is recommended the existing galvanized steel pipes be replaced with copper pipe meeting the required low lead content. Provide labels to identify system and flow direction.

Domestic Hot Water System

Commercial gas-fired tank type water heaters have a life expectancy of 10-12 years. Assuming it was installed in first quarter of 2018, the end of its useful life another 6-8 years. The heater can remain, but code required seismic straps should be installed. Replace pipes as recommended for the domestic cold-water system. Provide labels to identify system and flow direction. Insulate pipes to reduce energy use and meet current Title 24 requirements.

Sanitary Sewer and Vent System

Cast iron pipes has a life expectancy of 80 to 100 years. With regular inspections and maintenance, the existing system may have a still have 20 plus years left. A camera inspection on the pipe interior is recommended to determine pipe conditions. Provide labels to identify system and flow direction.

Storm Drainage System

It is recommended the rusted dome strainers be replaced. Provide labels to identify system and flow direction.

Natural Gas System

Steel pipes have a life expectancy of 40 to 70 years. The existing pipe can remain with regular inspection and maintenance. Provide labels to identify system and flow direction

Plumbing Fixtures

It was observed, most fixtures in the toilet rooms and drinking fountains have been updated. Flow rates noted on those fixtures indicate they are low-flow or high-efficiency with water usage. It is recommended those fixtures to remain. Toilet rooms that are not accessible should provide accessible fixtures. Where

indicated to be old and near the end of its useful life, the existing janitor's sinks should be replaced. The older sinks should also be replaced with accessible models and water conserving faucets.

TITLE 24 AND ECAP

As mentioned in the mechanical systems evaluation above, use of natural gas for new buildings by 2030 and existing buildings to be all electric by 2040. The existing domestic hot water heater use natural gas. The water heater should be replaced with heat pump water heaters.

CONSIDERATION FOR BUILDING ADDITION

Future additions will provide an opportunity to use environmentally friendly materials, systems and equipment. The domestic water system should use low lead copper pipes, fixtures and fittings. Stormwater collection and greywater water should also be considered to reduce water use. Heat pump or solar thermal domestic water heaters shall provide for domestic hot water demand.

Fire Protection System Evaluation

SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

An existing automatic fire sprinkler system is not currently installed within the existing building. A manual standpipe system with hose valves located in the stairs and extended to the roof level was observed to be installed. The standpipe system is not currently monitored or supervised by the existing fire alarm system. An incoming dedicated fire main was not observed to be installed.

EQUIPMENT LIFE SPAN

Standpipe hose valves and the associated piping have a life span of 50-75 years if maintained properly and inspected at the designated intervals per NFPA 25.

TITLE 24 CHANGES REQUIRED

None.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

If a new sprinkler system is installed within the existing building to accommodate new construction expansion/remodel or is retroactively required by the AHJ a new underground (min.6") fire main will be required to supply a new wet-pipe fire sprinkler system. Additionally, a new backflow preventer and fire department connection will be required. The backflow and fire department connection should be located on site in a pre-approved location by the local Fire Department and AHJ. The new wet-pipe sprinkler system will be required to be supervised and monitored by the fire alarm system.

The existing standpipe system should be fully inspected, and hose valves replaced which show signs of valve "sticking" or are inoperable. If a new fire sprinkler system is provided the exiting standpipe system should be connected to the fire water supply. Additionally, hose valves located on the roof should be clearly labeled and tagged per NFPA 14 requirements.

Electrical Systems Evaluation

SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

Electrical Service and Normal Power System

The existing service to the property is 600 amps at 208Y/120V, 3 phase, 4 wire from a single utility meter. The main switchboard is by Westinghouse, made up of 5 sections, and is equipped with a 600A main circuit breaker. It supplies the following listed loads throughout the building:

Branch-Circuit Panelboards

- Panelboard 'A' fed from a 200 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'B' fed from a 200 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'C' fed from a 200 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'D' fed from a 200 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'E' fed from a 100 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'F' fed from a 100 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'G' fed from a 200 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'H' fed from a 200 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'l' fed from a 100 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Panelboard 'J' fed from a 100 amp, 3 pole breaker

Equipment

- Computer Room equipment fed from a 100 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Computer Room equipment fed from a 70 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Elevator #1 fed from a 200 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Elevator #2 fed from a 100 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Dumb Waiter fed from a 70 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Humidifiers fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Precipitators fed from a 30 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Burner North fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Burner South fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Vent Controls fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Welder fed from a 30 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 1 Supply fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 1 Exhaust fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 2 Supply fed from a 20 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 2 Exhaust fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 3 Supply fed from a 35 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 3 Exhaust fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 4 Supply fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 4 Exhaust fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 5 Supply fed from a 35 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 5 Exhaust fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 6 Supply fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- Fan 6 Exhaust fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker

- Sump Pump fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- North Condenser fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker
- South Condenser fed from a 15 amp, 3 pole breaker

Emergency Power System

There is no emergency power distribution system currently serving the building loads via generator and transfer switches or inverter systems. The building emergency lighting is backed up by battery packs integral to fixtures.

Lighting System

The majority of the existing interior lighting system consists of fluorescent and incandescent type luminaires, that are suspended, surface-mounted, or recessed. A small portion of the luminaires have been replaced by LED type. Many linear fluorescent luminaires have one or more lamps that are in operational, reducing the lighting quality of the space.

The exterior lighting system consists of building surface mounted and pole mounted luminaires.

Automatic controls are provided for a portion of the lighting system via lighting control cabinets for time scheduling. Other remaining area luminaires are controlled via manual wall switches.

EQUIPMENT LIFE SPAN

Most distribution equipment including the main switchboard and most branch-circuit panelboards are original to the building, antiquated, and past manufacturer's recommended life expectancy. Recommend replacing all original distribution equipment. The remaining equipment that has been replaced in more recent renovations may remain for re-use based on condition.

TITLE 24 AND ECAP

Lighting, if modified or added in the building will be required to comply with the Title 24 California Energy Code 2022 Chapter 6.

The existing fluorescent and incandescent lighting is not energy efficient and no longer compliant with Title 24 lighting power density requirements. The existing areas with manual lighting controls are also not compliant, as Title 24 requires automatic lighting control for interior and exterior lighting.

The Equitable Climate Action Plan eliminates the use of natural gas for new buildings by 2030 and existing buildings to be all-electric by 2040. This electric load will need to be accounted for in the electrical service for the building expansion.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR BUILDING ADDITION

New Electrical Service and Normal Power Distribution System

Based on the anticipated addition of up to 80,000 SF to the existing building, we recommend upgrading the existing electrical service per the following high level preliminary load calculation. The preliminary new service size recommended is 4000 amps at 208Y/120V, 3 phase, 4 wire. This can also be divided into two

services at 2000 amps each. The service size required will be adjusted during design phase based on programming information and expected loads.

Oakland Main Library - Preliminary Expansion Electrical Load Calculation							
							Total
Space / Type	Area / Load	HVAC	Lighting	Recept.	Misc.	Total	(A@208V)
Spaces:							
General Library Areas	135,000 SF	4.00 VA/SF	1.00 VA/SF	1.00 VA/SF	1.50 VA/SF	1,013 kVA	2,810 A
Offices	15,000 SF	4.00 VA/SF	0.85 VA/SF	1.00 VA/SF	1.50 VA/SF	110 kVA	306 A
Circulation (Corridors, Stairs, Etc.)	4,000 SF	4.00 VA/SF	0.60 VA/SF	0.25 VA/SF	0.25 VA/SF	20 kVA	57 A
Back-of-House (MEP Service, Support)	1,500 SF	1.00 VA/SF	0.40 VA/SF	0.25 VA/SF	0.25 VA/SF	3 kVA	8 A
Restrooms	1,000 SF	4.00 VA/SF	0.65 VA/SF	0.25 VA/SF	0.25 VA/SF	5 kVA	14 A
Storage	6,000 SF	4.00 VA/SF	0.45 VA/SF	0.25 VA/SF	0.25 VA/SF	30 kVA	82 A
Equipment:							
Elevator (2 Total)	25 HP x 2					54 kVA	150 A
Totals:							
Total Building Load	162,500 SF					1,235 kVA	3,428 A
Grand Total Load (with 15% Spare Canacity)	162 500 SE					1 420 kVA	3 9/2 4
Grand Total Load (with 15% Spare Capacity)	102,500 3F					1, 4 20 KVA	3,542 A
Service Size - @ 208V, 3-Phase							4000A

The existing original main switchboard and downstream distribution branch panels should be replaced with new due to age and inadequate capacity for the building expansion. The remaining distribution equipment replaced during recent renovations can be considered for re-use based on condition.

The new branch panelboards should be disaggregated and organized according to load type, such as plug loads, lighting, and HVAC.

Emergency Power System

An emergency battery-backup inverter system can be considered to supply the emergency/egress lighting and other optional selected emergency loads such as certain areas and HVAC, from a centralized location. This could replace the existing luminaire-integrated battery packs for building emergency lighting, that require individual maintenance.

An exterior generator and associated transfer switches can also be considered, if the selected emergency loads are large enough to exceed the typical capacity of inverter systems.

Lighting System

It is recommended to replace or retrofit all the existing interior and exterior luminaires with updated LED type equivalents, to improve lighting quality and energy efficiency, and meet current efficiency standards. Lower maintenance and much longer life span are other benefits of LEDs.

New lighting controls should be provided for each space that includes a combination of manual switches, dimmer switches, occupancy sensors and photocell sensors, with integration to time scheduling, as appropriate for each space type, in compliance with Title 24. New automatic lighting control systems will further increase energy savings and dimmer switches will allow flexibility for staff and occupants to set the lighting levels of the space as desired.

Fire Alarm System Evaluation

SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The existing fire alarm system is an EST IO Series. The system, from the latest as-built drawings, appears to be about 19yrs old. This is right at the life expectancy of the fire alarm system.

The existing system is a horn/strobe system that utilizes horns and strobes for audible and visual notification.

Area detection is provided throughout the building.

EQUIPMENT LIFE SPAN

Fire alarm systems have a typical life span of about 20 years.

TITLE 24 CHANGES REQUIRED

None.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

It is recommended that the fire alarm system be fully replaced as it is at the end of its life span and upgraded to an Emergency Voice Alarm Communication System (EVACS), to meet code.

Replacement of all the area detection, input and output modules.

Replacement of all notification appliances and replaced with code compliant speakers, speaker/strobes, and strobes.



156 Ellis Street, 2nd Floor, San Francisco CA 94102 T: (415) 882-9449

1305 Franklin Street, Suite 312, Oakland CA 94612 T: (510) 433-0828

Oakland Main Library- Seismic Evaluation of the Existing Building

Prepared for

Oakland Public Library Oakland, CA

Prepared by

OLMM Consulting Engineers 156 Ellis Street, 2nd Floor San Francisco, CA 94102

OLMM Project Number: 2022-01

November 15, 2024



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	EXEC	CUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0	BUILI	DING DESCRIPTION	4
3.0	EVAL	UATION	
	3.1	SCOPE AND APPROACH	4
	3.2	BASIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	4
	3.3	SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION PARAMETERS	5
	3.4	FINDINGS	6
4.0	RECO	OMMENDATIONS	6
5.0	RETF	OFIT TRIGGERS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS	6
6.0	DISC	LAIMERS/LIMITATIONS	7
7.0	REFE	RENCE DOCUMENTS	7

APPENDICES

A	FIGURE 1 AND FIGURE 2	8
В	TIER 1 CHECKLISTS	10
С	ANNOTATED EXISTING DRAWINGS SHOWING DEFICIENCIES	19



1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Tier 1 Screening study was performed for the Oakland main library building in Oakland, CA based on ASCE 41-17 guidelines. The assessment was performed for the building's lateral load-resisting system. The target performance objective for the building is Collapse Prevention for BSE-2E hazard level. Collapse Prevention structural performance level is defined as the post-earthquake damage state in which a structure has damaged components and continues to support gravity loads but retains no margin against collapse. A significant risk of injury caused by falling hazards from structural debris might exist. The structure might not be technically practical to repair and is not safe for re-occupancy.

Oakland Main Library is one of the largest public libraries in the Bay Area. The building is a 3-story concrete building with a mezzanine floor. The main lateral-force-resisting system of the building consists of concrete piers and spandrels located around the perimeter of the building. Interior concrete walls with thicknesses ranging from 6" to 12" are present around the elevator, stair, and stacking room areas. For the Tier 1 checks, all the interior walls starting from the foundation level are considered part of the lateral-force-resisting system. Concrete slabs, beams, and columns form a complete vertical load-carrying system. The slab is typically 5" thick and column depths range from 16" to 34". The foundation system mainly comprises of isolated footings and a mat foundation at the stairs and elevator area. The bottom of the footing elevations vary from the east end of the building to the west due to the sloping ground surface at the site.

OLMM has relied on the original construction drawings dated 18th June 1948 for the Tier 1 Study. The Tier 1 screening has identified several non-compliant items in the checklist, which are summarized in Table 1 and shown below. The list number in the table does not indicate a rank or an order of importance. The retrofit priority number in the table indicates the proposed order in which the deficiencies need to be mitigated.

No.	Checklist Item	Description and proposed retrofit solution	Retrofit Priority
1	MEZZANINES: Interior mezzanine levels are braced independently from the main structure or are anchored to the seismic-force- resisting elements of the main structure.	The mezzanine floor is attached to the interior walls and the piers on the north side of the building. However, further evaluation of walls and the connections are needed to determine adequacy to accommodate the mezzanine forces. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) fabric to increase the shear capacity of the walls and to increase the strength of the connection between the mezzanine floors and concrete walls	1
2	LIQUEFACTION: Liquefaction- susceptible, saturated, loose granular soils that could jeopardize the building's seismic performance do not exist in the foundation soils at depths within 50 ft (15.2 m) under the building.	Based on the Association of Bay Area Governments (MTC/ABAG) Maps, the area around the building has moderate susceptibility to earthquake liquefaction. A Geotechnical investigation is required for a detailed evaluation of the liquefaction potential of the site.	2

Table 1: Executive Summary Table – List of non-compliant items



3	TIES BETWEEN FOUNDATION ELEMENTS: The foundation has ties adequate to resist seismic forces where footings, piles, and piers are not restrained by beams, slabs, or soils classified as Site Class A, B, or C.	 Proposed retrofit solution: follow recommendations in the geotechnical investigation report for the site to mitigate the effects of liquefaction on the structure. Ties are not present between the foundations. A geotechnical investigation is required to evaluate the competency of the soil to laterally brace the foundations. Proposed retrofit solution: Install new tie beams (grade beams) between footings in two orthogonal directions. This needs further evaluation after receiving the site- specific geotechnical report. 	3
4	SHEAR STRESS CHECK: The shear stress in the concrete shear walls, calculated using the Quick Check procedure of Section 4.4.3.3, is less than the greater of 100 lb/in. ² (0.69 MPa) or $2\sqrt{f'c}$	The average shear stress in the shear walls calculated using the quick check procedure was found to be greater than 110 psi. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) fabric to increase the shear strength of the concrete walls/piers.	1
5	REINFORCING STEEL: The ratio of reinforcing steel area to gross concrete area is not less than 0.0012 in the vertical direction and 0.0020 in the horizontal direction.	The horizontal reinforcement ratio for the concrete wall piers along the perimeter and some of the interior shear walls were found to be less than 0.0020. A further evaluation is required to check the capacity of the concrete wall piers and interior shear walls to resist seismic forces. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) fabric to increase the shear strength of the concrete walls/piers.	1
6	TRANSFER TO SHEAR WALLS: Diaphragms are connected for the transfer of seismic forces to the shear walls	Spandrels are not present around the building perimeter on the 2 nd floor. The diaphragm connections and the collectors on the 2 nd floor need to be evaluated. Proposed retrofit solution: Strengthen the axial capacity of the existing beams along the perimeter of the diaphragm at second floor using FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) wrap to act as a collector to drag the diaphragm loads into the concrete piers. Add steel angles at top and bottom of the beam running perpendicular to the concrete wall piers	1



		to strengthen the connection at the diaphragm/wall pier interface.	
7	DEFLECTION COMPATIBILITY: Secondary components have the shear capacity to develop the flexural strength of the components.	Building columns don't have the shear capacity to develop the flexural strength of the columns. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) wrap to increase the shear capacity of the columns.	2
8	COUPLING BEAMS: The ends of both walls to which the coupling beam is attached are supported at each end to resist vertical loads caused by overturning.	Overturning forces cannot be resisted by the individual piers alone. Coupling beams need to be evaluated to check their capacity to resist the deformations imposed by the piers. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) wrap to increase the shear and flexural capacity of concrete spandrels.	1
9	DIAPHRAGM CONTINUITY: The diaphragms are not composed of split-level floors and do not have expansion joints.	Diaphragm at the roof level is discontinuous. A 2'-1" raised slab is present at the roof level Proposed retrofit solution: This needs further evaluation to address any diaphragm deficiency issue.	3



2. BUILDING DESCRIPTION

The building is a 3-story concrete building with a mezzanine floor. The main lateral-force-resisting system of the building consists of concrete piers and spandrels located around the perimeter of the building. Interior concrete walls with thicknesses ranging from 6" to 12" are present around the elevator, stair, and stacking room areas. Concrete slabs, beams, and columns form a complete vertical load-carrying system. The slab is typically 5" thick and column depths range from 16" to 34". The foundation system mainly comprises of isolated footings and a mat foundation at the stairs and elevator area. The bottom of the footing elevations vary from the east end of the building to the west due to the sloping ground surface at the site.

The building type is identified as Type C2 (Concrete Shear Walls with Stiff Diaphragms) as per Table 3-1 of ASCE 41-17.

3. EVALUATION

3.1 SCOPE AND APPROACH

The purpose of this study is to screen the building for potential deficiencies using ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 evaluation for the structural elements. Evaluation of non-structural elements is not part of the current scope and work.

A Tier 1 Screening Study was conducted based on the Collapse Prevention checklists and noncompliant items were identified.

3.2 BASIC PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE

The building is a risk category II building, as defined in Table 1.5-1 in ASCE 7-16. The Basic Performance Objective for Existing Buildings (BPOE) for risk category II structures are Life Safety Structural Performance at the BSE-1E Seismic Hazard level and Collapse prevention Structural Performance at the BSE-2E Seismic Hazard level as per Table 2-1 of ASCE 41-17. For the Tier 1 screening procedure, Structural Performance Levels need to be checked only at the BSE-2E Seismic Hazard Level as per Table 2-2, which is Collapse Prevention Structural Performance. As per the commentary section C2.2.1 of ASCE 41-17 " For Tier 1 or Tier 2, Life Safety with the BSE-1E hazard is implied by meeting the criteria for Collapse Prevention Structural Performance Level with the BSE-2E hazard and the requirements in Chapter 3 that permit the use of Tier 1 and Tier 2 deficiency-based procedures". Hence the evaluation of Life Safety Structural Performance at the BSE-1E hazard level is not explicitly required.

The target performance objective is Collapse Prevention at the BSE-2E Seismic Hazard Level, for this Tier 1 study. The BSE-2E hazard has a return period of 975 years (5% probability of exceedance in 50 years). See Table for a summary of hazard levels and corresponding target performance objectives.

Hazard Level	Target
(Probability of Exceedance)	Performance Objective
BSE-2E (5% in 50 years)	Collapse Prevention Structural Performance (S-5)

Per ASCE 41-17, "Collapse Prevention structural performance level is defined as the postearthquake damage state in which a structure has damaged components and continues to support



gravity loads but retains no margin against collapse". A significant risk of injury caused by falling hazards from structural debris might exist. The structure might not be technically practical to repair and is not safe for re-occupancy.

3.3 SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION PARAMETERS

The spectral response acceleration parameter for BSE-2E was obtained from the SEAOC/OSHPD Seismic Design Maps Tool website. The soil profile is taken as site class D. See Table 3 for a summary of seismic parameters for the hazard level. The level of seismicity is classified as "High" per ASCE 41-17 Table 2-5 for the hazard levels. Figure 1 graph shows the response spectrum acceleration for the BSE-2E hazard.

Table 3: Spectral Response Acceleration Parameter

Hazard	S s	S ₁	S _{xs}	S _{X1}	Level of
Level	[g]	[g]	[g]	[g]	Seismicity
BSE-2E	1.719	0.64	2.063	1.088	







3.4 FINDINGS

The following lists non-compliant items identified as potential deficiencies based on the Tier 1 screening process.

• Mezzanines

The mezzanine floor is attached to the interior walls and the piers on the north side of the building. However, further evaluation of the walls and the connections is needed to determine adequacy to accommodate the mezzanine forces.

• Liquefaction

Based on the Association of Bay Area Governments (MTC/ABAG) Maps, the area around the building has moderate susceptibility to earthquake liquefaction. A Geotechnical investigation is required for a detailed evaluation of the liquefaction potential of the site.

• Ties Between Foundation Elements

Ties are not present between the foundations. A geotechnical investigation is required to evaluate the competency of the soil to laterally brace the foundations.

• Shear Stress Check

The average shear stress in the shear walls calculated using the quick check procedure was found to be greater than 110 psi.

Reinforcing Steel

The horizontal reinforcement ratio for the piers and some of the shear walls were found to be less than 0.0020. A further evaluation is required to check the capacity of the piers and shear walls to resist seismic forces.

• Transfer To Shear Walls

Spandrels are not present around the building perimeter on the 2nd floor. The diaphragm connections and the collectors on the 2nd floor need to be evaluated.

• Deflection Compatibility

Building columns don't have the shear capacity to develop the flexural strength of the columns.

• Coupling Beams

Overturning forces cannot be resisted by the individual piers alone. Coupling beams need to be evaluated to check their capacity to resist the deformations imposed by the piers.

• Diaphragm Continuity

Diaphragm at the roof level is discontinuous. A 2'-1" raised slab is present at the roof level.

4. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

A Tier 2 evaluation is required to evaluate all the potential deficiencies identified in the Tier 1 screening. Additional analysis and evaluation of each potential deficiency must be conducted to confirm the deficiency or demonstrate the adequacy of the structure. A detailed geotechnical investigation is needed to evaluate the soil conditions and the liquefaction potential.

5. RETROFIT TRIGGERS FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS



The retrofit triggers for an existing building based on 2022 California Existing building code are as follows:

Risk category II buildings

- Existing structural elements supporting gravity loads must be replaced or modified as necessary to safely carry the gravity load required by the current California Building Code (CBC) for new structures if alterations result in more than 5% increase in design dead, live, or snow loads.
- Existing structural elements designed to resist lateral loads must be modified or replaced to comply with the current CBC requirements for new structures if alterations:
 - Increase design lateral load that result in prohibited structural irregularity stated in ASCE 7
 - Reduce the capacity of any existing lateral load resisting elements.

Existing lateral load resisting elements are permitted to remain unaltered if the increase in their demand-to-capacity ratio due to the alteration is less than 10%.

• Substantial Structural Alterations: If the work area exceeds 50% of the building area and involves significant structural modifications, the lateral load resisting system of the altered building must comply with the current CBC requirements for new structures.

The following requirement also applies to Risk Category III and IV buildings, regardless of the extent of the alteration.

• If the cost of reconstruction, alteration, or addition exceeds 50% of the building's replacement value, the entire building must be evaluated and retrofitted to meet the CBC requirements for new structures

6. DISCLAIMERS/LIMITATIONS

Our evaluation consisted of a site visit, visual observations, a review of available existing drawings, and structural evaluation as described in this report. The evaluation of building materials and elements such as mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, accessibility requirements, waterproofing, and other non-structural features, is not within the scope of our services. Our services were performed in accordance with generally accepted standards of engineering practice. We offer no other guarantee or warranties, expressed or implied, and none should be assumed. This report is provided for the exclusive use of the client for whom it was prepared. It may not be used by others without the prior written approval of the client.

7. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), (2016). *Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures*. Reston: ASCE.

American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), (2017). *Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings*. Reston: ASCE.

Muller & Warnecke Architects (Existing architectural and structural drawings). (1948, June 18), Oakland, California:

SEAOC/OSHPD Seismic Design Maps Tool. Retrieved from https://seismicmaps.org/



APPENDIX - A





Figure 1. Earthquake Liquefaction Susceptibility For Oakland Main Library. (Courtesy of MTC/ABAG Hazard Map)



Figure 2. Ariel View of the Building (Courtesy of Google Earth)



APPENDIX - B TIER 1 CHECKLISTS

•

ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 Checklists

FIRM:	OLMM Consulting Engineers
PROJECT NAME:	Oakland Main Library
SEISMICITY LEVEL:	High
PROJECT NUMBER:	2022-01
COMPLETED BY:	Sanoop Subramanian
DATE COMPLETED:	11-15-2024
REVIEWED BY:	Mallikarjuna Doddupla, SE
REVIEW DATE:	

Project Name Oakland Main Library Project Number 2022-01

Appendix C: Summary Data Sheet

BUILDING DATA Building Name: Oakland Mai	in Library				Date: C	6/21/2023
Building Address: 125 14th St.	Oakland, CA 9461	2, United States	3			
Latitude: 37.8009509	Longit	ude: <u>-122.2636</u> 1	88		By:	Google Maps
Year Built: c. 1949	Year(s) Remode	eled:	(Original Design	n Code:	di .
Area [ft ² (m ²)]: 87000	Length [ft	(m)]: 195.67		Width	[ft (m)]: 1	25.5
No. of Stories: 3 Story & Me	zzan Story He	ight: <u>12.5 ft 15</u>	ft.	Total	Height: 5	0.5 ft
USE Industrial Office	Warehouse Ho	ospital 🗌 Reside	ntial 🗌	Educational	Other:	Library
CONSTRUCTION DATA		(O'mlana Oalana				_
Gravity Load Structural System:	Concrete Beams	Girders, Colum	ns, Slabs	s and Beari	ng wall	\$
Exterior Transverse Walls:	42" thick concret	e piers		Openin	gs?	
Exterior Longitudinal Walls:	27" concrete pier	S		Openin	gs?	
Roof Materials/Framing:	5" thick Concrete	Slab with bean	ns/girders	6		
Intermediate Floors/Framing:	5" thick Concrete	Slab with bean	ns/girders	3		
Ground Floor:						
Columns:	Square Columns	, varying from 2	4 " to 16"	Foundati	ion: Sha	allow Foundation
General Condition of Structure:	13					
Levels Below Grade?	None					
Special Features and Comments:	Mezzanine floor	above 1st				
LATERAL-FORCE-RESIST	ING SYSTEM					
	Lo	ngitudinal			Tran	sverse
System:	Shear Walls co	upled w/ conc. I	beams	Shear Wa	alls coup	oled w/ conc. bea
Vertical Elements:	Concrete Wall	Piers		Concrete	Wall Pie	ers
Diaphragms:	5" NWC Slab			5" NWC 8	Slab	
Connections:						
EVALUATION DATA						
BSE-1N Spectral Re	sponse See -	1 414		Sec. =	0 761	
Accele	rations: Class -	<u> </u>		0// -	1 2	F 17
BSE-2E Spectral Be	sponse	2 000		F_4=	1.000	
Acceler	rations: $S_{\rm XS} =$	2.063		S _{X1} =	1.066	
Level of Seis	smicity:	High	Perfor	mance Level:	Collaps	se Prevention
Building	Period: T =	0.379			-	
Spectral Accel	eration: S _a =	2.063			-	
Modification	Factor: $C_m C_1 C_2 =$	1.1	Building	Weight: W =	22,940	kips
Pseudolateral	Force: $V = C_m C_1 C_2 S_a W =$	52,058 kips			-	
BUILDING CLASSIFICATIO	DN:					•
REQUIRED TIER 1 CHECK	LISTS	Yes	No			
Basic Configuration Checklist		~				
00						
Building Type <u>C2</u> Structural Cl	hecklist					
Building Type <u>C2</u> Structural Cl Nonstructural Component Chec	hecklist klist					

Project Name Oakland Main Library Project Number 2022-01

17.1.2CP Basic Configuration Checklist

Tier 2 Commentary **Evaluation Statement** Reference Reference Status Comments Low Seismicity Building System—General С NC N/A U LOAD PATH: The structure 5.4.1.1 A.2.1.1 The building contains a complete load path. contains a complete, well-defined X load path, including structural elements and connections, that serves to transfer the inertial forces associated with the mass of all elements of the building to the foundation. NC N/A ADJACENT BUILDINGS: The clear С U 5.4.1.2 A.2.1.2 There are no adjacent buildings; item is not applicable distance between the building X being evaluated and any adjacent building is greater than 0.25% of the height of the shorter building in low seismicity, 0.5% in moderate seismicity, and 1.5% in high seismicity. NC N/A U **MEZZANINES:** Interior mezzanine 5.4.1.3 A.2.1.3 С The mezzanine floor is attached to the interior walls and the piers on levels are braced independently X the north side of the building. from the main structure or are However, further evaluation of walls anchored to the seismic-forceand the connections are needed to determine adequacy to resisting elements of the main accommodate the mezzanine structure. **Building System-**-Building Configuration A.2.2.2 С NC N/A U WEAK STORY: The sum of the 5.4.2.1 The shear wall areas are nearly identical for the roof and the 2nd shear strengths of the seismic-X ΓI story. No weak story is present force-resisting system in any story in each direction is not less than 80% of the strength in the adjacent story above. С NC N/A U SOFT STORY: The stiffness of the 5.4.2.2 A.2.2.3 Story stiffnesses are calculated and compared based on an ETABS seismic-force-resisting system in X analysis. No soft story is present any story is not less than 70% of the seismic-force-resisting system stiffness in an adjacent story above or less than 80% of the average seismic-force-resisting system stiffness of the three stories above. NC N/A VERTICAL IRREGULARITIES: All A.2.2.4 С U 5.4.2.3 All the walls that are part of the vertical elements in the seismicmain seismic force resisting system X are continuous to the foundation force-resisting system are continuous to the foundation.

Table 17-2. Collapse Prevention Basic Configuration Checklist

Project Name	Oakland Main Library
Project Number	2022-01

С	NC	N/A	U	GEOMETRY: There are no changes	5.4.2.4	A.2.2.5	The building plan dimensions are				
X				in the net horizontal dimension of			same throughout the building				
<u></u>				the seismic-force-resisting system							
				of more than 30% in a story							
				relative to adjacent stories,							
				excluding one-story penthouses							
				and mezzanines.							
С	NC	N/A	U	MASS: There is no change in	5.4.2.5	A.2.2.6	There is no change in effective				
				effective mass of more than 50%	ian 50%		mass of more than 50% from one story to the next				
<u>^</u>				from one story to the next. Light							
				roofs, penthouses, and							
				mezzanines need not be							
				considered.							
С	NC	N/A	U	TORSION: The estimated distance	5.4.2.6	A.2.2.7	The locations of center of mass and				
									between the story center of mass		the rigidity has been calculated
X						and the story center of rigidity is			using ETABS. The distance		
				less than 20% of the building			between center of mass and the rigidity is less than 20% of the				
				width in either plan dimension.			building width.				
							0				
					Tion D	C					

Statu	ıs			Evaluation Statement	Tier 2 Reference	Commentary Reference	Comments			
Mod	Moderate Seismicity (Complete the Following Items in Addition to the Items for Low Seismicity)									
Geologic Site Hazards										
С	NC	N/A	U	LIQUEFACTION: Liquefaction-	5.4.3.1	A.6.1.1	Based on the Association of Bay			
	X			susceptible, saturated, loose granular soils that could jeopardize the building's seismic performance do not exist in the foundation soils at depths within 50 ft (15.2 m) under the building.			Area Governments (MTC/ABAG) Maps, the area around the building has moderate susceptibility to earthquake liquefaction. A Geotechnical report is required for a detailed evaluation of the liquefaction potential of the site			
c X		N/A	U	SLOPE FAILURE: The building site is located away from potential earthquake-induced slope failures or rockfalls so that it is unaffected by such failures or is capable of accommodating any predicted movements without failure.	5.4.3.1	A.6.1.2	The building site is located away from potential earthquake-induced slope failures or rockfalls			
c X	NC	N/A	U	SURFACE FAULT RUPTURE: Surface fault rupture and surface displacement at the building site are not anticipated.	5.4.3.1	A.6.1.3	No surface fault rupture and surface displacement are anticipated at the building site.			

Project Name Oakland Main Library 2022-01

Statu High	us Seism	icity (C	ompl	Evaluation Statement ete the Following Items in Addition	Tier 2 Reference to the Items fo	Commentary Reference or Moderate Seism	Comments icity)
Foun	dation	n Config	urati	on			
c X		N/A	U	OVERTURNING: The ratio of the least horizontal dimension of the seismic-force-resisting system at the foundation level to the building height (base/height) is greater than 0.6 <i>Sa</i> .	5.4.3.3	A.6.2.1	0.6Sa = 0.6x2.063=1.24 The least horizontal dimension of the SFRS is equal to the building width = 125.5' B/H = 2.49 > 1.24;OK
c	NC X	N/A	U	TIES BETWEEN FOUNDATION ELEMENTS: The foundation has ties adequate to resist seismic forces where footings, piles, and piers are not restrained by beams, slabs, or soils classified as Site Class A, B, or C.	5.4.3.4	A.6.2.2	Ties are not present between the foundations. A geotechnical investigation is required to evaluate the competency of the soil to prevent the lateral spreading of the foundations.

17.12CP Structural Checklist for Building Types C2: Concrete Shear Walls with Stiff Diaphragms and C2a: Concrete Shear Walls with Flexible Diaphragms

					Tier 2	Commentary				
Statu	ıs			Evaluation Statement	Reference	Reference	Comments			
Low and Moderate Seismicity										
Seismic-Force-Resisting System										
С	NC	N/A	U	COMPLETE FRAMES: Steel or concrete	5.5.2.5.1	A.3.1.6.1	Concrete columns and beams			
$\mathbf{\nabla}$				frames classified as secondary			form a complete vertical			
\frown				components form a complete vertical-			load-carrying system			
				load-carrying system.						
С	NC	N/A	U	REDUNDANCY: The number of lines of	5.5.1.1	A.3.2.1.1	More than 2 lines of shear			
Y				shear walls in each principal direction is			walls are present in each			
				greater than or equal to 2.			principal direction			
С	NC	N/A	U	SHEAR STRESS CHECK: The shear stress in	5.5.3.1.1	A.3.2.2.1	The average shear stress in			
	X			the concrete shear walls, calculated using			the shear walls calculated			
				the Quick Check procedure of Section			using quick check procedure was found to be greater than			
				4.4.3.3, is less than the greater of 100			110 psi.			
				lb/in. ² (0.69 MPa) or $2\sqrt{f_c}$.						
С	NC	N/A	U	REINFORCING STEEL: The ratio of	5.5.3.1.3	A.3.2.2.2	27" thick walls are reinforced			
				reinforcing steel area to gross concrete			with #5 bars at 12" at each			
	\frown			area is not less than 0.0012 in the vertical			face horizontally.			
				direction and 0.0020 in the horizontal			2x0.31 sq.in/(12" x27") =			
				direction.			0.0019 < 0.0020			
Conn	Connections									
С	NC	N/A	U	WALL ANCHORAGE AT FLEXIBLE	5.7.1.1	A.5.1.1	The diaphragm is rigid; item is			
		X		DIAPHRAGMS: Exterior concrete or			not applicable			
				masonry walls that are dependent on						
				flexible diaphragms for lateral support are						
				anchored for out-of-plane forces at each						
				diaphragm level with steel anchors,						
				reinforcing dowels, or straps that are						
				developed into the diaphragm.						
				Connections have strength to resist the						
				connection force calculated in the Quick						
				Check procedure of Section 4.4.3.7.						
С	NC	N/A	U	TRANSFER TO SHEAR WALLS: Diaphragms	5.7.2	A.5.2.1	Diaphragm connections to			
	X			are connected for transfer of seismic			shear walls need to be			
				forces to the shear walls.			evaluated at the 2nd noor			
С	NC	N/A	U	FOUNDATION DOWELS: Wall	5.7.3.4	A.5.3.5	Wall reinforcement is			
X				reinforcement is doweled into the			doweled into the foundation			
<u> </u>				foundation with vertical bars equal in size			size and spacing			
				and spacing to the vertical wall			6			
				reinforcing directly above the foundation.						

Table 17-24. Collapse Prevention Structural Checklist for Building Types C2 and C2a
Project Name Oakland Main Library Project Number 2022-01

					Tier 2	Commentary			
Statu	IS			Evaluation Statement	Reference	Reference	Comments		
High	Seism	icity (C	omple	ete the Following Items in Addition to the I	tems for Low a	and Moderate Se	eismicity)		
Seisn	nic-For	rce-Resi	isting S	System					
c	NC ×	N/A	U	DEFLECTION COMPATIBILITY: Secondary components have the shear capacity to develop the flexural strength of the components.	5.5.2.5.2	A.3.1.6.2	Building columns don't have the shear capacity to develop the flexural strength of the columns.		
с	NC	N/A	U	FLAT SLABS: Flat slabs or plates not part	5.5.2.5.3	A.3.1.6.3	No flat slabs present		
		×		of the seismic-force-resisting system have continuous bottom steel through the column joints.					
C	NC	N/A	U	COUPLING BEAMS: The ends of both walls to which the coupling beam is attached	5.5.3.2.1	A.3.2.2.3	Coupling beams need to be evaluated to check their		
	X			are supported at each end to resist vertical loads caused by overturning.			capacity to resist the deformations imposed by the piers.		
Diap	hragm	s (Stiff	or Flex	ible)					
с	NC ×	N/A	U	DIAPHRAGM CONTINUITY: The diaphragms are not composed of split- level floors and do not have expansion	5.6.1.1	A.4.1.1	A 2' raised slab is present at the roof level.		
	NC	NI/A			5613	A A 1 A	N N N N		
×			OPENINGS AT SHEAR WALLS: Diaphragm openings immediately adjacent to the shear walls are less than 25% of the wall longth		3.0.1.5	N.T. I.T	No such condition is present		
Flexil	ble Dia	phraar	ns						
С	NC	N/A	U	CROSS TIES: There are continuous cross	5.6.1.2	A.4.1.2	Diaphragm is rigid; Not		
		×		ties between diaphragm chords.			аррисаріе		
с		N/A	U	STRAIGHT SHEATHING: All straight- sheathed diaphragms have aspect ratios less than 2-to-1 in the direction being considered.	5.6.2	A.4.2.1	Diaphragm is rigid; Not applicable		
С	NC	N/A	U	SPANS: All wood diaphragms with spans	5.6.2	A.4.2.2	Diaphragm is rigid; Not		
		×		greater than 24 ft (7.3 m) consist of wood structural panels or diagonal sheathing.			applicable		
С	NC	N/A	U	DIAGONALLY SHEATHED AND	5.6.2	A.4.2.3	Diaphragm is rigid; Not		
		X		UNBLOCKED DIAPHRAGMS: All diagonally sheathed or unblocked wood structural panel diaphragms have horizontal spans less than 40 ft (12.2 m) and aspect ratios less than or equal to 4-to-1.			applicable		
c X		N/A	U	OTHER DIAPHRAGMS: Diaphragms do not consist of a system other than wood, metal deck, concrete, or horizontal bracing.	5.6.5	A.4.7.1	The diaphragms are all concrete slabs		

Legend: C = Compliant, NC = Noncompliant, N/A = Not Applicable, U = Unknown

Project Name Oakland Main Library Project Number 2022-01

Connections												
С	NC	N/A	U	UPLIFT AT PILE CAPS: Pile caps have top	5.7.3.5	A.5.3.8	The building does not					
		X		reinforcement, and piles are anchored to the pile caps.			contain pile caps; item is not applicable					

Legend: C = Compliant, NC = Noncompliant, N/A = Not Applicable, U = Unknown



APPENDIX - C

ANNOTATED EXISTING DRAWINGS SHOWING DEFICIENCIES





Antipersonal and a second seco		2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	6, +;} ;; ;; ;; ;; ;; ;; ;; ;; ;; ;; ;; ;; ;
The descent particular desce		9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{c} \end{array}{c} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ $	SEC AT TOL
	<i>ب</i> بر		Bi Bi Bi Bi Bi Bi Bi Bi Bi Bi	For a
			$\frac{1}{3}$	
			1972 1972 1972 1974 1996 1997 2008	











2	sheft End Right Ends & Support aleran & Support planat \$ 5 Frederic Street by Struct sob	Mark B	D Span	Mart No	Size Heat OI	END RI	OF HA	Sizetyp	Spraing each en	LEFT END Location for Unsymmetrical	REMARKS	BEAM	Mary N. C.	BARS LFT END RIG	HT END	STIRRUPS	LEFT
she .	cce the Dig with the the	B27 18	22 13-6	A 2 CR 2	1 - 0-9	- 8.	0-7 6	1/2 0	226, 2012, thei 024'cc	Bni B25		B62 12 12 13-	A 2 34	09	ar How 312	U 286, Then 824	cc Col B
	RI AT STD CIRCULAR STD STRAIGHT	B28 /8	36 36-4	A AJ 22	19 6 0-1	1-0 1-	0-7 6	58 01	1284" then Ci2" Hist this type (b) of Skylight Only	c	2"FL Brad Skylight	B6312 12 12	CR 2 13 A 2 34 6	0-2	0-7 6	Ú 90	Star
	al de al ar HOOR & BENO HOOR SU HOR S	v		CR 5	34 6 0-6	5-0 5-	0-7 24		265" 2012" 14-	A ban		K+2'2"	CR 3 4	0-23-6 - 36	02612	1 20° 5° man @ 8	
	BAR DIAGRAM I See General Notes Sheet i See General Notes Sheet i See General Notes Sheet i	st	18 18-11	CL 3 CR 3	34	404 6.0 -			@ 24 *cc.	COS #6,#11	2'20	1304 12 12 13-	4 CL 2 L CR 2 M	40 40 40	40	- 200,///2/20	с.с. ,
	2. Dimensions al, al, ar, or are not necessarily the same for bars of different marks. 3. Spans linted are for subject of support. When the same for bars of different marks.	B30 12 1	4 9-4	A CR 3	34 - 1-0	- 4-0	0-9 - 4-6 -	12 5	2@5", then @ 242	Bm 829	220 R. Brn, Cais B4, B1	E65 12 12 16 0	CL 2 14 CR 2 4	4-0 4-0 4-0	0-2 6 12 4-0 -	U 200, thene4	ec.
	and the second second string purposes "I have accur they may be used as distributing bar and betalier must verify all span dimensions" All sturups to be socurely wired to longitudinal bars with Floer Plans. "Provide beam bar spacers to support student to end	5 B31 12 2	24 13-6	A 2 A 1 CL 3	1 6 0-6	2-0 2-0	0-6 5	12 13	459", then Color	Colline D	,Co/6.DL.D.I	B66 12 12 10-	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{c} \\ $	3-03-0 - 3-0	0-3 6 12	℃ 4€6° then @2	tec Stair V
	4. Use round deformed bars unless noted. for beams less than 0 beams privide three space for beams less than 0 0° span, Add one space for each additional 50° span, Add one space	BIT	1 1 1 1	R 2 .	34 6 0-3	- 4-0	0-6 12	!₂ 1J	10	E6 4 E 11	2" FI Bm.	B67 12 36 18-1	A 2 70 6 AI 1 70 - CL 3 1 10	0-6 - 1 - 0 2-0	0-7 6 1/2	13 2 86" then @24	èc Exterior
	a and a computer so ar Hochion of span.	633 (C)		C2 3 CR 3	8-4-6	4-6 -	4-6-				between Collines Dand E	B63 12 10 9-4	CR 5 1 -	- 5-0	0-7 18	11 do	Bm E
	BEAM SCHEDULE	B330 12 2	4 13-6	41 3 3	8 - 4-6	2-0 2-0	0-9	213	do		do	B69 10 14 Storne	A 2 34 6 7 2 34	3-3	0-3 6 /2	ช <i>do</i>	
	Mark B D Span Work No Sue LEFT END PIGHT END Spacing each and Insummarian REMARKS	5	+	A 2	10 B330	011.5	0-6 6	12 5	205" 209" 1012		and Cl Read St	B70 10 14 13-6	A 2 4 6 7 2 4 10	8-1	036'2 0310	1) do	
	1 2 10 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	= K = 2	8 /3-11	CL 37 CR 37	8 - 4-0	2-0 2-0	4.0 -		then Cafee	· ·	e - Febriar Stars	10 14 Sparie	A 2 34 6	30	99- 12 30-	1) 00	Br: 3
	B1 20 18 37-81 C 4 1 1 12 1/10 10 5	B35 10 1	4 13-6	A 2 1 A1 1 7 62 3 3	1 6 0-3 4	1-0 1-0	0-9	/2 U	5@ 9", then @ 2420	Line 5	Cd 85	B72 10 18 13-6	A 2 1 6 Al 1 1 - CL 3 1 -	0-7 4-6 4-6	0-7 6 12	U 286 589 the @ 24° = c	7
	$B_{2}^{2} = 20 = 22 = 15 - 6 \begin{array}{c} 7 & 2 & 7^{+} & - & 0 - 9 & - & - & - & 0 - 7 \\ R & 2 & R & 2 & - & - & - & - & 0 - 7 \\ R & 2 & R & - & - & - & - & - & 0 - 6 \\ R & 2 & R & - & - & - & - & - & - & 0 - 1 \\ \end{array}$	B36 12 1	13-0	A 2 7	d - 0-9 8 - 1.0	4-0 4-0	0.36	12 U	2 80" then C 2400	Bm. B20	2ª FL. Bin. Cel AB	In Two Rows	(A) 2 1'8 6 (A) 3 1'8 -	0-0 0	0-7 6 5/8	5 886", then @12'c	Exterior
	$B_{3 20 22 15-6} \begin{array}{c} 7 \\ R \\$	B37 12 12	2 15-6	7 3 3	4 6 0-3		0.3 6	12 0	236. then & 1200		See Ding for truc span		CR 2 10 24	08 - 5-0	0-7 24 0-7 24		
	B4 10 4 15-6 11 1 2 5 - 0-9 0-9 12 3 3095 there 2 dec A X is the clear	B38 92 12	2 10-3	A 2 1 A 1 2 G1 2	8 - 1-0 4 - 1-0	3-0 -	0-36	12 1	4 @ 5". then @ 24'cc.	Entrancewall	Drop So Fill of 558 b to receive Reint From State Run.	B74 10 12 13-6	A 2 3 6 AI 1 1 CL 3 34 -	0-3	0-3 6 'z	1 50 3; thence 24%	e
	B40 10 4 13-6 12 1 1 2 - 3-0 3-0	B39/4 2	2 13-6	CR 2 1 A 2 7	8-0-9	- 3.0	3-0 -	1/2 U	206 2012 Then	Be. B8	Al 2-nd. Fl. near Entrance Rock Rin	B75 10 14.13-6	A 2 58 -	0-9	9-6 - 0-9 - 12	1) do	
	B5 rest Some as Som Bas encer hope & barry at her and At line 12 14 Flort Bm, Col 31	B40.11 14	13-6	A 2 7	5 0~7	2-0 2-0	0-9 - 1	12 11	##"c.c. 4@6,"3@9",Then	Stock Rm	Roof Brn Cale DuDII		AI / 70 T 2 34	4-6	4-6 -		The second
	D34 Some as Boom B5, except amit CR for Col B6 / VFIBA Col bb	╶┠╍╍┾╌┼╴	┼──┟	CL 2 7	8 10 0-7 4 6 0-7	4-0	0-7 6 5	*# 154	4 Part = 12@ 6"then	wall	ED, 12D Make Clevennes the	B76 10 14 13-6 B76a 10 14 13-6	A 23 34 10	0-5	0-9 - 1/2 1-0 -	1 3C 9, then C242	e. Wall
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	B41 18 36	36-4	7 44	8 ² 34 0-7 4 24 0-7	5-0 - 50	0 7 84	100	Clec: Se this lund at Surlia	20.4	ome as shown in Sketch for Bm B 28	B TT 10 24 13-6	A 2 18 -	0-9 1	0-9 - 12	1 226; 1hene 24'co	-
	E 1 13-5 19 2 1 - 9 20 20 - 0-7 6 1/2 U 2005 300 Col B7 Col B1 K-22 CR 3 10	R42 15 V		A 2 1 AI 2 1	6 0-7	2-0 2-0	0-7 6 -	58 118	4 @ 9" then@ 12"cc.	Cols B8489	cool 23m at Skyright	B77a 10 24 13.6.	CZ Z BB - For Seame	770 Only 8-0	50 -		
	B 8 14 25 28-3 [2 1] 18 10 0 1-0			CL 3 1 CR 3 1	- 5-0	5-0 5-0	0-7 18	+) <20	sethistype at Skyligh	+ Only	do	5 10 10 24 10-6 2 20 5 73 10 24 9-4	$\begin{array}{c} A \\ CL \\ Z \\ R \\ A \\ 7 \\ R \\ R$	0.0 5.0 -	7:9 - 1/2 (1/2 (U 206, thene 24'cc	Blog Con
	$\frac{1}{68} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{$	B45 14 36	13-6	R 3 1 CL 3 1 CR 3 1	0 - 4-0	1-0 - 4-0	-7 6 1 -0 -	2 11	2 C 6' then & 12° c. c.		Roof Bin at Elevotor	4.22 380 10 24 12.0	CL 2 % 12	0-6 4-0	2	do	do Shirvall
	$\frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$	B44 14 18 K·23	13-5	A 3 73	6 0-3 - 4-0	F0 -	1-0 - 1	z U	800, then C12 cc.	COI 46	Root Bra Col AL	B81 12 34 6-3	A 2 1 6 T 2 1 14	0-2 5-0	1/2	1 206; then 312'cc	
	$\begin{array}{c} C_{10} & 0 & 16 & 16 & 9 & 22 \\ K_{10} & 25 & K_{10} & 0 & 0 & 66 & 6-9 \\ K_{10} & 25 & K_{10} & 0 & 0 & 66 & 6-9 \\ K_{10} & 25 & K_{10} & 0 & 0 & 66 & 6-9 \\ K_{10} & 25 & K_{10} & 0 & 0 & 66 & 6-9 \\ K_{10} & K_{$	B45 14 36	12-7	4 3 1 (4 3 1 (R 3 1)	6 0-3 - 4-0 -	0	0-3 6 11 1-0 -	2 11 2	2@ 6" then @ 12"cc.		do at flenstor	582 8 14 8-6	A 2 58 6 T 2 58 12	5-6 2	2-9 - 2 1	1 12"cc, thrunut	At Bm B. TolsE8a,E
	B/1 22 21 13-13 17 2 30 0 0-6 1-0 1-0 - 0.9 - 33 U 2818, Mene 24 cc Interior Hall 14 FL. Beam, Col AL	B46 14 14	15 6 2	9 2 7 8 CR 2 7 8		- 4-0	2-36! 7310		4 @ 6' then @ 24"cc	Col AB	do	383 8 14 5-0	Bars suppling	1 69 Em 382	"	, do	1
	B12 22 30 13-6 11 31 6 0-7 07 6 38 11 584; Men Carco Col B6 12 FL Beanifold	847 12 14	10-3	T 2 7 a	- 2-0		2-0-	2 10 2	386,389, then 82+cc.		do						
	$\frac{2}{2}\left[\frac{2}{3}\left[\frac{1}{3}-\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{1}{3}-\frac{1}{3}\right)\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{1}{3}$		10-3	2278	- 3-0	- 5-0	-0 -			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	40						
	B 13 10 14 13-6 11 1 1 - 1 - 10 10 - 1 - 10 10 - 1 - 10 000, Meng 28 cc Colline D 10 FL Blarns CL 3 + - 4-6 5	B49 12 14	10-3 2	R 3 3	- 3-0 3	- 3-0		2 4 2	2@6*3@9*,then @24*cc	1.	oof Bri at Cols B& \$B9						
	B14 10 14 9 - 4 11 1 18 6 007 - 0 - 0 09 - 12 U do Col Line B 19 FL Brams	B50 12 10	14-9	41 22 2	60-6	020	-0 12 -0	8 11 8	8 6 6 then C 24 cc.	exterior Wall	Mezz FL. Bni						
	B15 12 12 10.3 6 3 6 0.3 0.3 6 2 U SE6, then Eld Co Bans B200000 W Man + 0.3 6 2 U	B51 12 10	13-6 A	9 2 18	- 0-9	-0 2-0	-9 - 12	2 15 7	106", then @ 24% c		de						
	9 15 10 20 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	B62 a	7	9 2 70	- 4-0		-7 6 12	- u	do	Bm B51	do						
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1332 12 10	15-5 2	R 2 34	4-0	- 4-0	78										
	B17 10 14 10-5 12 24 03 6 12 U 286; Men @ 247.6 WIFE Beams of Cal B0, 89	B53 12 10	13-5	2 2 3 8	6 0-7 2 6 0-7 2 6 0-7 4	0 2-0	7 6 2	2 12	do		do						
	B1312 18 19-32 141 1 19 14 06 1-0 10 16 12 U 206" 2012 Men Esterior Hall 18 FL BM Col AH		A	R 2 74	6 0-3	4-00	-7 6 1	118	26. there 24 cm	Col Lines A	40						
	$\frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{12} - \frac{1}{10} - \frac{1}{10} - \frac{1}{10} - \frac{1}{10} - \frac{1}{10} \frac{1}{10} - \frac{1}{10} \frac{1}{10}$	B54 12 10 K + 22	13.5 7	2 34	- 2.0 2	020	76			\$ 11	40						
	B2012 14 13-0 11 1 6 0 3 - 0 9 - 12 U 536 3 5; Then Col Line 8 # Mars, 2 2 # H Bm	B55 12 10	13.6 2		6074	-6 0	8 - 12	11 2	@ 6", then@ 24cc	0/3 45# 412 als A 7#410	do	•					
	$\frac{k \cdot p_{11}}{R_{22}} = \frac{k \cdot p_{21}}{R_{22}} = \frac{k \cdot p_{22}}{R_{22}} = k $	B56 12 10	13-6 12	× 2 °4 7 2 3 4 4 2 5 4	- 0-9 -	6 - 0	9 - 12	υ	do	ols 4H4 i3H	do						
	$\begin{array}{c} -23 \\$	B.56012 10	13-6	R Em	8550 Only	464	6 -										
	12-212 14 13-6 41 17 4 2-0 2-0 2-0	E5/ 10 18	13-6 A A	270	6 0-6 -	0 1-0	9 - 10	U 0	24°c.c	Nanior in A	oot an at Col. 89						
	B24 10 4 13-6 4 2 24 007 46 09 - 11 286 Mew 826 22 24 14 185 8 B24 10 4 13-6 4 2 24 00 09 09 - 14 11 4	DO0 12 10	11-9 CI	12 34	60-64	6 4-6 4	6 -			AVERYON WOIN	1012 H. Bm.	•					
	B2400 14 5-6 (-2 + 2 + + - +	B60 12 10	13-6 CA 13-7 A	2 2 34	6 0-3	4-60	7 0 12	12 2	00 C	ois 60,110	do						
	B25 18 38 37-4 54 16 12 12 16 0	B60 12 12	13-5 CL		0 0-3 4	0 2.0	0-	U e	24 c.c.	00 0 0 100	do , col Line 8						
	11 Two Rouse	E61 12 12 Rei Kate	13-11 A	2 34	- 0-9 - - 4-0 4-	0 = 0	9 - 12	11 20	e this lype at Elevelo © 6," then @ 24=c	<u> </u>							• .
	B 26 10 10 10 A 2 2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	00/012 121	13-6/124	0312	- 1-1 -	14-0 0	0-	1		Ì	do juli Line B						



	-Dp.d. structural via A		
	Left Ends Left Ends Left el - er	MARD D L MENTIND REMTEND LEFT END REMARKS.	MD: In-Rouse notes It appears that the drawings do not show descent and taken load residing system GENERAL NOTES
	AT 8 TARE STO CHEVULAR HOOK Except as otherwise		Applying to oil Structural Features unless otherwise shown or no.
	al de al action de la constance de la constanc	Permanent stat	0. See Architestural Drawings for: Mids of floor flush and their location; openings in walls and subs require liners; and arge hongesset; and edition for attached to the concrete structure; roadway baring, make of subject productions and location; or argin; etc.
	(Support L. Span Support 1.40 Liss BAR DIAGRAM STD. STRAIGHT HOOK	30 5 Varies 6 2 2 6 0 3 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0	<u>DIMENSING</u> <u>a Consisting unless</u> otherwise noted are to rough source to surfaces. <u>JSEREPARCIES</u> <u>DISEREPARCIES</u>
	1 See General Notas. 2 Dimensions diar, e.e. are not necessarily the same for bars of different marks. 3 Will bas to be Revind deformed values allowing marks for bars of different marks.	64 4 12 See Seet A baby - 2 - 0 - 64 bars	(a) The charter for project the structure into which with the Architectural Drawings as to legall, during the Architectural Drawings as to legall, during the structure of a structure of the Architectural Drawing as to legall, during the structure of the Architectural Drawing as to legall, during the structure of the Architectural Drawing as the legall, during the structure of the Architectural Drawing as the legall, during the structure of the Architectural Drawing as the legall, during the Architectural Drawing as the legall, during the structure of the Architectural Drawing as the legall, during the Architectural Drawing as the legall, durin
	4 Span ""as listed in Schedule is for estimating purposes only. The contractor sha verify all span dimensions with latest issue of framing puppess. <u>BAR (HAUS)</u> Characteria is a contractor sha bar (HAUS).	// 3/ s	OMISSIONS. (0) In the event that certain festures of the construction are not fully shown on the drawings or called the same character as for stimiler constructions that are shown as called for: 6 CONCESTE
	 b bit and close shall be or <u>unitingent</u> TTP, and shall be used in support. G. <u>SLABS-GENERAL</u> Go Stabs are marked on framing Plans thus: <u>(Mark)</u>. The arrows indicated 	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(0) All shructural concrete shall have an ultimate strength in compression of at assis 3 000 % of at 28 days STELL PELINFORCEMENT (0) All shructural in formation stores (0) All shructural in formation of a loss (0) All shructural in formation (0) All shructural in formatio
	 (b) In bottom of skot the As and "a bors are to alternate. Over supports the B'bars from opposite sides and to alternate. "C'and/or "T" bars are to alternate with "B'bars. 	$\frac{32}{33} \frac{5}{5} \frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{62} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{12} \frac{2}{12} \frac{1}{12} \frac{2}{12} \frac{3}{12} \frac{3}{12} \frac{3}{12} \frac{3}{12} \frac{5}{12} \frac{3}{12} \frac{5}{12} \frac{5}{12} \frac{5}{12} \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{12}$	 (6) All textincing bars to be deformed bars and shall show a bowd strength 25 per cent greater that plantbars series. (6) All textinorement shall be continuous. Laps of 50 lives shall be at least 48 bars dhome least of Stretching and the to be an ended to be bars.
	(2) All adges of all Openings in slabs place 4-54 bars thus - Bart to mysler 48 d bayond convers. Edge at opening- least ends it 48 d cannot be obtained. (d) For Two Way slabs arrange and detail childreneous 4's"	34 5 Grees (1) 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	(a) Similar a noise intervents to be a similar inter an else on on the best of a norther pargit. (b) Similar devices of some statistic in a understare device intervent on the spectrum of the true horizon to the intervent of a statistic intervent of the second of the secon
	so that the bars in the start direction are 34" stear from Top or Bottom of stab as the case may be.	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	before being uses. 8. WALS (a) See Architectureri Drawinas for concrete works not stawn on Structured. Drawinas.
		$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$.0 All Walls shall have typical reinforcement even though no reinforcement is shown oil the drawings unless a failars. For 6 "wall and under - 4" 8 12" etris each may in center of wall.
	SLAB SCHEDULE	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1000 1012 Holis - \$ \$ \$ 12 Cors and way and have at \$ 5 char from sheer to have of har! for malls over 12" that: - \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$
	Main Size Specification Left END REMARKS I B. 9 B 0	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(a) Al un cur ner s una nois mors sections als creats show the contraction of the state of house
	$ \frac{10}{2} \frac{5}{2} \frac{5}{2} \frac{5}{2} \frac{10}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{14}{2} \frac{4}{2} \frac{4}{2} \frac{10}{2} \frac{10}{2$	$\frac{46}{42} \frac{\pi}{3} \frac{1}{2} $	
1	$\begin{array}{c} 2a \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 5 \\ 2s-3 \\ f_{1} \\ f_{2} \\$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(e) Arcand at the eiger st operator use integrat there as show below $(ARGINRL BA2S: \rightarrow 1.78\%$ for while G^{+}_{A} under in thickness 27% for walls B to 17% (nc). In thickness 27% for walls B to 17% (nc). In thickness
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	AT R-1 (Use strains and the first and first an
	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1 46 5 12 113 50 12 12 11 00 40 40 - 0 40 5 40 0 40 0 40 0 40 0 4	
الهار ا	7 5 Wines CL 9 2 2 10 0 3 - 0 - 0 - Wini or opening At all there around Stock M. Area Stock 1	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	50 3 Varies 61 4 4 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Hoor time Downth surveys Where your Survey S
	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	The many and and a set of the set
	12 5 0 4 2 18 2 6 0 5	53 5 Haries 2 12 6 0-1 0-1 6 Machine 200m Root	3 Development of weight and tooking with sloke resting on growing useff that as oft?" Ches, weijeching 2* 0* lake slow inside tore of in (b) All pack is at well with the that is a scape of the and spacing as weak "contar somean, Devolg show' exhaust 454 metric of all more all contarters as composition of contarts well and space as a scale of the state of the state state of all more all contarters as composition of contarts and space as a scale of the state of the state of the state of the state of the st
	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(c) Provid dowels for all walls starting an Seans and for stats. These dowels shall be as when in Paragraph 96. Stop Departments in the Contractor shall submit to the Architect for approval complete bending and placing defails of all reinforcement all the Contractor shall include an easily and a statements.
	15 5 10-11 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(i) The interpretation recently as a state of any one positional concerned and interpretation for an and the state of the position of the interpretation of the interpretatio
	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$58 \ s \ 5^{-2} \ c_{1}^{-2} \ a_{1}^{-2} \ a_{2}^{-2} \ c_{2}^{-2} $	 <u>CONSTRUCTION JOINTS</u>
	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	39 5 7-1 26 51/5 4-9 9 - Col Imed 60 5 27-5 9 4 46 12 + 4-9 9	main the subset of concrete of construction join? is self-soil provide leaves of 40 ctris. Powers (O hors 4 (mor main): Proves (O hors 6 Chair Car main): O thick and your in landshow the entire surface of constructions joint sa rangement with surface mechanism and main within 48 hours of term power from the membrane surfaces so of high July Prior to ciposalling of new concrete, the surface of construction joint shall be thoroughlouteauxes
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	61a 5 55 (1.1.4.5) 12 - 5 66	a coal of 12 cement inorto' shall be slushed on the surface. 13 <u>FOUNDATIONS</u> (0) Least where otherwise shown excavertion shall be made as near us for the lot the neat lines required by the
	2 L 2 B H CO - 70 - 9 - Sour gening	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(b) Barkfill shall not be plane: against walls until floor slobs bracing the walls have been poured and have a STRUCTUREL_STRUCT (3) All structured Steel shall conform to the ALSC Specifications for the design fabrication and beckers of
	21 5 Capita Garden, see defail	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	beel som constant to the constant oscillations of the ASSAIL by solar for Brages one Bullings, ServerCus [6] Faint See Speartheattons
	22 5 13-6 4 2 12 14 - 2		
1	$\begin{array}{c} 23:5 \\ 23:5 \\ 4 \\ 4 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		2-6 1/4
			Same as bolow State and State
	26 5 A)		Provide I Presence in Standard (UN017120) AT CEAMS gritter NAT was also Provide a defended
4	See Bular	Asn St Ling	Alt 022 c continues bars. Size Alt. (Die trans a traines) traines a traines bars. Chief and the continues of the continues
	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	All Is hit	With the second
	28 5 - 7 2 8 6 0.9 - Car Hite 5 - See Steller Stal 28	TYP. DETAIL AT SLAB DEPRESSIONS	ORDER OF DIACONG
			The dimension of the assumption of the distance submit and see of the submit of the su

noted
ired by doors, windows, ducts, vents, Diumbing, etc. ; all types of Hashing .
lks, stairs, ramps, curb walls, terraces, etc., exterior grades; elevations
umensions and elevations. All discrepancies, if any, shall be reported to
nings.
i for in the General Notes or Specifications then their construction shaft
ys on standard test cylinders taken on the job. See Specifications.
Risant Const
antal and vertical
s, queciffically nated * <u>Not, Reinforce</u> ri * Typical well reinforcement shall be as
e of wall
the store of the s
e 11/1/2010/11/1 1-12'317: hks.
120° (b)
enbedment
as many final $\frac{1}{10^2}$ As close as possible to \mathbf{g} of wall there are
SECTION X-1
i e the paraget Use standard books when this embedment is not possible.
n walt orteoping (ne O Straspit dools where deviets territante at 1400 of volt. Vers inte welt and ASdiemeters into tooling. Provide 6° straight hoods at 1.
e nr far his work. These details shall include the diagrammatic elevations nd generationed: schice: etc for these bars.
ings. Reinforcement shall be supported by precast concrete blocks5"×5"+21"
(DE destriales experient al contraction for experience) there is not experience to contraction for experience they is not excepted in the experience of th
de los 6 and 6 B mail Sindi be los finde Mal not be los finde and method and
the size and shepe of the structure. No unnecessary material is to be
a alternat Deurstrangth. At Starture Start for Amidian 1916 Lation 1946 The structure
usinarity ATT 46 05 amendea to caste.
STRUCTURAL SLAB SCHEDULE & GEN NOTES
MAIN LIBRARY BUILDING
CITY OF GARLAND ISTH. 1414. Gark & Mod Schotters Oakland Ca. Forma
GIB-46 MILLER & WARNECKE 1123 ARCHITECTS
HALL & PREOVOP CLIPSE IN A CLIPSE IN TAXABLE MAINTER TO TAXABLE AND A CLIPSE IN A CLIPPA I











Economic Reports

OAKLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY | MAIN LIBRARY FEASIBILITY STUDY • DECEMBER 20, 2024

LAND ECON GROUP

One Sansome Street, Suite 3500 | San Francisco, CA 94104

MEMO

То:	Doug Speckhard, EHDD
From:	Bill Lee and Tanya Chiranakhon, Land Econ Group (LEG)
RE:	Five Case Studies on New Library Development and Funding DRAFT
Date:	August 27, 2024

Introduction

Founded in 1878, the Oakland Public Library (OPL) is the second-oldest public library in California. As a department of the City of Oakland, OPL serves a diverse population of 450,000 in Oakland, Emeryville, and Piedmont. In 2006, OPL completed a Master Facilities Plan in response to the community's need for improved library services. This Plan articulated a vision for overall service improvements, and the recommendations included a new or expanded Main Library.

The Oakland Public Works Department through a competitive proposal process selected EHDD Architects to lead a feasibility study for the Main Library. Land Econ Group (LEG), urban planning and real estate economists serving on the EHDD team, is contributing two memoranda to this feasibility effort. This is the first of two memoranda and covers how five other cities in North America funded the construction of their new main libraries in recent years. The second memorandum will evaluate the final two or three site alternatives from a long-term city building economics perspective.

The five main library case studies include:

- Seattle Central Library
- Salt Lake City Main Library
- Long Beach Library

- Calgary Central Library
- Austin Central Library

Seattle Central Library

The Seattle Central Library is the flagship library of the Seattle, Washington Public Library system. The 11-story glass and steel building occupies a site in the downtown core that has held Seattle's main library since 1902. The library was rebuilt in the 1960s, but public demand for library services exceeded this space within 30 years. Upon approval of a capital improvement plan to rebuild the library in 1998, a modern design was commissioned from celebrity architect Rem Koolhaas. The Central Library opened to the public on May 23, 2004, to great fanfare and architectural accolades. It contains 362,987 square feet of space and offers underground public parking for 143 vehicles.

The library was funded through a \$196.4 million general obligation bond issue that was approved by Seattle voters on November 2, 1998. The funds were earmarked for the construction of the new Central Library, as well as for renovations and improvements to other branches of the Seattle Public Library system, under the name "Libraries for All." The total cost for the Libraries for All capital plan was \$238 million, and the Seattle Public Library Foundation campaigned to raise a further \$35 million from private donations to satisfy the funding demands, which funded additional features and amenities for the new library, such as the "Living Room" on the third floor, the "Mixing Chamber" on the fifth floor, and the "Book Spiral" that winds its way up through the building. The total cost of the new Seattle Central Library was estimated at \$165 million, with the remaining bond funds being used for other library system improvements.

Figure 1: Seattle Central Library



Initial outlays were authorized under a \$15 million bond placed with Bank of America to establish a line of credit, with a maturity of five years. Thereafter a first tranche of \$100 million in bonds were issued in 1999, for terms of between six months and 18 years, and interest rates between 4.5 percent and 5.375 percent, through a syndicate led by Goldman Sachs. Bonds maturing after 2009 were callable on 30 days' notice after December 1, 2009.

Salt Lake City Main Library

The Salt Lake City Main Library was rebuilt and opened in February 2003. The structure contains 240,000 square feet and is situated on Library Square, a single 10-acre large city block on the east edge of Salt Lake City's Central Business District. Redevelopment of the Main Library was evaluated in 1997 and financed through an approval for \$84 million municipal bonds on November 3, 1998. The bond covered the cost of the new main library building itself, covered underground parking for 600 vehicles, an outdoor plaza, replacement of the heating and cooling plant, and demolition of all the buildings on the library block with the exception of the current library.

A total value of \$81 million in bonds was issued as general obligation bonds on October 1, 1999, at interest rates of 5.00 to 5.75 percent with a final maturity date in 2019.¹ According to Fitch Ratings, a nationally recognized credit rating agency, the bonds matured serially from June 15, 2000, through June 15, 2019, with optional redemption at par beginning in 2010.

On August 7, 2002, Salt Lake City issued a further set of general obligation bonds, of which \$53,779,018 was deposited in irrevocable escrow in order to defease \$45.36M of the 1999 issuance. For reference the Federal Funds Rate was approximately 5.20 percent in October 1999 and had dropped to 1.74 percent by August 2002.

¹ http://www.slcdocs.com/accounting/CAFR08.pdf at 65.

Figure 2: Salt Lake City Main Library



By June 30, 2007, the remaining balance due on the original Series 1999 bonds was only \$11.4 million, with a further \$47.4 million due on the 2002 bonds. By June 30, 2014, the remaining balance on the Series 1999 was only \$150,000, reducing the annual payments to around \$30,000 through final

maturation.² The Series 2002 had a further \$16.8 million due. This mechanism, in view of the sudden drop in interest rates, allowed a significant reduction in payments due under the Series 1999 notwithstanding that the bonds were not callable for another eight years.

Long Beach Library

The City of Long Beach, California, opened its renovated Billie Jean King library in September 2019. This renovation was part of a larger redevelopment of the Long Beach Civic Center Project. The library replaced the former subterranean library with an above-ground, airy structure. The new library occupied 92,500 square feet sitting within the 22-acre civic center complex and Lincoln Park.



Figure 3: Long Beach Library

² http://www.slcdocs.com/accounting/CAFR2015.pdf at 60-62.

LAND ECON GROUP



Funding for the Civic Center Project was arranged through a massive and novel Develop, Build, Finance, Operate and Maintain (DBFOM) program totaling \$522 million with the Plenary Group, through Plenary-Edgemoor Civic Partners ("PECP").³ Estimates of the total final cost of construction for the complex range from \$428 million to \$557 million.⁴ The estimated cost of the library component was \$48 million.⁵

The deal structure provides the land under the former civic center to PECP, which will then be responsible for redeveloping the new civic center, on land which will remain owned by the City of Long Beach. Over a 40-year term the City will rent the new civic center buildings from PECP, after which the buildings will be owned outright by the city.

This financing arrangement was premised on a proposal with an annual payment roughly in-line with the costs to continue operating the old civic center, approximately \$13.6 million per year.⁶ The final

³ https://plenary.com/project/long-beach-civic-center-redevelopment

⁴ https://la.curbed.com/2019/7/5/20683212/long-beach-civic-center-opening, https://www.bdcnetwork.com/long-beach-gets-municipal-marvel

⁵ https://www.presstelegram.com/2019/07/26/this-is-how-long-beach-will-pay-for-its-new-city-hall-digs/

⁶ https://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-long-beach-civic-center-20180217-story.html

proposal from Plenary Edgemoor exceeded this budget, at \$14.8 million per year, which the City Council justified based on the extent of the proposal.⁷

The 40-year payments from the City of Long Beach to PECP are called Base Services fees, consisting of a Fixed Growth Fee, attributable to construction costs of the project, and a Variable Growth Fee, attributable primarily to operation and maintenance services and life-cycle replacement costs of Project Assets.

Both the Fixed Growth and Variable Growth Fee have scheduled annual increases. The Fixed Growth component is a stable 2.18 percent per year and the Variable Growth is subject to annual increases in the CPI-U index. The expected Base Services fees over the project life as determined in 2022 (three years after payments began) are:

			Payments		
		Base	Variable	Harbor	
Year	Principal	Interest	Growth	Fee	Total
2022	5,189	5,011	7,208	732	18,140
2023	5,280	4,919	7,445	743	18,387
2024	5,373	4,827	7,688	780	18,668
2025	5,467	4,732	7,935	778	18,912
2026	5,563	4,636	8,188	801	19,188
2027 - 2031	29,319	21,679	44,938	4,502	100,438
2032 - 2036	31,987	19,011	52,145	4,672	107,815
2037 - 2041	34,898	16,099	60,172	3,706	114,875
2042 - 2046	38,075	12,923	69,115	6,229	126,342
2047 - 2051	41,540	9,458	79,074	5,438	135,510
2052 - 2056	45,321	5,677	90,169	4,614	145,781
2057 - 2061	41,753	1,596	84,559	3,497	131,405
	\$289,765	\$ 110,568	\$518,636	\$36,492	\$955,461

Source: City of Long Beach Comprehensive Annual Report, 2021.⁸ Pending repayment, the obligation is represented as a liability in the amount of the outstanding principal, only (\$289 million as of 2021).

⁷ https://www.planningreport.com/2016/07/22/long-beach-civic-center-lessons-learned-successful-public-private-partnership ⁸ https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/finance/media-library/documents/city-budget-and-

finances/accounting/comprehensive-annual-financial-report/fiscal-year-2021-annual-report

Calgary Central Library

Planning for a new Calgary Central Library began in 2004 with extensive studies on site selection and public engagement. Construction started in 2014, and the new Calgary Central Library opened in 2018. It replaced the former downtown library located nearby, which was built in 1962 and had served the community for over 55 years.

The selected site was a challenging one, located directly across the street from the Calgary Municipal Building, the site was bisected by an existing light rail line (LRT). The first phase of construction was the encapsulation of the light rail line to serve as the base of the new library, followed by construction of the new five-story, 240,000 square foot Calgary Central Library on top of the encapsulating tunnel. The result is an iconic civic space and landmark destination for the city.



Figure 4: Calgary Central Library

LAND ECON GROUP



The overall CAD\$310 million budget was financed through a combination of public and private funding. The City of Calgary contributed CAD\$245 million towards the project, broken out by CAD\$175 million from the city itself and a further CAD\$70 million from the Calgary Municipal Land Corporation (CMLC), the developer for the project, with an additional CAD\$40 million in funding coming from the provincial Government of Alberta. The remaining funds were raised through private donations, including a CAD\$25 million donation from Calgary businessperson and philanthropist, David Bissett.

The CMLC is a corporation founded in 2007 and wholly owned by the City of Calgary to revitalize Calgary's Rivers District. CMLC is funded by a community revitalization levy, where the increase in property tax assessments in the CMLC's area is captured by the CMLC. This program was initially implemented for 20 years but was extended by the City and Province to an additional 20-year term.

The City's share of CAD\$175 million was funded by an initial commitment of CAD\$40 million in 2004 when the project was announced, and a subsequent commitment of CAD\$135 million from Calgary's Community Investment Fund in 2011. The Community Investment Fund was established in 2011. Notably, the first municipal bond was issued in Calgary in 2023, with most financing for the City before that point coming from loans from the Province of Alberta.

In addition to the funding for the building's construction, the Calgary Public Library Foundation raised CAD\$10 million to support ongoing programming and services at the new library. The Foundation continues to fundraise to support the library's initiatives and enhance its offerings for the community.

Austin Central Library

The new Austin Central Library opened in 2017 and replaced the Fault Central Library, a 110,000 square foot building which opened in 1979. In the spring of 2013, the City of Austin broke ground on a new central library located in the Seaholm Power Plant site. The new library would join the Seaholm District, a massive urban redevelopment project transforming a former industrial section of southwest downtown. The Austin Central Library is a 198,000 square foot, six-story, technology-loaded and multipurpose building offering a living rooftop garden, reading porches, an indoor reading room and a bicycle corral, large indoor and outdoor event spaces, a 350-seat theater, an art gallery, a gift shop and a café. A solar energy array on the library's roof is incorporated into the city's energy delivery network. The opening date was repeatedly pushed back, and it opened to the public in October 2017.

The total budget for the project was ultimately \$125 million. Funding was initially set at \$90 million with the issuance of a municipal bond approved by Austin voters in 2006. However, four years later Austin City Council approved an additional \$30 million and then another \$5 million to complete the project.

Figure 5: Austin Central Library



Observations from the Case Studies

These five case studies indicate that funding for a new main library requires broad-based political support from the tax paying public, from their elected leaders and from wealthy philanthropists. The two key attributes essential to building that support include:

- A central downtown location that allows the project to be viewed as part of the heart and soul of the entire metropolitan community.
- An iconic piece of architecture that motivates both taxpayers and philanthropists to contribute to the funding of the project.

The actual funding formula depends upon a combination of reserves, bonds that commit future tax revenue, real estate, private contributions and miscellaneous sources. The actual composition of that combination depends upon the local legal context and political opportunities. The City of Oakland faces many challenging demands for its municipal budget. Funding for a new main library will depend upon broad based and passionate political support from the entire city and the East Bay community and likely requires a new tax and/or bonding measure. An iconic city center location that becomes a new symbol of Oakland and an inspirational architectural statement are essential to the gathering of political support essential to the passage of any future tax measure.

Oakland Main Library Fesability

Conceptual Design December 10, 2024

CUMMING GROUP

CUMMING GROUP | San Francisco 475 Sansome Street, Suite 700 • San Francisco • California • 94111 cumming-group.com Phone: 415-748-3080

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1 Project Introduction Section 1.1 Project Introduction	Section 3 Cost Breakdowns Section 3.1 Element Summary
Section 1.2 Executive Summary	Section 3.2 Renovation Detail
Section 1.3 Benchmarking	Section 3.3 Extension of Existing Detail
Section 2 Cost Summaries	Section 3.4 New Build Detail
Section 2.1 Seismic Evaluation	Section 3.5 Site Summary
Section 2.2 Option 1	Spotion 2 6 Site Datail
Section 2.2 Option 2	Section 3.0 Site Detail
	Section 4 Project Assumptions
Section 2.2 Option 3	Section 4.1 Project Assumptions
Section 2.2 Option 4	
Section 2.2 Option 5	

Section 1.1 | Project Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This estimate has been prepared, pursuant to an agreement between EHDD and Cumming, for the purpose of establishing a probable cost of construction at the Conceptual Design stage.

The project scope encompasses the seismic upgrading, renovations, expansion and new construction of a existing Oakland Main Library building and associated site works. Cumming have estimated five (5) options based on the document "OML_Massing Options."

1.2 Cost Estimation Breakdown

The total estimated construction costs for each option is summarized below:

Element	Area	Cost / SF	Total
Option 1	148,000	\$1,299.37	\$192,307,363
Option 2	148,000	\$1,223.75	\$181,115,237
Option 3	148,000	\$1,253.99	\$185,590,075
Option 4	148,000	\$1,302.21	\$192,726,497
Option 5	148,000	\$1,442.01	\$213,417,567

The project totals stated above are inclusive of all general requirements & conditions, insurances, and design contingency and costs are at Mid-point Construction (3rd Quarter 2027).

Refer to Section 1.2 for a detailed comparison of each option.

1.3 Project Schedule

The project schedule has been assumed and is summarized below;

Element	Start	Finish	Duration
Construction	Jul-26	Oct-28	27 months

Section 1.1 | Project Introduction

1.4 Key Assumptions & Exclusions

This document should be read in conjunction with the Appendices which outline assumptions, project understanding, approach, and cost management methodology. Key assumptions built into the above cost breakdown include

Key Assumptions Hard Bid Single Phased Construction

Kitchen Equipment Digital Monument Signage allow Escalation to Mid-point of Construction Opt. 5 Costs Increased by 10% to allow for Downtown Congestion.

Key Exclusions

Project Soft Costs excluded Hazard abatement excluded Parking Car Port excluded Energy Center excluded Loose FFE excluded Works to ground water remedial action center Existing building demolition Specialist Lighting & IT/AV Equipment to Events Roof PV and Battery Storage allowance Item 9 of the Seismic Evaluation Scope

	Section 1.2 Executive Summary														
	Optio	on 1 - Existing Site		Optic	on 2 - Downtown		Optior	n 3 - East Oakland		Opti	on 4 - Downtown		Optic	in 5 - Downtown	
			-	and the second se											
		CHILD IN	-	1			and and	Sal Barris							
	And in case of the local division of the loc			THE REAL PROPERTY AND	- MAAAAA		a start	Contraction of the second	A DECEMBER	and the second	Contrast .	a kan	- Believe		
		CHANNE .		10	and the second	123		OML Sealing Site 11.0	00.1/		CML Educing The N2.20	6 14 C	De Star 3		inter 1
							200	a a a		- Solo	Tin the	- Aller			A THE
	and	- series		-	CONTRACT.	and the	Ser 11-52	a	23440	- 4	She.	1000			War y
	CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER	A Press			Same and Carrier	No.			100		A STATE OF	a sur	E-1-1	and the second	
Area	Total	\$/sqft	GSF	Total	\$/sqft	GSF	Total	\$/sqft	GSF	Total	\$/sqft	GSF	Total	\$/sqft	GSF
Seismic Evaluation (Incl. Mark-Ups)	\$14,415,000	\$ 176 / ft ²	82,000 ft ²	\$14,415,000	\$ 176 / ft ²	82,000 ft ²	\$14,415,000	\$ 176 / ft ²	82,000 ft ²	\$14,415,000	\$ 176 / ft ²	82,000 ft ²	Excluded.		
Renovation of Existing (Incl. Mark Ups)	\$72,287,400	\$ 882 / ft ²	82,000 ft ²	\$80,504,100	\$ 864 / ft ²	93,200 ft ²	\$74,790,700	\$ 912 / ft ²	82,000 ft ²	\$78,160,100	\$ 953 / ft ²	82,000 ft ²	Excluded.		
Expansion of Existing (Incl. Mark Ups)	\$96,778,200	\$ 1,466 / ft ²	66,000 ft ²	\$44,803,100	\$ 1,358 / ft ²	33,000 ft ²	\$46,126,600	\$ 1,398 / ft ²	33,000 ft²	Excluded.			Excluded.		
New Build (Incl. Mark Ups)	Excluded.			\$28,581,300	\$ 1,311 / ft ²	21,800 ft ^a	\$41,431,000	\$ 1,255 / ft ²	33,000 ft ²	\$87,339,600	\$ 1,323 / ft ²	66,000 ft ²	\$205,413,700	\$ 1,388 / ft ²	148,000 ft ²
Site (Incl. Mark Ups)	\$8,826,700	\$ 148 / ft ²	59,764 ft²	\$12,811,800	\$ 141 / ft ²	90,802 ft ²	\$8,826,700	\$ 148 / ft ²	59,764 ft²	\$12,811,800	\$ 141 / ft ²	90,802 ft ²	\$8,003,900	\$ 177 / ft ²	45,123 ft ²
Total Construction Award Costs	\$192,307,300	\$ 1,299 / ft ²	148,000 ft ²	\$181,115,300	\$ 1,224 / ft²	148,000 ft ²	\$185,590,000	\$ 1,254 / ft ²	148,000 ft ²	\$192,726,500	\$ 1,302 / ft ²	148,000 ft ²	\$213,417,600	\$ 1,442 / ft ²	148,000 ft ²
Element	Total	\$/sqft	%	Total	\$/sqft	%	Total	\$/sqft	%	Total	\$/sqft	%	Total	\$/sqft	%
Seismic Evaluation	\$7,922,050	\$ 54 / ft ²	4%	\$7,922,050	\$ 54 / ft ²	4%	\$7,922,050	\$ 54 / ft²	4%	\$7,922,050	\$ 54 / ft ²	4%	Excluded.		
Shell	\$28,417,340	\$ 192 / ft ²	15%	\$19,829,900	\$ 134 / ft ²	11%	\$23,236,600	\$ 157 / ft ²	13%	\$24,492,300	\$ 165 / ft ²	13%	\$44,734,701	\$ 302 / ft ²	21%
Interiors	\$20,832,700	\$ 141 / ft ²	11%	\$20,130,500	\$ 136 / ft ²	11%	\$20,757,400	\$ 140 / ft ²	11%	\$20,905,900	\$ 141 / ft ²	11%	\$22,942,370	\$ 155 / ft ²	11%
Equipment & Vertical Transportation	\$6,868,400	\$ 46 / ft ²	4%	\$7,542,000	\$ 51 / ft ²	4%	\$8,073,400	\$ 55 / ft²	4%	\$8,063,900	\$ 54 / ft ²	4%	\$5,374,490	\$ 36 / ft ²	3%
Services	\$36,794,800	\$ 249 / ft ²	19%	\$37,070,000	\$ 250 / ft ²	20%	\$37,154,300	\$ 251 / ft ²	20%	\$37,491,500	\$ 253 / ft ²	19%	\$39,837,600	\$ 269 / ft ²	19%
Site Construction	\$4,850,900	\$ 33 / ft²	3%	\$7,041,000	\$ 48 / ft ²	4%	\$4,850,900	\$ 33 / ft²	3%	\$7,041,000	\$ 48 / ft ²	4%	\$4,398,700	\$ 30 / ft²	2%
Sub-Total	\$105,686,190	\$ 714 / ft²	55%	\$99,535,450	\$ 673 / ft ²	55%	\$101,994,650	\$ 689 / ft ²	55%	\$105,916,650	\$ 716 / ft ²	55%	\$117,287,861	\$ 792 / ft²	55%
Indirect Costs	\$66,039,273	\$ 446 / ft ²	34%	\$62,195,687	\$ 420 / ft ²	34%	\$63,732,425	\$ 431 / ft ²	34%	\$66,183,047	\$ 447 / ft ²	34%	\$73,288,406	\$ 495 / ft ²	34%
Escalation to MOC	\$20,581,900	\$ 139 / ft ²	11%	\$19,384,100	\$ 131 / ft²	11%	\$19,863,000	\$ 134 / ft ²	11%	\$20,626,800	\$ 139 / ft ²	11%	\$22,841,300	\$ 154 / ft ²	11%
Total Construction Award Costs	\$192,307,363	\$ 1,299 / ft ²	100%	\$181,115,237	\$ 1,224 / ft ²	100%	\$185,590,075	\$ 1,254 / ft ²	100%	\$192,726,497	\$ 1,302 / ft ²	100%	\$213,417,567	\$ 1,442 / ft ²	100%

Oakland Main Libray Feasability

Oakland, CA

Conceptual Design

Section 2.1 Seismic Evaluation									
No.	Checklist Item	Description	Quantity	Unit	Rate		Total	Comments	Priority
1	Mezzanines: Interior mezzanine levels are braced independently from the main structure or are anchored to the seismic-force-resisting elements of the main structure.	The mezzanine floor is attached to the interior walls and piers on the north side of the building. However, further evaluation of walls and the connections are needed to determine adequacy to accommodate the mezzanine forces.	3,940 sf		\$	100 \$	394,000	Assume two layers of FRP.	1
		Proposed Retront Solution: Use FRP radii to increase the shear capacity of the Walls and to increase the strength of the connection between the mezzanine floors and concrete walls.							
	LIQUEFACTION: Liquefaction- susceptible, saturated, loose granular soils that could jeopardize the building's seismic performance do not exist in the foundation soils at depths within 50 ft (15.2 m) under the building.	Based on the Association of Bay Area Governments (MTC/ABAG) Maps, the area around the building has moderate susceptibility to earthquake liquefaction. A Geotechnical investigation is required for a detailed evaluation of the liquefaction potential of the site.							
2		Proposed retrofit solution: follow recommendations in the geotechnical investigation report for the site to mitigate the effects of liquefaction on the structure.	23,879 sf		\$	50 \$	1,193,950	Allowance for foundation upgrades.	. 2
3	TIES BETWEEN FOUNDATION ELEMENTS: The foundation has ties adequate to resist seismic forces where footings, piles, and piers are not restrained by beams, slabs, or soils classified as Site Class A, B, or C.	Ties are not present between the foundations. A geotechnical investigation is required to evaluate the competency of the soil to laterally brace the foundations. Proposed retrofit solution: Install new tie beams (grade beams) between footings in two orthogonal directions. This needs further evaluation after receiving the site- specific acetechnical report.	104 cy		\$5	,000 \$	519,000		3
4	SHEAR STRESS CHECK: The shear stress in the concrete shear walls, calculated using the Quick Check procedure of Section 4.4.3.3, is less than the greater of 100 lb/in. ² (0.69 MPa) or 2√fc	The average shear stress in the shear walls calculated using the quick check procedure was found to be greater than 110 psi. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) fabric to increase the shear strength of the concrete walls/niers	7,880 sf		\$	100 \$	788,000	Assume two layers of FRP to the walls.	1
5	REINFORCING STEEL: The ratio of reinforcing steel area to gross concrete area is not less than 0.0012 in the vertical direction and 0.0020 in the horizontal direction.	The horizontal reinforcement ratio for the concrete wall piers along the perimeter and some of the interior shear walls were found to be less than 0.0020. A further evaluation is required to check the capacity of the concrete wall piers and interior shear walls to resist seismic forces. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) fabric to increase the shear	24,390 sf		\$	100 \$	2,439,000	Assume two layers of FRP to the piers/columns at exterior perimeter.	. 1
6	TRANSFER TO SHEAR WALLS: Diaphragms are connected for the transfer of seismic forces to the shear walls	Spandrels are not present around the building perimeter on the 2 nd floor. The diaphragm connections and the collectors on the 2 nd floor need to be evaluated. Proposed retrofit solution: Strengthen the axial capacity of the existing beams along the perimeter of the diaphragm at second floor using FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) wrap to act as a collector to drag the diaphragm loads into the concrete piers. Add steel angles at top and bottom of the beam running perpendicular to the concrete wall piers to strengthen the connection at the diaphragm/wall	5,691 sf		\$	100 \$	569,100	Assume two layers of FRP.	1
6		nier interface	540 ea		\$	225 \$	121,500	Steel angles to top and bottom of	1
7	DEFLECTION COMPATIBILITY: Secondary components have the shear capacity to develop the flexural strength of the components.	Building columns don't have the shear capacity to develop the flexural strength of the columns. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) wrap to increase the shear capacity of the columns.	18,225 sf		\$	100 \$	1,822,500	Assume two layers of FRP.	2
8	COUPLING BEAMS: The ends of both walls to which the coupling beam is attached are supported at each end to resist vertical loads caused by overturning.	Overturning forces cannot be resisted by the individual piers alone. Coupling beams need to be evaluated to check their capacity to resist the deformations imposed by the piers. Proposed retrofit solution: Use FRP (Fiber Reinforced Polymer) wrap to increase the shear and flexural capacity of concrete spandrels.	750 sf		\$	100 \$	75,000	Assume two layers of FRP.	1
9	DIAPHRAGM CONTINUITY: The diaphragms are not composed of split-level floors and do not have expansion joints.	Diaphragm at the roof level is discontinuous. A 2'-1" raised slab is present at the roof level Proposed retrofit solution: This needs further evaluation to address any diaphragm deficiency issue.	1 ls			\$	-		3
Total Direct Costs\$ 7,922.050.00									
Oakland, CA

Conceptual Design

	Executive Summary				
Ref	Element		Total	\$/sqft	
1	Substructure		\$2,838,000	\$ 19 / ft ^a	
2	Vertical Structures		\$11,740,800	\$ 79 / ft [:]	
3	Floor & Roof Structure		\$2,134,000	\$ 14 / ft ^a	
4	Exterior Cladding		\$10,049,240	\$ 68 / ft ²	
5	Roofing and Waterproofing		\$1,655,300	\$ 11 / ft [:]	
6	Interior Partitions, Doors & Glazi	ng	\$9,282,200	\$ 63 / ft [:]	
7	Floor, Wall and Ceilings		\$11,550,500	\$ 78 / ft [:]	
8	Functional Equipment and Speci	alties	\$5,188,400	\$ 35 / ft [*]	
9	Stairs and Vertical Transportation	n	\$1,680,000	\$ 11 / ft [*]	
10	Plumbing Systems		\$5,450,000	\$ 37 / ft [*]	
11	Heating, Ventilation and Air Cond	ditioning	\$10,926,800	\$ 74 / ft ^a	
12	Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications		\$18,790,000	\$ 127 / ft ^a	
13	Fire Protection Systems		\$1,628,000	\$ 11 / ft ^a	
14	Site Preparation and Demolition		\$179,300	\$ 1 / ft ^a	
15	Site Paving, Structures & Landso	aping	\$3,343,200	\$ 23 / ft ^a	
16	Utilities On-site		\$1,328,400	\$ 9 / ft ^a	
17	Seismic Evaluation		\$7,922,050	\$ 54 / ft [:]	
	Sub-Total		\$105,686,190	\$ 714 / ft ²	
18	General Requirements & Conditions	17.0%	\$17,966,700	\$ 121 / ft ^a	
19	Local Business Enterprises (LB	6.0%	\$7,419,173	\$ 50 / ft [*]	
20	Insurance	3.0%	\$3,932,200	\$ 27 / ft ^a	
21	Contractor's Fee	6.0%	\$8,100,300	\$ 55 / ft ^a	
22	Design Contingency	20.0%	\$28,620,900	\$ 193 / ft [;]	
23	Escalation to MOC	12.0%	\$20,581,900	\$ 139 / ft [:]	
	Total Construction Award C	Costs	\$192,307,363	\$ 1,299 / ft ²	



	Total Cost per Square Foot				
	Element	Direct \$/sf	Indirect \$/sf	Total \$	
÷	Seismic Evaluation	\$ 97 / ft²	\$ 79 / ft²	\$ 176 / ft²	
÷	Expansion of Existing	\$ 806 / ft ²	\$ 660 / ft ²	\$ 1,466 / ft ²	
÷	Renovation of Existin	\$ 484 / ft²	\$ 397 / ft ²	\$ 882 / ft²	
÷	New Build				
÷	Site Area	\$ 81 / ft²	\$ 67 / ft ²	\$ 148 / ft²	
	Total Cost	\$ 714 / ft²	\$ 585 / ft²	\$ 1,299 / ft²	
	Area Schedule Summary				



Section 2.2 | Option 1

Key Assumptions & Exclusions • Hard Bid • Project Soft Costs excluded • Single Phased Construction • Hazard abatement excluded • Kitchen Equipment • Car Port excluded. PGE. • Digital Monument Signage allow Energy Center excluded • Battery Storage & Roof PVs excluded Loose FFE excluded

	Key Building Metrics				
•	Building Type	Education			
•	Number Storeys	4 Floors			
•	Typical Floor Height	10 ft			
•	Wall : Floor Efficiency	65%			
•	Glazed Façade % (allowance)	40%			
•	Solid Façade \$/sf	\$ 150 / ft ²			
•	Glazed Façade \$/sf	\$ 200 / ft ²			
•	Steel Structure	17psf			
•	Steel Pricing	\$ 6,000 / tonnes			
•	Kitchen Equipment	\$ 450 / ft ²			
•	Single Port EV Charging	\$ 60,000			

Area Schedule ft ²		
Program	% Split	Gross Area
Expansion of Existing	45%	66,000 ft ²
Renovation of Existing	55%	82,000 ft ²
New Build		Excluded
Site Area	-	59,764 ft ²
Building Total (GSF)	100%	148,000 ft ²

Project # 24-0000.00

Oakland, CA

Conceptual Design

	Executive Summary					
Ref	Element		Total	\$/sqft		
1	Substructure		\$2,538,000	\$ 17 / ft ²		
2	Vertical Structures		\$6,116,600	\$ 41 / ft ²		
3	Floor & Roof Structure		\$1,439,600	\$ 10 / ft ²		
4	Exterior Cladding		\$7,880,000	\$ 53 / ft ²		
5	Roofing and Waterproofing		\$1,855,700	\$ 13 / ft ²		
6	Interior Partitions, Doors & Gla	izing	\$9,052,500	\$ 61 / ft²		
7	Floor, Wall and Ceilings		\$11,078,000	\$ 75 / ft²		
8	Functional Equipment and Spe	ecialties	\$5,552,000	\$ 38 / ft²		
9	Stairs and Vertical Transportat	tion	\$1,990,000	\$ 13 / ft ²		
10	Plumbing Systems		\$5,517,200	\$ 37 / ft ²		
11	Heating, Ventilation and Air Co	onditioning	\$11,051,800	\$ 75 / ft ²		
12	Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications		\$18,873,000	\$ 128 / ft ²		
13	Fire Protection Systems		\$1,628,000	\$ 11 / ft ²		
14	Site Preparation and Demolition	n	\$383,400	\$ 3 / ft ²		
15	Site Paving, Structures & Land	Iscaping	\$4,919,000	\$ 33 / ft ²		
16	Utilities On-site		\$1,738,600	\$ 12 / ft ²		
17	Seismic Evaluation		\$7,922,050	\$ 54 / ft²		
	Sub-Total		\$99,535,450	\$ 673 / ft ²		
18	General Requirements & Conditions	17.0%	\$16,921,000	\$ 114 / ft ²		
19	Local Business Enterprises (LBE)	6.0%	\$6,987,387	\$ 47 / ft ²		
20	Insurance	3.0%	\$3,703,300	\$ 25 / ft ²		
21	Contractor's Fee	6.0%	\$7,628,800	\$ 52 / ft ²		
22	Design Contingency	20.0%	\$26,955,200	\$ 182 / ft ²		
23	Escalation to MOC	12.0%	\$19,384,100	\$ 131 / ft ²		
	Total Construction Award	Costs	\$181,115,237	\$ 1,224 / ft ²		



Total Cost per Square Foot				
Element	Direct \$/sf	Indirect \$/sf	Total \$	
- Seismic Evaluation	\$ 85 / ft²	\$ 70 / ft²	\$ 155 / ft²	
 Expansion of Existing 	\$ 746 / ft ²	\$ 612 / ft²	\$ 1,358 / ft ²	
- Renovation of Existin	\$ 475 / ft²	\$ 389 / ft²	\$ 864 / ft²	
- New Build	\$ 721 / ft²	\$ 591 / ft²	\$ 1,311 / ft²	
- Site Area	\$ 118 / ft²	\$ 97 / ft²	\$ 214 / ft²	
Total Cost	\$ 673 / ft²	\$ 507 / ft ²	\$ 1,126 / ft²	
Area Schedule Summary				



Key Assumptions & Exclusions Hard Bid Project Soft Costs excluded - Single Phased Construction - Hazard abatement excluded

 Kitchen Equipment Digital Monument Signage allow

- Battery Storage & Roof PVs excluded

Energy Center excluded Loose FFE excluded

- Car Port excluded. PGE.

	Key Building Metrics				
	Building Type	Education			
•	Number Storeys	3 Floors (Existing) / 2 Floors (New Build)			
•	Typical Floor Height	10 ft			
•	Wall : Floor Efficiency	65%			
•	Glazed Façade % (allowance)	40%			
•	Solid Façade \$/sf	\$ 150 / ft²			
•	Glazed Façade \$/sf	\$ 200 / ft²			
•	Steel Structure	17psf			
•	Steel Pricing	\$ 6,000 / tonnes			
	Kitchen Equipment	\$ 450 / ft²			
	Single Port EV Charging	\$ 60,000			

Area Schedule ft ²		
Program	% Split	Gross Area
Expansion of Existing	22%	33,000 ft ²
Renovation of Existing	63%	93,200 ft ²
New Build	15%	21,800 ft ²
Site Area	-	59,764 ft ²
Building Total (GSF)	100%	148,000 ft ²

Project # 24-0000.00

Oakland, CA

Conceptual Design

	Executive Summary				
Ref	Element		Total	\$/sqft	
1	Substructure		\$2,673,000	\$ 18 / ft [:]	
2	Vertical Structures		\$6,296,500	\$ 43 / ft	
3	Floor & Roof Structure		\$1,650,100	\$ 11 / ft	
4	Exterior Cladding		\$10,329,700	\$ 70 / ft	
5	Roofing and Waterproofing		\$2,287,300	\$ 15 / ft	
6	Interior Partitions, Doors & Glazi	ng	\$9,311,900	\$ 63 / ft	
7	Floor, Wall and Ceilings		\$11,445,500	\$ 77 / ft	
8	Functional Equipment and Speci	alties	\$5,793,400	\$ 39 / ft	
9	Stairs and Vertical Transportation	n	\$2,280,000	\$ 15 / ft	
10	Plumbing Systems		\$5,450,000	\$ 37 / ft	
11	Heating, Ventilation and Air Cond	ditioning	\$11,451,300	\$ 77 / ft	
12	Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications		\$18,625,000	\$ 126 / ft	
13	Fire Protection Systems		\$1,628,000	\$ 11 / ft	
14	Site Preparation and Demolition		\$179,300	\$ 1 / ft	
15	Site Paving, Structures & Landso	aping	\$3,343,200	\$ 23 / ft	
16	Utilities On-site		\$1,328,400	\$ 9 / ft	
17	Seismic Evaluation		\$7,922,050	\$ 54 / ft	
	Sub-Total		\$101,994,650	\$ 689 / ft	
18	General Requirements & Conditions	17.0%	\$17,339,100	\$ 117 / ft	
19	Local Business Enterprises (LB	6.0%	\$7,160,025	\$ 48 / ft	
20	Insurance	3.0%	\$3,794,800	\$ 26 / ft	
21	Contractor's Fee	6.0%	\$7,817,300	\$ 53 / ft	
22	Design Contingency	20.0%	\$27,621,200	\$ 187 / ft	
23	Escalation to MOC	12.0%	\$19,863,000	\$ 134 / ft	
	Total Construction Award C	Costs	\$185,590,075	\$ 1,254 / ft	



	Total Cost per Square Foot				
	Element	Direct \$/sf	Indirect \$/sf	Total \$	
•	Seismic Evaluation	\$ 97 / ft²	\$ 79 / ft²	\$ 176 / ft ²	
•	Expansion of Existinç	\$ 768 / ft²	\$ 630 / ft²	\$ 1,398 / ft ²	
-	Renovation of Existin	\$ 501 / ft²	\$ 411 / ft²	\$ 912 / ft²	
-	New Build	\$ 690 / ft²	\$ 566 / ft²	\$ 1,255 / ft ²	
-	Site Area	\$ 81 / ft²	\$ 67 / ft²	\$ 148 / ft ²	
	Total Cost	\$ 689 / ft²	\$ 521 / ft²	\$ 1,157 / ft²	
	Area Schedule Summary				



Section 2.2 | Option 3

Key Assumptions & Exclusions • Hard Bid • Project Soft Costs excluded • Single Phased Construction • Hazard abatement excluded • Kitchen Equipment • Car Port excluded. PGE. • Digital Monument Signage allow Energy Center excluded • Battery Storage & Roof PVs excluded Loose FFE excluded

	Key Building Metrics				
•	Building Type	Education			
÷	Number Storeys	3 Floors (Existing) / 2 Floors (New Build)			
÷	Typical Floor Height	10 ft			
÷	Wall : Floor Efficiency	65%			
÷	Glazed Façade % (allowance)	40%			
÷	Solid Façade \$/sf	\$ 150 / ft²			
÷	Glazed Façade \$/sf	\$ 200 / ft²			
÷	Steel Structure	17psf			
÷	Steel Pricing	\$ 6,000 / tonnes			
•	Kitchen Equipment	\$ 450 / ft²			
•	Single Port EV Charging	\$ 60,000			

Area Schedule ft ²			
Program	% Split	Gross Area	
Expansion of Existing	22%	33,000 ft ²	
Renovation of Existing	55%	82,000 ft ²	
New Build	22%	33,000 ft ²	
Site Area	-	59,764 ft ²	
Building Total (GSF)	100%	148,000 ft ²	

Project # 24-0000.00

Oakland, CA

Conceptual Design

	Execu	itive Sum	nmary			
Ref	Element		Total	\$/sqft		
1	Substructure		\$2,310,000	\$ 16 / ft		
2	Vertical Structures		\$4,952,300	\$ 33 / ft		
3	Floor & Roof Structure		\$1,716,000	\$ 12 / ft		
4	Exterior Cladding	\$12,999,800	\$ 88 / ft			
5	Roofing and Waterproofing		\$2,514,200	\$ 17 / ft		
6	Interior Partitions, Doors & Glazi	ng	\$9,460,400	\$ 64 / ft		
7	Floor, Wall and Ceilings	\$11,445,500	\$ 77 / ft			
8	Functional Equipment and Speci	\$6,023,900	\$ 41 / ft			
9	Stairs and Vertical Transportation	\$2,040,000 \$ 1				
10	Plumbing Systems	\$5,450,000	\$ 37 / ft			
11	Heating, Ventilation and Air Cond	\$11,788,500	\$ 80 / ft			
12	Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications	\$18,625,000	\$ 126 / ft			
13	Fire Protection Systems		\$1,628,000	\$ 11 / ft		
14	Site Preparation and Demolition		\$383,400	\$ 3 / ft		
15	Site Paving, Structures & Landso	caping	\$4,919,000	\$ 33 / ft		
16	Utilities On-site		\$1,738,600	\$ 12 / ft		
17	Seismic Evaluation		\$7,922,050	\$ 54 / ft		
	Sub-Total		\$105,916,650	\$ 716 / ft		
18	General Requirements & Conditions	17.0%	\$18,005,800	\$ 122 / ft		
19	Local Business Enterprises (LB	6.0%	\$7,435,347	\$ 50 / ft		
20	Insurance	3.0%	\$3,940,700	\$ 27 / ft		
21	Contractor's Fee	6.0%	\$8,117,900	\$ 55 / ft		
22	Design Contingency	20.0%	\$28,683,300	\$ 194 / ft		
23	Escalation to MOC	12.0%	\$20,626,800	\$ 139 / ft ^a		
	Total Construction Award C	\$192,726,497	\$ 1,302 / ft			



Total Cost per Square Foot												
Element	Direct \$/sf	Indirect \$/sf	Total \$									
 Seismic Evaluation 	\$ 97 / ft ²	\$ 79 / ft²	\$ 176 / ft ²									
- Expansion of Existing												
 Renovation of Existin 	\$ 524 / ft²	\$ 429 / ft ²	\$ 953 / ft ²									
 New Build 	\$ 727 / ft²	\$ 596 / ft ²	\$ 1,323 / ft ²									
 Site Area 	\$ 118 / ft²	\$ 97 / ft²	\$ 214 / ft²									
Total Cost	\$ 716 / ft²	\$ 543 / ft²	\$ 1,205 / ft ²									
	Area Schedule	Summary										



Key Assumptions & Exclusions Hard Bid Project Soft Costs excluded - Single Phased Construction - Hazard abatement excluded Kitchen Equipment - Car Port excluded. PGE. Digital Monument Signage allow Energy Center excluded Battery Storage & Roof PVs excluded

Loose FFE excluded

	Key Building Metrics										
÷	Building Type	Education									
÷	Number Storeys	3 Floors (Existing) / 2 Floors (New Build)									
÷	Typical Floor Height	10 ft									
÷	Wall : Floor Efficiency	65%									
÷	Glazed Façade % (allowance)	40%									
÷	Solid Façade \$/sf	\$ 150 / ft²									
÷	Glazed Façade \$/sf	\$ 200 / ft²									
÷	Steel Structure	17psf									
÷	Steel Pricing	\$ 6,000 / tonnes									
÷	Kitchen Equipment	\$ 450 / ft²									
÷	Single Port EV Charging	\$ 60,000									

Area Schedule ft ²											
Program	% Split	Gross Area									
Expansion of Existing	0%	-									
Renovation of Existing	55%	82,000 ft ²									
New Build	45%	66,000 ft ²									
Site Area	-	59,764 ft ²									
Building Total (GSF)	100%	148,000 ft ²									

Section 2.2 | Option 4

Project # 24-0000.00

Oakland, CA

Conceptual Design

	Ехес	utive Sun	Executive Summary												
Ref	Element		Total	\$/sqft											
1	Substructure		\$2,937,000	\$ 20 / ft											
2	Vertical Structures		\$12,688,632	\$ 86 / ft											
3	Floor & Roof Structure		\$3,907,200	\$ 26 / ft											
4	Exterior Cladding	\$22,547,800	\$ 152 / ft												
5	Roofing and Waterproofing	\$2,654,069	\$ 18 / ft												
6	Interior Partitions, Doors & Glazi	\$11,705,320	\$ 79 / ft												
7	Floor, Wall and Ceilings	\$11,237,050	\$ 76 / ft												
8	Functional Equipment and Speci	\$4,450,490	\$ 30 / ft												
9	Stairs and Vertical Transportatio	\$924,000 \$ 6													
10	Plumbing Systems	\$5,453,800 \$ 37													
11	Heating, Ventilation and Air Con	\$13,377,100	\$ 90 / ft												
12	Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications	\$19,460,100	\$ 131 / ft												
13	Fire Protection Systems		\$1,546,600	\$ 10 / ft											
14	Site Preparation and Demolition		\$423,600	\$ 3 / ft											
15	Site Paving, Structures & Landso	caping	\$2,744,300	\$ 19 / ft											
16	Utilities On-site		\$1,230,800	\$ 8 / ft											
17	Seismic Evaluation														
	Sub-Total		\$117,287,861	\$ 792 / ft											
18	General Requirements & Conditions	17.0%	\$19,938,900	\$ 135 / ft											
19	Local Business Enterprises (LB	6.0%	\$8,233,606	\$ 56 / ft											
20	Insurance	3.0%	\$4,363,800	\$ 29 / ft											
21	Contractor's Fee	6.0%	\$8,989,400	\$ 61 / ft											
22	Design Contingency	20.0%	\$31,762,700	\$ 215 / ft											
23	Escalation to MOC	12.0%	\$22,841,300	\$ 154 / ft											
	Total Construction Award C	\$213,417,567	\$ 1,442 / ft												



	Total Cost per Square Foot												
	Element	Direct \$/sf	Indirect \$/sf	Total \$									
÷	Seismic Evaluation												
÷	Expansion of Existing												
÷	Renovation of Existing												
÷	New Build	\$ 763 / ft²	\$ 625 / ft ²	\$ 1,388 / ft ²									
÷	Site Area	\$ 1,963 / ft ²	\$ 1,608 / ft²	\$ 3,571 / ft ²									
	Total Cost	\$ 792 / ft²	\$ 650 / ft²	\$ 1,442 / ft²									
		Area Schedule	Summary										



Key Assumptions & Exclusions Hard Bid Project Soft Costs excluded - Single Phased Construction - Hazard abatement excluded Kitchen Equipment - Car Port excluded. PGE. Digital Monument Signage allow Energy Center excluded Battery Storage & Roof PVs excluded Loose FFE excluded

	Key Building Metrics											
•	Building Type	Education										
÷	Number Storeys	4 Floors (New Build)										
÷	Typical Floor Height	10 ft										
÷	Wall : Floor Efficiency	65%										
÷	Glazed Façade % (allowance)	40%										
÷	Solid Façade \$/sf	\$ 150 / ft ²										
÷	Glazed Façade \$/sf	\$ 200 / ft ²										
÷	Steel Structure	17psf										
÷	Steel Pricing	\$ 8,000 / tonnes										
÷	Kitchen Equipment	\$ 450 / ft ²										
•	Single Port EV Charging	\$ 60,000										

Area Schedule ft ²											
Program	% Split	Gross Area									
Expansion of Existing											
Renovation of Existing											
New Build	100%	148,000 ft ²									
Site Area	-	59,764 ft ²									
Building Total (GSF)	100%	148,000 ft ²									

Project # 24-0000.00

	Section 3.1 Element Summary												
Element	Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4		Option 5				
	1/0 000 #2 \$/#2		148 000 #2	4.40,000,542 0/542		4 40 000 542 \$1542		¢/#+2	148 000 ft2	¢/#+2			
	140,000 10	φ/Τι	140,000 ft	φ/π	140,000 11	φ/π	140,000 ft	φ/IL	140,000 ft	φ/π			
1 Substructure	\$2,838,000	\$19	\$2,538,000	\$17	\$2,673,000	\$18	\$2,310,000	\$16	\$2,937,000	\$20			
2 Vertical Structures	\$11,740,800	\$79	\$6,116,600	\$41	\$6,296,500	\$43	\$4,952,300	\$33	\$12,688,632	\$86			
3 Floor & Roof Structure	\$2,134,000	\$14	\$1,439,600	\$10	\$1,650,100	\$11	\$1,716,000	\$12	\$3,907,200	\$26			
4 Exterior Cladding	\$10,049,240	\$68	\$7,880,000	\$53	\$10,329,700	\$70	\$12,999,800	\$88	\$22,547,800	\$152			
5 Roofing and Waterproofing	\$1,655,300	\$11	\$1,855,700	\$13	\$2,287,300	\$15	\$2,514,200	\$17	\$2,654,069	\$18			
6 Interior Partitions, Doors & Glazing	\$9,282,200	\$63	\$9,052,500	\$61	\$9,311,900	\$63	\$9,460,400	\$64	\$11,705,320	\$79			
7 Floor, Wall and Ceilings	\$11,550,500	\$78	\$11,078,000	\$75	\$11,445,500	\$77	\$11,445,500	\$77	\$11,237,050	\$76			
8 Functional Equipment and Specialties	\$5,188,400	\$35	\$5,552,000	\$38	\$5,793,400	\$39	\$6,023,900	\$41	\$4,450,490	\$30			
9 Stairs and Vertical Transportation	\$1,680,000	\$11	\$1,990,000	\$13	\$2,280,000	\$15	\$2,040,000	\$14	\$924,000	\$6			
10 Plumbing Systems	\$5,450,000	\$37	\$5,517,200	\$37	\$5,450,000	\$37	\$5,450,000	\$37	\$5,453,800	\$37			
11 Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning	\$10,926,800	\$74	\$11,051,800	\$75	\$11,451,300	\$77	\$11,788,500	\$80	\$13,377,100	\$90			
12 Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications	\$18,790,000	\$127	\$18,873,000	\$128	\$18,625,000	\$126	\$18,625,000	\$126	\$19,460,100	\$131			
13 Fire Protection Systems	\$1,628,000	\$11	\$1,628,000	\$11	\$1,628,000	\$11	\$1,628,000	\$11	\$1,546,600	\$10			
14 Site Preparation and Demolition	\$179,300	\$1	\$383,400	\$3	\$179,300	\$1	\$383,400	\$3	\$423,600	\$3			
15 Site Paving, Structures & Landscaping	\$3,343,200	\$23	\$4,919,000	\$33	\$3,343,200	\$23	\$4,919,000	\$33	\$2,744,300	\$19			
16 Utilities On-site	\$1,328,400	\$9	\$1,738,600	\$12	\$1,328,400	\$9	\$1,738,600	\$12	\$1,230,800	\$8			
17 Seismic Evaluation	\$7,922,050	\$54	\$7,922,050	\$54	\$7,922,050	\$54	\$7,922,050	\$54					
Sub Total	\$105,686,190	\$714	\$99,535,450	\$673	\$101,994,650	\$689	\$105,916,650	\$716	\$117,287,861	\$792			
17 General Requirements & Conditions	\$17,966,700	\$121	\$16,921,000	\$114	\$17,339,100	\$117	\$18,005,800	\$122	\$19,938,900	\$135			
18 Local Business Enterprises (LBE)	\$7,419,173	\$50	\$6,987,387	\$47	\$7,160,025	\$48	\$7,435,347	\$50	\$8,233,606	\$56			
19 Insurance	\$3,932,200	\$27	\$3,703,300	\$25	\$3,794,800	\$26	\$3,940,700	\$27	\$4,363,800	\$29			
20 Contractor's Fee	\$8,100,300	\$55	\$7,628,800	\$52	\$7,817,300	\$53	\$8,117,900	\$55	\$8,989,400	\$61			
21 Design Contingency	\$28,620,900	\$193	\$26,955,200	\$182	\$27,621,200	\$187	\$28,683,300	\$194	\$31,762,700	\$215			
22 Escalation to MOC, 08/16/27	\$20,581,900	\$139	\$19,384,100	\$131	\$19,863,000	\$134	\$20,626,800	\$139	\$22,841,300	\$154			
Total Estimated Construction Cost	\$192,307,363	\$1,299	\$181,115,237	\$1,224	\$185,590,075	\$1,254	\$192,726,497	\$1,302	\$213,417,567	\$1,442			

					Section 3.2 R	enovation D	etail							
					Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4		Option 5	
				GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA	93,200 ft ²	GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA		
Ref	Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	
ļ	A SHELL										-		_	
	1 Substructure				\$ -		\$ -		Ş -		Ş -		Ş	-
	Shallow foundations: footings, grade beams, etc.	sf	\$30.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded	-	Exc	luded
	Slab on Grade; assume 5" thick; incl. excavation, disposal, formwork,	sf	\$18.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded	-	Exc	luded
	reinforcement, concrete, insulation, waterproofing.													
	Premium foundations - multi-storey	sf	\$2.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded	-	Exc	uded
		15	\$40,000.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded	-	Exc	luded
1	2 Vertical Structures				\$ 328,000.00		\$ 372,800.00		\$ 328,000.00		\$ 328,000.00		\$	-
			* ******		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Exc	luded
	Structural steel framing; columns and plate girders; assumed 65psf to Single	t	\$6,000.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excl	uded
	Structural steel framina: columns and plate girders: assumed 18psf to Multi-	t	\$6.000.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Exc	luded
	storey building	-												
	Miscellaneous Bolts & Connections; say 10%	t	\$6,500.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Exc	luded
	Fire proofing; 2 hour Miscellaneous metals	t	\$600.00	82 000	\$ 328,000,00	03 200	\$ 372,800,00	82 000	\$ 328,000,00	82 000	\$ 328,000,00		Excl	uded
		31	ψ4.00	02,000	φ 520,000.00	33,200	φ 372,000.00	02,000	ψ 520,000.00	02,000	ψ 320,000.00			
;	3 Floor & Roof Structure				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		Ş -		\$	-
	Floor dock: 2" thick composite motal dock: with concrete tenning clob	of	¢17.00		\$ - Excluded		\$- Evoludod		\$ - Evoludod		\$ - Exoludod		Ş	-
	Roof deck: 1.5" thick corrugated metal deck; with concrete topping slab	si	\$17.00	23 163	Excluded	23 163	Excluded	23 163	Excluded	23 163	Excluded	-	э 5	-
	Misc. roof structures	sf	\$2.50	23,163	Excluded	23,163	Excluded	23,163	Excluded	23,163	Excluded	-	\$	-
	External canopies; say 10% roof area; includes framing	sf	\$75.00	2,316	Excluded	2,316	Excluded	2,316	Excluded	2,316	Excluded	-	\$	-
4	4 Exterior Cladding				\$ 2.256.440.00		\$ \$ 2,284,400.00		\$ 2,256,400.00		\$ 3.858.800.00		s s	-
					\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$	-
	Demolition of Existing								• • • • • • • •	10.000				
	Exterior Glazing	st	\$25.00	9,118	\$ 227,940.00	9,118	\$ 227,900.00 \$	9,118	\$ 227,900.00	16,239	\$ 406,000.00		¢	_
	Facade	sf	\$150.00		Ψ Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Exc	luded
	Glazing & Windows				\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-		\$	-
	Exterior Glazing	sf	\$200.00	9,118	\$ 1,823,500.00	9,118	\$ 1,823,500.00	9,118	\$ 1,823,500.00	16,239	\$ 3,247,800.00		\$	-
	Exterior boors Exterior doors: allow	sf	\$2.50	82 000	\$ \$ 205 000 00	93 200	\$ \$ 233 000 00	82 000	\$ - \$ 205 000 00	82 000	\$ 205 000 00		ъ \$	-
		0.	\$2.00	02,000	200,000100	00,200	• 200,000,000	02,000	÷ 200,000.00	02,000	¢ 200,000.00		Ŷ	
	5 Roofing and Waterproofing				\$ 123,000.00		\$ 903,500.00		\$ 886,700.00		\$ 886,700.00		Ş	-
	Exterior Walls, incl. Parapet													
	Insulation	sf	\$6.50		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded			
	Air and Water Barrier	sf	\$7.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		¢	
	Rooting Elat Roof assembly	sf	\$30.00		ուլin Extension	23 163	\$- \$694,900,00	23 163	\$- \$694,900,00	23 163	\$ - \$ 694 900 00		s s	-
	Gutter	sf	\$1.25		Incl. in Extension	23,163	\$ 29,000.00	23,163	\$ 29,000.00	23,163	\$ 29,000.00		\$	-
	Downspouts	sf	\$0.50		Incl. in Extension	23,163	\$ 11,600.00	23,163	\$ 11,600.00	23,163	\$ 11,600.00		\$	-
	Metal Flashing Reaf Access Ladder, Allewages	sf	\$1.00		Incl. in Extension	23,163	\$ 23,200.00	23,163	\$ 23,200.00 \$ 5,000.00	23,163	\$ 23,200.00		Ş	-
	Miscellaneous Thermal and Moisture Protection	ea	φο,υυυ.υυ		Inci. In Extension	1	φ 5,000.00	1	φ 5,000.00	1	ຈ ວ,000.00		φ	-
	Misc. sheetmetal and flashing, allowance	sf	\$1.00	82,000	\$ 82,000.00	93,200	\$ 93,200.00	82,000	\$ 82,000.00	82,000	\$ 82,000.00		\$	-
	Caulking and Sealants	sf	\$0.50	82,000	\$ 41,000.00	93,200	\$ 46,600.00	82,000	\$ 41,000.00	82,000	\$ 41,000.00		\$	-
F	INTERIORS				р -		\$ -		ф —		ф -		ŷ	-
(Exteriors, Interior Partitions, Doors & Glazing				\$ 4,715,000.00		\$ 5,359,000.00		\$ 4,715,000.00		\$ 4,715,000.00		\$	-
	Exterior Facade													

	Section 3.2 Renovation Detail												
			C	ption 1	(Option 2	(Option 3	(Option 4	(Option 5	
			GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA	93,200 ft ²	GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA		
Ref Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	
Metal stud, batt insulation, and wall sheathing	sf	\$30.00											
Interior Partitions												\$ -	
Allowance for partitions	sf	\$40.00	82,000	\$ 3,280,000.00	93,200	\$ 3,728,000.00	82,000	\$ 3,280,000.00	82,000	\$ 3,280,000.00		\$-	
Interior glazing; allow	sf	\$5.00	82,000	\$ 410,000.00	93,200	\$ 466,000.00	82,000	\$ 410,000.00	82,000	\$ 410,000.00		\$ -	
Interior Doors	-6	¢10.50	82.000	\$- \$100500000	02.000	\$ - \$ 1 105 000 00	82.000	\$ - \$ 1.005.000.00	82.000	\$ - ¢ 1.005.000.00		\$ -	
Allowance for doors	ST	\$12.5U	82,000	\$ 1,025,000.00 \$ -	93,200	\$ 1,100,000.00 \$ -	62,000	\$ 1,025,000.00 \$ -	62,000	\$ 1,025,000.00 \$ -	-	ə - s -	
7 Floor, Wall and Ceilings				\$ 6,430,000.00		\$ 6,225,000.00		\$ 6,833,000.00		\$ 6,833,000.00		s -	
				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
Demo / Removal of Existing													
Finishes	sf	\$15.00	82,000	\$ 1,230,000.00	82,000	\$ 1,230,000.00	82,000	\$ 1,230,000.00	82,000	\$ 1,230,000.00		\$ -	
<u>FILOUL</u> Public Collection	ef	\$80.00	29,000	Տ 2,320,000,00	20.070	φ - \$ 1.605.600.00	20.000	ې - 1 600 000 00	10.000	\$- \$800.000.00		ə - s -	
Gathering	sf	\$80.00	9,200	\$ 736.000.00	11.530	\$ 922.400.00	7,400	\$ 592.000.00	17,400	\$ 1.392.000.00		\$ -	
Exhibition / Events	sf	\$90.00	-	\$ -	-	\$ -	8,300	\$ 747,000.00	8,300	\$ 747,000.00		\$ -	
Collaboration	sf	\$60.00	-	\$-	-	\$ -	3,000	\$ 180,000.00	3,000	\$ 180,000.00		\$ -	
Administration / Staff Area	sf	\$55.00	22,400	\$ 1,232,000.00	25,000	\$ 1,375,000.00	11,400	\$ 627,000.00	11,400	\$ 627,000.00		\$-	
Green Space	sf	\$150.00	1,000	\$ 150,000.00	1,000	\$ 150,000.00	5,000	\$ 750,000.00	5,000	\$ 750,000.00		\$ -	
Circulation	sf	\$45.00	10,000	\$ 450,000.00	14,000	\$ 630,000.00	20,000	\$ 900,000.00	20,000	\$ 900,000.00		\$ -	
Back of House	st	\$30.00	10,400	\$ 312,000.00 \$ -	10,400	\$ 312,000.00 \$ -	6,900	\$ 207,000.00 \$	6,900	\$ 207,000.00 \$		\$ - \$ -	
C EQUIPMENT AND VERTICAL TRANSPORTATION				Ŷ		Ý		Ŷ		Ý		, in the second	
8 Functional Equipment and Specialties				\$ 3,265,500.00		\$ 3,601,500.00		\$ 3,467,100.00		\$ 3,716,400.00		ş -	
				\$- \$		\$ -		ş -		ş -		\$ -	
Fittings, fixtures and furniture	of	\$450.00	1 000	\$- ¢ 450.000.00	1 000	\$- \$450,000,00	1 000	\$- \$450.000.00	1 000	\$ - \$ 450.000.00		ծ - ¢	
Library shelving	ef	\$15.00	82,000	\$ 430,000.00 \$ 1,230,000.00	93 200	\$ 430,000.00 \$ 1398,000.00	93 200	\$ 430,000.00 \$ 1,398,000.00	93 200	\$ 1 398 000 00		φ -	
Building signage, incl. feature signage	sf	\$2.00	82,000	\$ 164.000.00	93,200	\$ 186.400.00	93,200	\$ 186.400.00	93,200	\$ 186.400.00		\$ -	
Misc. Fixtures	sf	\$1.00	82,000	\$ 82,000.00	93,200	\$ 93,200.00	93,200	\$ 93,200.00	93,200	\$ 93,200.00		\$-	
Blinds; automatic	sf	\$35.00	9,118	\$ 319,100.00	9,118	\$ 319,100.00	9,118	\$ 319,100.00	16,239	\$ 568,400.00		\$ -	
Casework & Millwork				\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-	
Allowance; generally	sf	\$10.00	82,000	\$ 820,000.00	93,200	\$ 932,000.00	82,000	\$ 820,000.00	82,000	\$ 820,000.00		\$ -	
Restroom Specialties		A A AA		\$- •		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
Restroom specialties, partitions, etc	st	\$2.00	82,000	\$ 164,000.00 • 16,200.00	93,200	\$ 186,400.00 \$ 16,200.00	82,000	\$ 164,000.00 \$ 16,200.00	82,000	\$ 164,000.00 \$ 16,200.00		¢	
Millols Paper towel dispenser	ea	\$050.00	25	\$ 10,300.00 \$ 8,800.00	25	\$ 10,300.00 \$ 8,800.00	25	\$ 10,300.00 \$ 8,800.00	25	\$ 10,300.00		р –	
Soan dispenser	ea	\$250.00	25	\$ 6,300,00	25	\$ 6,000.00 \$ 6,000.00	25	\$ 6,300,00	25	\$ 6,000.00		φ - \$ -	
Toilet tissue holder	ea	\$200.00	25	\$ 5,000.00	25	\$ 5,000.00	25	\$ 5,000.00	25	\$ 5,000.00		\$-	
				\$ -		\$-		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
9 Stairs and Vertical Transportation				\$ 1,360,000.00		\$ 1,360,000.00		\$ 1,360,000.00		\$ 1,360,000.00		<u>\$</u> -	
Removal of existing:				ə -		φ -		ə -		ф -		ф -	
Stairs	ea	\$20.000.00	2	\$ 40.000.00	2	\$ 40.000.00	2	\$ 40.000.00	2	\$ 40.000.00			
Elevators	ea	\$40,000.00	2	\$ 80,000.00	2	\$ 80,000.00	2	\$ 80,000.00	2	\$ 80,000.00			
Installation of new:													
Stairs - incl. handrails, assume 2	ea	\$55,000.00	8	\$ 440,000.00	8	\$ 440,000.00	8	\$ 440,000.00	8	\$ 440,000.00		\$-	
Elevator, assume 2	flrs	\$100,000.00	8	\$ 800,000.00	8	\$ 800,000.00	8	\$ 800,000.00	8	\$ 800,000.00		\$ -	
D SERVICES				φ -		φ -		ф -		\$ -		ф -	
10 Plumbing Systems				\$ 3,239,000.00		\$ 3,681,400.00		\$ 3,239,000.00		\$ 3,239,000.00		\$ -	
				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
Demolition of existing	sf	\$6.00	82,000	\$ 492,000.00	93,200	\$ 559,200.00	82,000	\$ 492,000.00	82,000	\$ 492,000.00			
Sanitary equipment; per restroom	sf	\$5.00	82,000	\$ 410,000.00	93,200	\$ 466,000.00	82,000	\$ 410,000.00	82,000	\$ 410,000.00	, I	\$ -	
General plumbing equipment; heat pumps	sf	\$6.00	82,000	\$ 492,000.00	93,200	\$ 559,200.00	82,000	\$ 492,000.00	82,000	\$ 492,000.00	, I	5 - c	
Waste distribution	SI	ቅ 14.00 \$5 በበ	82,000	\$ 1,140,000.00 \$ 410,000.00	93,200 Q3 200	\$ 466.000.00	02,000 82 000	\$ 410,000,00	02,000 82 000	\$ 410,000,00		\$	
	01	ψ0.00	52,000	÷ 10,000.00	00,200	÷	52,000	+ 10,000.00	52,000	+ 10,000.00		¥ -	

Conceptual Design

					Section 3.2 R	enovation D	etail						
				0	ption 1	(Option 2	(Option 3		Option 4	Opti	on 5
				GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA	93,200 ft ²	GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA	82,000 ft ²	GIA	
Ref	Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total
	Roof drainage	sf	\$3.50	82,000	\$ 287,000.00	93,200	\$ 326,200.00	82,000	\$ 287,000.00	82,000	\$ 287,000.00	\$	-
1	1 Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning				\$ 6,347,000.00		\$ 7,203,600.00		\$ 6,351,500.00		\$ 6,351,500.00	\$	-
	Demolition of existing Chilled water distribution to air handlers Hot water distribution to HVAC Air sided equipment and distribution Integrated automation EO Exhaust and ventilation requirements per code Gas provision to kitchen Collaboration, Events, Exhibition space - premium	sf sf sf sf sf sf sf	\$6.00 \$5.00 \$46.00 \$10.00 \$15.00 \$10.00 \$15.00	82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 1,000 1,000 22,400	\$ - \$ 492,000.00 \$ 410,000.00 \$ 492,000.00 \$ 3,772,000.00 \$ 820,000.00 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 10,000.00 \$ 336,000.00	93,200 93,200 93,200 93,200 93,200 1,000 1,000 25,000	\$ - \$ 559,200.00 \$ 466,000.00 \$ 559,200.00 \$ 4,287,200.00 \$ 932,000.00 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 10,000.00 \$ 375,000.00	82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 1,000 1,000 22,700	\$ - \$ 492,000.00 \$ 410,000.00 \$ 492,000.00 \$ 3,772,000.00 \$ 820,000.00 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 10,000.00 \$ 340,500.00	82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 1,000 1,000 22,700	\$ - \$ 492,000.00 \$ 410,000.00 \$ 492,000.00 \$ 3,772,000.00 \$ 820,000.00 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 10,000.00 \$ 340,500.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	-
					\$-		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	\$	-
1	2 Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications			-	\$ 10,761,000.00		\$ <u>12,226,200.00</u>		\$ 10,764,000.00		\$ 10,764,000.00	Ş	-
	Demolition of existing Electrical Distribution Convenience power Lighting and controls Communications; voice and data AV, rough-in only Electrical safety and security; access controls Electrical safety and security; security system Electrical safety and security; fire alarm IT/AV Equipment Roof PV Battery Storage	sf sf sf sf sf sf sf sf sf ut ls	\$10.00 \$20.00 \$18.00 \$40.00 \$3.50 \$7.50 \$3.50 \$11.00 Excluded. Excluded.	82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000	\$ - \$ 820,000,00 \$ 1,640,000,00 \$ 1,476,000,00 \$ 3,280,000,00 \$ 1,230,000,00 \$ 287,000,00 \$ 287,000,00 \$ 902,000,00	93,200 93,200 93,200 93,200 93,200 93,200 93,200 93,200 93,200	3 - \$ 932,000.00 \$ 1,864,000.00 \$ 1,677,600.00 \$ 3,728,000.00 \$ 1,398,000.00 \$ 326,200.00 \$ 326,200.00 \$ 326,200.00 \$ 326,200.00	82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000	\$ 820,000,00 \$ 1,640,000,00 \$ 1,476,000,00 \$ 3,280,000,00 \$ 1,230,000,00 \$ 287,000,00 \$ 287,000,00 \$ 287,000,00 \$ 902,000,00	82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000 82,000	\$ 820,000.00 \$ 1,640,000.00 \$ 1,476,000.00 \$ 3,280,000.00 \$ 1,230,000.00 \$ 287,000.00 \$ 287,000.00 \$ 287,000.00 \$ 287,000.00 \$ 902,000.00	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	
	Collaboration, Events, Exhibition space - premium	sf	\$10.00	22,400	\$ 224,000.00 \$ -	25,000	\$ 250,000.00 \$ -	22,700	\$ 227,000.00 \$ -	22,700	\$ 227,000.00 \$ -	\$ \$	-
1	3 Fire Protection Systems				\$ 902,000.00		\$ 1,025,200.00		\$ 902,000.00		\$ 902,000.00	\$	-
	Allowance for fire sprinklers	sf	\$11.00	82,000	\$- \$902,000.00 \$-	93,200	\$ - \$ 1,025,200.00 \$ -	82,000	\$- \$902,000.00 \$-	82,000	\$ - \$ 902,000.00 \$ -	s s s	-
	Total Net Cost				\$ 39,726,940.00		\$ 44,242,600.00		\$ 41,102,700.00		\$ 42,954,400.00	\$	-

Section 3.3 Extension of Existing Detail												
			(Option 1	(Option 2	(Option 3		Option 4		Option 5
			GIA	66,000 ft ²	GIA	33,000 ft ²	GIA	33,000 ft²	GIA	0 ft²	GIA	0 ft²
Ref Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total
A SHELL 1 Substructure				\$ 2,838,000,00		\$ 1,518,000,00		\$ 1 518 000 00		e -		¢ .
				\$ -		\$ 1,510,000.00 \$ -		\$ 1,510,000.00 \$ -		ş -		\$ -
Shallow foundations; footings, grade beams, etc.	sf	\$40.00	66,000	\$ 2,640,000.00 \$ 108,000.00	33,000	\$ 1,320,000.00 \$ 108,000.00	33,000	\$ 1,320,000.00	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
reinforcement, concrete, insulation, waterproofing.	ST	\$10.UU	11,000	\$ 196,000.00	11,000	\$ 196,000.00	11,000	\$ 196,000.00	-	ъ -	-	ə -
Elevator pit	ls	\$40,000.00		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded	-	Excluded	-	Excluded
2 Vertical Structures				\$ 11,412,800.00		\$ 4,216,400.00		\$ 3,656,400.00		ş -		\$ -
Structural steal framing: columns and plate airdars: accumed 19osf to Multi		\$0,000,00	504	\$ - \$ 5346,000,00	207	\$ - \$ 2,673,000,00	207	\$ - \$ 2,673,000,00		\$ -		\$ - ¢
storey building	L	<i>4</i> 9,000.00	554	\$ 5,540,000.00	251	φ 2,073,000.00	251	φ 2,075,000.00	-	φ -	-	φ -
Structural steel framing; bracing; assumed 3psf	t	\$9,000.00	99	\$ 891,000.00	50	\$ 445,500.00	50	\$ 445,500.00	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
Seismic joints	sf	\$600.00 \$10.00	66,000	\$ 415,800.00 \$ 660,000.00	347 33,000	\$ 207,900.00 \$ 330,000.00	33,000	\$ 207,900.00 \$ 330,000.00	-	ъ -	-	ə -
Strengthen existing structure to receive new program overhead	sf	\$50.00	82,000	\$ 4,100,000.00	11,200	\$ 560,000.00		Excluded		Excluded		
3 Floor & Roof Structure				\$ 2,134,000.00		\$ 1,034,000.00		\$ 792,000.00		\$-		\$ -
Remove existing roof and deck	ef	\$20.00	33.000	\$ - \$	11 000	\$ - \$ 220.000.00	11 000	\$ - \$ 220.000.00		\$-		\$ -
Floor deck; 2" thick composite metal deck; with concrete topping slab	sf	\$22.00	22,000	\$ 484,000.00	22,000	\$ 484,000.00	11,000	\$ 242,000.00	-	\$-	-	\$-
Roof deck; 1.5" thick corrugated metal deck; w/o concrete topping slab	sf	\$15.00 \$2.50	33,000	\$ 495,000.00 \$ 82,500.00	11,000	\$ 165,000.00 \$ 27,500.00	11,000	\$ 165,000.00 \$ 27,500.00	-	\$ -	-	\$ - ¢
External canopies; say 10% roof area; includes framing	sf	\$125.00	3,300	\$ 412,500.00	1,100	\$ 137,500.00	1,100	\$ 137,500.00	-	\$ -	-	\$-
4 Exterior Cladding				\$ 7 792 800 00		\$ 3 502 800 00		\$ <u>4 905 300 00</u>		\$ -		\$ - \$
				\$ -		\$ -		\$		\$ -		\$ -
Demolition of Existing Solid Facade / Exterior Glazing	ef	\$25.00	13 392	\$ 334,800,00	13 392	\$ 334,800,00	13 392	\$ 334 800 00		\$		
Solid Façade	51	φ20.00	10,002	\$ -	10,002	\$ -	10,002	\$ -		\$ -		\$-
Façade Glazing & Windows	sf	\$150.00	25,740	\$ 3,861,000.00 \$	10,890	\$ 1,633,500.00 \$	15,840	\$ 2,376,000.00	-	\$ - \$	-	\$ - \$
Exterior Glazing	sf	\$200.00	17,160	\$ 3,432,000.00	7,260	\$ 1,452,000.00	10,560	\$ 2,112,000.00	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
Exterior Doors Exterior doors: allow	sf	\$2.50	66 000	\$ - \$ 165.000.00	33 000	\$ - \$ 82,500,00	33,000	\$- \$82 500 00	-	\$ - \$ -	_	\$- \$-
	01	¥2.00	00,000	• 100,000.00	00,000	¢ 02,000.00	00,000	¢ 02,000.00		•		Ŷ
5 Rooting and Waterproofing				\$ 1,532,300.00 \$ -		\$ 561,800.00 \$ -		\$ 643,700.00 \$ -		\$ - \$-		\$ - \$ -
Exterior Walls, incl. Parapet		00 50	05 740	\$ -	40.000	\$ -	15.010	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
Insulation Air and Water Barrier	st sf	\$6.50 \$7.00	25,740 25.740	\$ 167,300.00 \$ 180,200.00	10,890 10.890	\$ 70,800.00 \$ 76,200.00	15,840 15.840	\$ 103,000.00 \$ 110,900.00	-	\$- \$-	-	\$- \$-
Roofing		¢00.00	22,000	\$ -	11.000	\$ -	44,000	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
Flat Roof assembly; white roof Gutter	sf	\$30.00 \$1.25	33,000	\$ 990,000.00 \$ 41,300.00	11,000	\$ 330,000.00 \$ 13,800.00	11,000	\$ 330,000.00 \$ 13,800.00	-	\$- \$-	-	s - S -
Downspouts	sf	\$0.50	33,000	\$ 16,500.00	11,000	\$ 5,500.00	11,000	\$ 5,500.00	-	\$ -	-	\$ -
Roof Access Ladder, Allowance	st ea	\$1.00 \$5,000.00	33,000	• 33,000.00 \$ 5,000.00	11,000	11,000.005,000.00	11,000	11,000.00 20,000.00	-	⇒ - \$ -	-	ə - \$ -
Miscellaneous Thermal and Moisture Protection		A4 00	CC 000	¢	20,000	¢ 00.000.00	22.000	¢ 00.000.00		¢		
Caulking and Sealants	st sf	\$1.00 \$0.50	66,000	\$ 33,000.00	33,000	\$ 33,000.00 \$ 16,500.00	33,000	• 33,000.00 \$ 16,500.00		\$ - \$ -		\$- \$-
				\$-		\$		\$		\$-		\$-
6 Interior Partitions, Doors & Glazing				\$ 4,567,200.00		\$ 2,224,200.00		\$ 2,372,700. <u>00</u>		\$ -		\$ -
Evtorior Econdo				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
Metal Stud and wall sheathing	sf	\$30.00	25,740	\$ 772,200.00	10,890	\$ 326,700.00	15,840	\$ 475,200.00		\$ -		\$ \$

	Section 3.3 Extension of Existing Detail												
				C	Option 2 Option 3				C	ption 4	Option 5		
				GIA	66,000 ft ²	GIA	33,000 ft ²	GIA	33,000 ft ²	GIA	0 ft²	GIA	0 ft²
Ref	Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total
	Interior Partitions Allowance for partitions Interior glazing; allow Interior Doors Allowance for doors	sf sf sf	\$40.00 \$5.00 \$12.50	66,000 66,000 66,000	\$ - \$ 2,640,000.00 \$ 330,000.00 \$ - \$ 825,000.00	33,000 33,000 33,000	\$ - \$ 1,320,000.00 \$ 165,000.00 \$ - \$ 412,500.00	33,000 33,000 33,000	\$ - \$ 1,320,000.00 \$ 165,000.00 \$ - \$ 412,500.00		\$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$		\$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$
	7 Floor, Wall and Ceilings				\$ 5,120,500.00		\$ 2,430,000.00		\$ 2,640,000.00		s -		s -
	Fit Out Public Collection Gathering Exhibition / Events Collaboration Administration / Staff Area Green Space Circulation Back of House	sf sf sf sf sf sf sf sf	\$80.00 \$80.00 \$90.00 \$55.00 \$150.00 \$45.00 \$30.00	5,000 24,700 8,300 7,000 5,500 5,500 10,000	\$ 400,000.00 \$ 1,976,000.00 \$ 747,000.00 \$ 420,000.00 \$ 302,500.00 \$ 825,000.00 \$ 450,000.00 \$ -	5,000 22,000 6,000 -	\$ - \$ 400,000.00 \$ 1,760,000.00 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	6,500 26,500 - - - -	\$ 520,000.00 \$ 520,000.00 \$ 2,120,000.00 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -		\$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -		\$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -
(C EQUIPMENT AND VERTICAL TRANSPORTATION				¢ 4 022 000 00		¢ 4 4 4 7 4 00 00		¢ 922.000.00				
	Fittings, fixtures and furniture Kitchen equipment, allowance Building signage, incl. feature signage Misc. Fixtures Blinds; manual Casework & Millwork Allowance; generally Restroom Specialties Mirrors, assume 10 Paper towel dispenser, assume 8 Soap dispenser, assume 8 Toilet tissue holder, assume 15	sf sf sf sf ea ea ea ea ea	\$450.00 \$2.00 \$1.00 \$35.00 \$10.00 \$650.00 \$350.00 \$250.00 \$200.00	1,000 66,000 66,000 17,160 66,000 10 8 8 8 15	\$ - \$ 450,000,00 \$ 132,000,00 \$ 660,000,00 \$ 660,000,00 \$ - \$ 660,000,00 \$ - \$ 6,500,00 \$ 2,800,00 \$ 2,800,00 \$ 2,000,00 \$ 3,000,00	1,000 33,000 33,000 7,260 33,000 10 8 8 15	\$ - \$ 450,000,00 \$ 66,000,00 \$ 33,000,00 \$ 254,100,00 \$ - \$ 330,000,00 \$ - \$ 6,500,00 \$ 2,800,00 \$ 2,000,00 \$ 3,000,00	1,000 - - 10,560 - 10 8 8 8 15	\$ - \$ 450,000.00 \$ - \$ 369,600.00 \$ - \$ 369,600.00 \$ - \$ 5 \$ 6,500.00 \$ 2,800.00 \$ 2,800.00 \$ 2,000.00 \$ 3,000.00		- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -		- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
ļ	9 Stairs and Vertical Transportation				\$ <u>320,000.00</u>		\$ 240,000.00		\$ 240,000.00		» - Տ -		\$ -
	Stairs - incl. handrails, assume 1 Elevator, assume 1	flrs flrs	\$40,000.00 \$90,000.00	8	\$ - \$ 320,000.00 \$ - \$ -	6	\$ - \$ 240,000.00 \$ - \$ -	6	\$ - \$ 240,000.00 \$ - \$ -		 		\$- \$\$- \$\$-
1	D SERVICES 0 Plumbing Systems				\$ 2 211 000 00		\$ 1 105 500 00		\$ 1 105 500 00		•		•
	Sanitary equipment; per restroom General plumbing equipment; heat pumps Domestic Hot & Cold water distribution Waste distribution Roof drainage	sf sf sf sf sf	\$5.00 \$6.00 \$14.00 \$5.00 \$3.50	66,000 66,000 66,000 66,000 66,000	\$ 330,000.00 \$ 396,000.00 \$ 924,000.00 \$ 330,000.00 \$ 231,000.00 \$ -	33,000 33,000 33,000 33,000 33,000	\$ 165,000,00 \$ \$ 165,000,00 \$ 198,000,00 \$ 462,000,00 \$ 165,000,00 \$ 115,500,00 \$ -	33,000 33,000 33,000 33,000 33,000	\$ 165,000,00 \$ 165,000,00 \$ 198,000,00 \$ 462,000,00 \$ 165,000,00 \$ 115,500,00 \$ -		\$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -		\$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -
1'	1 Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning				\$ 4,579,800.00		\$ 2,368,800.00		\$ 2,368,800.00		\$-		\$ -
	Chilled water distribution to air handlers Hot water distribution to HVAC Air sided equipment and distribution Integrated automation EO Exhaust and ventilation requirements per code Gas provision to kitchen	sf sf sf sf sf sf	\$5.00 \$6.00 \$46.00 \$10.00 \$15.00 \$10.00	66,000 66,000 66,000 66,000 1,000 1,000	3 330,000.00 \$ 330,000.00 \$ 396,000.00 \$ 3,036,000.00 \$ 660,000.00 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 10,000.00	33,000 33,000 33,000 33,000 1,000 1,000	3 - \$ 165,000.00 \$ 198,000.00 \$ 1,518,000.00 \$ 330,000.00 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 10,000.00	33,000 33,000 33,000 33,000 1,000 1,000	\$ 165,000.00 \$ 198,000.00 \$ 1,518,000.00 \$ 330,000.00 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 10,000.00		5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 -		> -

12/10/24

Section 3.3 | Extension of Existing Detail Option 1 Option 2 Option 3 Option 4 Option 5 GIA 66,000 ft² GIA 33,000 ft² GIA 33,000 ft² GIA 0 ft² GIA 0 ft² Ref Element Unit Quantity Total Quantity Total Quantity Total Quantity Total Quantity Total Rate Collaboration, Events, Exhibition space - premium sf \$15.00 8,850 132,800.00 8,850 132,800.00 8,850 132,800.00 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ -\$ S 12 Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications 8.029.000.00 3.910.500.00 3.910.500.00 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ -Electrical Distribution \$20.00 66,000 \$ 1,320,000.00 33,000 \$ 660,000.00 33,000 \$ 660,000.00 \$ sf \$ --33.000 \$ Convenience power sf \$18.00 66.000 \$ 1.188.000.00 33.000 \$ 594.000.00 594.000.00 \$ -\$ -Lighting and controls sf \$40.00 66.000 2.640.000.00 33.000 \$ 1.320.000.00 33.000 \$ 1.320.000.00 \$ \$ \$ --Communications; voice and data sf \$15.00 66,000 \$ 990,000.00 33,000 \$ 495,000.00 33,000 \$ 495,000.00 \$ -\$ -231,000.00 33,000 \$ AV, rough-in only sf \$3.50 66,000 \$ 33,000 \$ 115,500.00 115,500.00 \$ \$ --Electrical safety and security; access controls \$7.50 66,000 495,000.00 33,000 247,500.00 33,000 \$ 247,500.00 sf \$ \$ \$ -\$ -231,000.00 Electrical safety and security; security system sf \$3.50 66,000 \$ 33,000 \$ 115,500.00 33,000 \$ 115,500.00 \$ _ \$ -\$11.00 363,000.00 363,000.00 Electrical safety and security; fire alarm sf 66,000 \$ 726,000.00 33,000 \$ 33,000 \$ \$ -\$ -IT/AV Equipment sf Excluded. Roof PV Excluded. wt Battery Storage ls Excluded. Collaboration, Events, Exhibition space - premium sf \$10.00 20,800 \$ 208,000.00 \$ \$ \$ \$ -------726,000.00 363,000.00 363,000.00 13 Fire Protection Systems \$ \$ - \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ -Allowance for fire sprinklers sf \$11.00 66,000 \$ 726,000.00 33,000 \$ 363,000.00 33,000 \$ 363,000.00 \$ \$ --\$ 53,186,300.00 24.622.400.00 25.349.800.00 \$ \$ **Total Net Cost** \$ \$ \$

	Section 3.4 New Build Detail												
					Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	(Option 5
				GIA		GIA	21,800 ft ²	GIA	33,000 ft ²	GIA	66,000 ft ²	GIA	148,000 ft ²
Ref	Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total
ļ	A SHELL				<u>_</u>								
	1 Substructure			[\$ - \$ -		\$ 1,020,000.00 \$ -		\$ 1,155,000.00 \$		\$ 2,310,000.00 \$		\$ 2,937,000.00 \$ -
	Shallow foundations; footings, grade beams, etc.	sf	\$50.00		\$-	14,000	\$ 700,000.00	16,500	\$ 825,000.00	33,000	\$ 1,650,000.00	37,000	\$ 2,035,000.00
	Slab on Grade; assume 5" thick; incl. excavation, disposal, formwork,	sf	\$20.00		\$-	14,000	\$ 280,000.00	16,500	\$ 330,000.00	33,000	\$ 660,000.00	37,000	\$ 814,000.00
	reinforcement, concrete, insulation, waterproofing.	ls	\$40.000.00		\$ -	1	\$ 40.000.00	2	Excluded	2	Excluded	2	\$ 88.000.00
			,		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
	2 Vertical Structures			Γ	\$ - \$ -		\$ 1,527,400.00 \$		\$ 2,312,100.00 \$		\$ 4,624,300.00 \$		\$ 12,688,632.00 \$
	Structural steel framing; columns and plate girders; assumed 18psf to Multi-	t	\$6,500.00		\$-	196	\$ 1,275,300.00	297	\$ 1,930,500.00	594	\$ 3,861,000.00	1,332	\$ 10,656,000.00
	storey building		¢C 050 00		¢	20	¢ 100.000.00	20	¢ 495 000 00	50	¢ 271.200.00	400	¢ 1.005.000.00
	Fire proofing; 2 hour	t	\$6,250.00		s -	20	\$ 122,600.00 \$ 129,500.00	30 327	\$ 185,600.00 \$ 196.000.00	59 653	\$ 371,300.00 \$ 392.000.00	1.465	\$ 1,065,600.00 \$ 967.032.00
					\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
	3 Floor & Roof Structure			1	\$ - \$ -		\$ 405,600.00		\$ 858,100.00		\$ 1,716,000.00		\$ 3,907,200.00
	Floor deck; 2" thick composite metal deck; with concrete topping slab	sf	\$22.00		\$-	7,800	\$ 171,600.00	16,500	\$ 363,000.00	33,000	\$ 726,000.00	111,000	\$ 2,686,200.00
	Roof deck; 1.5" thick corrugated metal deck; w/o concrete topping slab	sf	\$15.00		\$-	7,800	\$ 117,000.00	16,500	\$ 247,500.00	33,000	\$ 495,000.00	37,000	\$ 610,500.00
	Misc. root structures External canopies: say 10% roof area: includes framing	sf	\$2.50 \$125.00		ծ - Տ -	7,800	\$ 19,500.00 \$ 97,500.00	16,500	\$ 41,300.00 \$ 206,300.00	33,000	\$ 82,500.00 \$ 412,500.00	37,000	\$ 101,750.00 \$ 508,750.00
		-			\$ -		\$ -	.,	\$ -	-,	\$ -	-1	\$ -
4	4 Exterior Cladding			1	\$ - \$ -		\$ 2,092,800.00		\$ 3,168,000.00		\$ 9,141,000.00		\$ 22,547,800.00
	Solid Façade				\$-		\$-		\$ -		\$-		\$-
	Façade	sf	\$150.00		\$ -	7,194	\$ 1,079,100.00	10,890	\$ 1,633,500.00	31,680	\$ 4,752,000.00	71,040	\$ 11,721,600.00
	Exterior Glazing	sf	\$200.00		s -	4.796	\$	7.260	\$ 1.452.000.00	21,120	\$ 4.224.000.00	47.360	\$ 10.419.200.00
	Exterior Doors				\$ -	,	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
	Exterior doors; allow	sf	\$2.50		\$-	21,800	\$ 54,500.00	33,000	\$ 82,500.00	66,000	\$ 165,000.00	148,000	\$ 407,000.00 \$ -
	5 Roofing and Waterproofing			I	\$-		\$ 390,400.00		\$ 756,900.00		\$ 1,627,500.00		\$ 2,654,069.00
	Exterior Walls incl. Paranet				\$ - \$ -		\$ - \$ -		\$ - \$ -		\$ - \$ -		\$ - \$ _
	Insulation	sf	\$6.50		\$-	7,194	\$ 46,800.00	10,890	\$ 70,800.00	31,680	\$ 205,900.00	71,040	\$ 507,936.00
	Air and Water Barrier	sf	\$7.00		\$-	7,194	\$ 50,400.00	10,890	\$ 76,200.00	31,680	\$ 221,800.00	71,040	\$ 547,008.00
	Flat Roof assembly: white roof	sf	\$30.00		\$- \$-	7.800	\$ - \$ 234.000.00	16.500	\$ - \$ 495.000.00	33.000	\$ - \$ 990.000.00	37.000	\$ 1.221.000.00
	Gutter	sf	\$1.25		\$-	7,800	\$ 9,800.00	16,500	\$ 20,600.00	33,000	\$ 41,300.00	37,000	\$ 50,875.00
	Downspouts Motol Floaking	sf	\$0.50		\$ -	7,800	\$ 3,900.00	16,500	\$ 8,300.00	33,000	\$ 16,500.00 \$ 22,000.00	37,000	\$ 20,350.00 \$ 40,700.00
	Roof Access Ladder, Allowance	ea	\$5,000.00		\$- \$-	7,000	\$ 7,800.00	10,500	\$ 10,500.00	33,000	\$ 33,000.00	37,000	\$ 40,700.00
	Miscellaneous Thermal and Moisture Protection												\$ -
	Misc. sheetmetal and flashing, allowance	sf	\$1.00 \$0.50		\$ - \$ -	21,800 21,800	\$ 21,800.00 \$ 10,900.00	33,000	\$ 33,000.00 \$ 16,500.00	66,000 66,000	\$ 66,000.00 \$ 33,000,00	148,000 148,000	\$ 162,800.00 \$ 81,400.00
		51	¥0.00		\$-	21,000	\$ 10,000.00 \$ -	00,000	\$ 10,000.00 \$ -	00,000	\$	140,000	\$ 01,400.00 \$ -
E	B INTERIORS				¢		\$ 1 460 200 00		\$ 2 224 200 00		\$ 4 745 400 00		\$ 11 705 220 00
	o menor Partitions, Doors & Glazing				\$ -		\$ 1,469,500.00		\$ 2,224,200.00		\$ 4,745,400.00 \$ -		\$
	Exterior Façade				\$ -	7.00	\$ -	10.000	\$ -	04.000	\$ -	74.010	\$ -
	Metal Stud and wall sheathing Interior Partitions	st	\$30.00		\$ \$	7,194	\$ 215,800.00 \$ -	10,890	\$ 326,700.00 \$ -	31,680	\$ 950,400.00 \$ -	/1,040	\$ 2,344,320.00 \$ -
	Allowance for partitions	sf	\$40.00		\$ -	21,800	\$ 872,000.00	33,000	\$ 1,320,000.00	66,000	\$ 2,640,000.00	148,000	\$ 6,512,000.00
	Interior glazing; allow	sf	\$5.00		\$-	21,800	\$ 109,000.00	33,000	\$ 165,000.00	66,000	\$ 330,000.00	148,000	\$ 814,000.00
	Allowance for doors	sf	\$12.50		\$ -	21,800	\$ 272,500.00	33,000	\$ 412,500.00	66,000	\$ 825,000.00	148,000	\$ 2,035,000.00

					Section 3.4 I	New Build De	tail							
	Option 1 Option 2 Option 3 Option 4 Option 5													
				GIA		GIA	21,800 ft ²	GIA	33,000 ft²	GIA	66,000 ft ²	GIA	148,000 ft ²	
Ref	Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	
7	Floor. Wall and Ceilings				<u>\$</u> - \$-		\$		\$		\$ 4.612.500.00		\$	
					\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$	
	Public Collection	sf	\$80.00		s - \$ -	8,200	\$	9,000	\$	25,500	\$ 2,040,000.00	35,500	\$	
	Gathering	sf	\$80.00 \$00.00		\$ -	0 200	\$- \$747.000.00		\$ -	16,500	\$ 1,320,000.00	33,900	\$ 2,983,200.00	
	Collaboration	si	\$90.00		• - \$ -	7,000	\$ 747,000.00 \$ 420,000.00	4,000	\$	4,000	\$ 240,000.00	7,000	\$ 62,000.00 \$ 462,000.00	
	Administration / Staff Area	sf	\$55.00		\$ -	4 000	\$- \$600.000.00	16,500	\$ 907,500.00	16,500	\$ 907,500.00	27,900	\$ 1,687,950.00	
	Circulation	si	\$150.00		\$- \$-	4,000	\$ 000,000.00 \$ -		\$- \$-		s -	20,000	\$ 990,000.00	
	Back of House	sf	\$30.00		\$ - \$ -		\$- \$-	3,500	\$ 105,000.00 \$ -	3,500	\$ 105,000.00 \$ -	10,400	\$ 343,200.00 \$ -	
C	EQUIPMENT AND VERTICAL TRANSPORTATION			1	¢		¢ 002 400 00		¢ 4 400 400 00		¢ 0.007.500.00		A 450 400 00	
ŏ	Functional Equipment and Specialties				\$ -		\$ 803,100.00 \$ -		\$ 1,492,400.00 \$ -		\$ 2,307,500.00 \$ -		\$	
	Fittings, fixtures and furniture		\$450.00		\$ -	750	\$ -	4 000	\$ -	4 000	\$ -	4 000	\$ -	
	Kitchen lab Building signage, incl. feature signage	st sf	\$450.00 \$2.00		\$ - \$ -	750 21,800	\$ 337,500.00 \$ 43,600.00	1,000 148,000	\$ 450,000.00 \$ 296,000.00	1,000 148,000	\$ 450,000.00 \$ 296,000.00	1,000 148,000	\$ 495,000.00 \$ 325,600.00	
	Misc. Fixtures	sf	\$1.00		\$ -	21,800	\$ 21,800.00	148,000	\$ 148,000.00	148,000	\$ 148,000.00	148,000	\$ 162,800.00	
	Blinds; manual Casework & Millwork	st	\$35.00		\$ - \$ -	4,796	\$ 167,900.00 \$ -	7,260	\$ 254,100.00 \$ -	21,120	\$ 739,200.00 \$ -	47,360	\$	
	Allowance; generally	sf	\$10.00		\$-	21,800	\$ 218,000.00	33,000	\$ 330,000.00	66,000	\$ 660,000.00	148,000	\$ 1,628,000.00	
	Mirrors, assume 10	ea	\$650.00		\$ - \$ -	10	\$ - \$ 6,500.00	10	\$ - \$ 6,500.00	10	\$	10	\$- \$7,150.00	
	Paper towel dispenser, assume 8	ea	\$350.00		\$ -	8	\$ 2,800.00	8	\$ 2,800.00	8	\$ 2,800.00	8	\$ 3,080.00	
	Soap dispenser, assume a Toilet tissue holder, assume 15	ea ea	\$250.00 \$200.00		\$- \$-	8 15	\$ 2,000.00 \$ 3,000.00	8 15	\$ 2,000.00 \$ 3,000.00	8 15	\$ 2,000.00 \$ 3,000.00	8 15	\$ 2,200.00 \$ 3,300.00	
٥	Stairs and Vertical Transportation				\$ - \$ -		\$		\$		\$ 680.000.00		\$ - \$ 924.000.00	
3					\$ -		\$		\$ -		\$ -		\$	
	Stairs - incl. handrails, assume 1	ea fire	\$40,000.00		\$ - \$	3	\$ 120,000.00 \$ 270,000.00	8	\$ 320,000.00 \$ 360,000,00	8	\$ 320,000.00 \$ 360,000,00	12	\$ 528,000.00 \$ 396,000.00	
		115	ψ30,000.00		\$ -	5	\$ <u>270,000.00</u> \$ -	т Т	\$ 300,000.00 \$ -	7	\$ 500,000.00 \$ -	7	\$ -	
D 10	SERVICES Plumbing Systems				\$ -		\$ 730,300.00		\$ 1,105,500.00		\$ 2,211,000.00		\$ 5,453,800.00	
		-4	¢5.00		\$ -	01.000	\$-	22,000	\$ -	000 00	\$ -	149.000	\$ -	
	General plumbing equipment; heat pumps	si	\$5.00 \$6.00		s - \$ -	21,800	\$ 109,000.00 \$ 130,800.00	33,000	\$ 105,000.00 \$ 198,000.00	66,000 66,000	\$ 396,000.00 \$ 396,000.00	148,000	\$ 814,000.00 \$ 976,800.00	
	Domestic Hot & Cold water distribution	sf	\$14.00		\$ -	21,800	\$ 305,200.00	33,000	\$ 462,000.00	66,000	\$ 924,000.00	148,000	\$ 2,279,200.00	
	Roof drainage	sf	\$5.00 \$3.50		\$- \$-	21,800	\$ 109,000.00 \$ 76,300.00	33,000	\$ 115,500.00 \$ 115,500.00	66,000 66,000	\$ 330,000.00 \$ 231,000.00	148,000	\$ 814,000.00 \$ 569,800.00	
11	Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning				\$ \$		\$		\$ - \$ 2.731.000.00		\$ <u>5.437.000.00</u>		\$	
					\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$-	
	Chilled water distribution to air handlers Hot water distribution to HVAC	sf	\$5.00 \$6.00		\$ - \$ -	21,800 21,800	\$ 109,000.00 \$ 130.800.00	33,000 33.000	\$ 165,000.00 \$ 198.000.00	66,000 66,000	\$ 330,000.00 \$ 396.000.00	148,000 148.000	\$ 814,000.00 \$ 976.800.00	
	Air sided equipment and distribution	sf	\$46.00		\$ -	21,800	\$ 1,002,800.00	33,000	\$ 1,518,000.00	66,000	\$ 3,036,000.00	148,000	\$ 7,488,800.00	
	EO Exhaust and ventilation requirements per code	si	\$10.00 \$15.00		\$- \$-	21,800	\$ 218,000.00 \$ 11,300.00	1,000	\$ 330,000.00 \$ 15,000.00	1,000	\$ 000,000.00 \$ 15,000.00	148,000	\$ 1,628,000.00 \$ 16,500.00	
	Gas provision to kitchen	sf	\$10.00		\$-	750	\$ 7,500.00	1,000	\$ 10,000.00	1,000	\$ 10,000.00	1,000	\$ 11,000.00	
	Upint for separate buildings Teaching & Learning Spaces; Lab Space; Premium	st sf	\$15.00 \$0.00		ծ - \$ -	8,850	» - \$ -	33,000 8,850	\$ 495,000.00 \$ -	66,000 8,850	\$	148,000 8,850	\$ 2,442,000.00 \$ -	
42	Electrical Lighting Dower and Communications				\$	-,	\$ -	-,	\$ -	-,	\$	-,	\$	
12	Electrical Lighting, Power and Communications				} -		\$ 2,736,300.00 \$		\$ 3,950,500.00 \$		\$ 7,861,000.00 \$		\$ 19,460,100.00 \$	

	Section 3.4 New Build Detail																
				C	1	Option 2		Option 3		Option 4		4	Option 5		n 5		
				GIA		GIA	2	21,800 ft ²	GIA	33,00) ft²	GIA	1	66,000 ft ²	GIA		148,000 ft ²
Ref	Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity		Total	Quantity	Tot	al	Quantity		Total	Quantity		Total
	Electrical Distribution	sf	\$20.00		\$-	21,800	\$	436,000.00	33,000	\$ 6	60,000.00	66,000	\$	1,320,000.00	148,000	\$	3,256,000.00
	Convenience power	sf	\$18.00		\$ -	21,800	\$	392,400.00	33,000	\$ 5	94,000.00	66,000	\$	1,188,000.00	148,000	\$	2,930,400.00
	Lighting and controls	sf	\$40.00		\$ -	21,800	\$	872,000.00	33,000	\$ 1,3	20,000.00	66,000	\$	2,640,000.00	148,000	\$	6,512,000.00
	Communications; voice and data	sf	\$15.00		\$ -	21,800	\$	327,000.00	33,000	\$ 4	95,000.00	66,000	\$	990,000.00	148,000	\$	2,442,000.00
	AV, rough-in only	sf	\$3.50		\$ -	21,800	\$	76,300.00	33,000	\$ 1	5,500.00	66,000	\$	231,000.00	148,000	\$	569,800.00
	Electrical safety and security; access controls	sf	\$7.50		\$ -	21,800	\$	163,500.00	33,000	\$ 2	17,500.00	66,000	\$	495,000.00	148,000	\$	1,221,000.00
	Electrical safety and security; security system	sf	\$3.50		\$ -	21,800	\$	76,300.00	33,000	\$ 1	15,500.00	66,000	\$	231,000.00	148,000	\$	569,800.00
	Electrical safety and security; fire alarm	st	\$11.00		\$-	21,800	\$	239,800.00	33,000	\$ 3	53,000.00	66,000	\$	726,000.00	148,000	\$	1,790,800.00
	II/AV Equipment	st	Excluded.														
	Root PV	wt	Excluded.														
	Battery Storage	IS	Excluded.		•	15 000	•	450 000 00	4 000	•		4 000	•	10 000 00	45 000	•	100 000 00
	Collaboration, Events, Exhibition space - premium	st	\$10.00		\$- ¢	15,300	\$ ¢	153,000.00	4,000	\$ ¢	10,000.00	4,000	ş	40,000.00	15,300	s ¢	168,300.00
13	3 Fire Protection Systems				ş - \$ -		φ \$	239.800.00		\$ 3	53.000.00		ş Ş	726.000.00		ş Ş	1.546.600.00
					\$ -		\$	-		\$	-		\$	-		\$	-
	Allowance for fire sprinklers	sf	\$11.00		\$ -	21,800	\$	239,800.00	33,000	\$ 3	53,000.00	66,000	\$	726,000.00	148,000	\$	1,546,600.00
					\$ -		\$	-		\$	-	,	\$	-	- ,	\$	-
	Total Net Cost				\$ -		\$ 1	15,707,400.00		\$ 22,76	9,200.00		\$	47,999,200.00		\$	112,889,161.00

			Section 3.5 Site S	ummary						
Element	Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4		Option 5	
GIA (sqft)	59,764 ft²	\$/ft²	90,802 ft²	\$/ft²	59,764 ft²	\$/ft²	90,802 ft²	\$/ft²	45,123 ft ²	\$/ft²
14 Site Preparation and Demolition	\$179,300	\$3	\$383,400	\$4	\$179,300	\$4	\$383,400	\$8	\$423,600	\$9
15 Site Paving, Structures & Landscaping	\$3,343,200	\$56	\$4,919,000	\$54	\$3,343,200	\$74	\$4,919,000	\$109	\$2,744,300	\$61
16 Utilities On-site	\$1,328,400	\$22	\$1,738,600	\$19	\$1,328,400	\$29	\$1,738,600	\$39	\$1,230,800	\$27
Sub Total	\$4,850,900	\$81	\$7,041,000	\$78	\$4,850,900	\$108	\$7,041,000	\$156	\$4,398,700	\$97
17 General Requirements & Conditions	\$727,600	\$12	\$1,056,200	\$12	\$727,600	\$12	\$1,056,200	\$12	\$659,800	\$15
18 Local Business Enterprises (LBE)	\$278,925	\$5	\$404,860	\$7	\$278,925	\$5	\$404,860	\$7	\$252,925	\$4
19 Insurance	\$117,100	\$2	\$170,000	\$2	\$117,100	\$2	\$170,000	\$2	\$106,200	\$2
20 Contractor's Fee	\$298,700	\$5	\$433,600	\$5	\$298,700	\$5	\$433,600	\$5	\$270,900	\$6
21 Design Contingency	\$941,000	\$16	\$1,365,800	\$15	\$941,000	\$16	\$1,365,800	\$15	\$853,300	\$19
22 Escalation to MOC, 08/16/27	\$864,700	\$14	\$1,255,000	\$14	\$864,700	\$14	\$1,255,000	\$14	\$784,100	\$17
Total Estimated Construction Cost	\$8,078,925	\$135	\$11,726,460	\$129	\$8,078,925	\$179	\$11,726,460	\$260	\$7,325,925	\$162

Oakland Main Libray Feasability Oakland, CA

					Se	ection 3.6 Site De	etail						
SIT	E WORKS			(Option 1	Ol	otion 2	0	ption 3	0	ption 4	0	ption 5
				GIA	59,764 ft ²	GIA	90,802 ft ²	GIA	176,465 ft ²	GIA	176,465 ft ²	GIA	45,123 ft ²
Ref	Element	Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total
	E Site Construction												
14	4 Site Preparation and Demolition			1	\$ 179,300.00		\$ 383,400.00		\$ 1,127,600.00		\$ 1,100,100.00		\$ 423,600.00
					\$ -		\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-
	Building Demolition				Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded		Excluded
	Exterior Site Demolition				\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-
	Removal of existing site furniture; planters, trees etc.	sf	\$0.50	59,764	\$ 29,900.00	90,802	\$ 45,400.00	176,465	\$ 88,200.00	176,465	\$ 88,200.00	45,123	\$ 22,600.00
	Site demo	sf	\$5.00	24.885	\$ 124,400.00	41,923	\$ 209,600.00	125,086	\$ 625,400.00	119,586	\$ 597,900.00	45,123	\$ 225,600.00
	Disposal offsite; say 1' deep	CY	\$90.00		\$-	1,149	\$ 103,400.00	4,322	\$ 389,000.00	4,322	\$ 389,000.00	1,671	\$ 150,400.00
	Miscellaneous site demolition	ls	\$25,000.00	1	\$ 25,000.00	1	\$ 25,000.00	1	\$ 25,000.00	1	\$ 25,000.00	1	\$ 25,000.00
					\$-		<u>\$</u>		\$ -		\$ -		<u>\$</u> -
1	5 Site Paving, Structures & Landscaping				\$ 3,343,200.00		\$ 4,919,000.00		\$ 10,239,400.00		\$ 9,973,500.00		\$ 2,744,300.00
	Farthwork				- с		а с		э - е		э - е		а с
		of	¢0.50	24 005	φ - ¢ 12.400.00	41 002	φ - ¢ 21.000.00	105 006	φ <u>-</u>	110 596	φ <u>-</u>	45 100	¢
	Pouch grading	SI	\$0.50	24,000	\$ 12,400.00 \$ 40,800.00	41,923	\$ 21,000.00 \$ 83,800.00	125,000	\$ 02,000.00 \$ 250,200.00	119,000	\$ 39,000.00	40,123	\$ 22,000.00 \$ 00,200.00
	Cloar and grub site	SI	\$2.00 ¢1.00	24,000	\$ 49,000.00 ¢ 24,000.00	41,923	\$ 03,000.00 ¢ 41,000.00	125,000	\$ 250,200.00 \$ 125,100.00	119,000	\$ 239,200.00 \$ 110,600.00	40,120	\$ 90,200.00 ¢ 45.100.00
	Fine grading	SI	\$1.00	24,000	5 24,900.00 ¢ 00,500.00	41,923	a 41,900.00	125,000	5 125,100.00 ¢ 500.200.00	119,000	\$ 119,000.00 ¢ 479,200.00	40,120	9 40,100.00 ¢ 190,500,00
	Fine grading	51	\$4.00 ¢0.00	24,000	\$ 99,000.00 ¢ 10,000,00	41,923	\$ 107,700.00 © 22,500.00	125,000	\$ 500,500.00 \$ 100,100,00	119,300	\$ 470,300.00 © 05,700.00	40,120	
	Erosion control	SI	\$U.0U	24,000	¢ 19,900.00	41,923	ຈ ວວ,ວບບ.ບບ	120,000	\$ 100,100.00 ¢	119,000	ຈ 95,700.00 ¢	40,123	ຈ 30,100.00 ຄ
	Hard Landacaning				- с		а с		э - е		э - е		э - с
	Agregate base: 6" thick		¢100.00	104	φ - ¢ 10.400.00	211	φ - ¢ 21.100.00	007	φ - ¢ 00.700.00	000	¢	00	- ç
	Aggregate base, 6 tillok	CV	\$100.00	104	3 10,400.00 0 21,000.00	011	5 31,100.00 C 53,700.00	927	\$ 92,700.00 \$ 100,100,00	000	\$ 00,000.00 ¢ 153,100,00	1 200	5 0,000.00 C 10,400.00
	Concrete; walkway; 40%	SI	\$0.00	3,960	\$ 31,000.00	0,700	\$ 53,700.00 © 400.500.00	20,014	\$ 100,100.00 ¢ 1000,000,00	19,134	\$ 153,100.00 \$ 1449,000,00	1,300	\$ 10,400.00 © 70,000.00
	Concrete pavers to hardscape	ST	\$40.00	5,970	\$ 238,800.00	10,061	\$ 402,500.00	30,021	\$ 1,200,800.00	28,701	\$ 1,148,000.00	1,949	\$ 78,000.00
	Curbing and edging	SI	\$1.5U	24,000	\$ 37,300.00	41,923	\$ 62,900.00	120,000	\$ 167,000.00	119,000	\$ 179,400.00	0,123	\$ 12,200.00
	Parking spaces; white line	nr	\$65.00	50	\$ 3,300.00	/5	\$ 4,900.00	40	\$ 2,600.00	40	\$ 2,600.00	50	\$ 3,300.00
	Soft Landscaping												
	Import soil: 24" thick	CV	\$125.00	1 106	\$ 138 300 00	1 863	\$ 232,900,00	5 559	\$ 694 900 00	5 315	\$ 664,400,00	361	\$ 45 100 00
	Planting: including rock mulch	of	\$15.00	1/ 935	\$ 224,000,00	25 154	\$ 377 300.00	75.051	\$ 1 125 800 00	71 751	\$ 1 076 300 00	4 874	\$ 73 100.00
	Trees in soft landscaped areas: max 36" thick	or	\$2,500,00	50	\$ 125,000,00	50	\$ 125,000,00	50	\$ 125,000,00	50	\$ 125,000,00	-,014	\$ 125,000,00
	Irrigation: semi-automatic system	ef	\$10.00	1/ 035	\$ 1/9/00.00	25 154	\$ 251 500.00	75.051	\$ 750 500 00	71 751	\$ 717 500.00	4 874	\$ 123,000.00
	ingation, semi-automatic system	31	ψ10.00	14,000	¢ 143,400.00	20,104	¢ 201,000.00	75,051	¢ 750,500.00	71,751	¢ /17,500.00	4,074	¢ +0,700.00
1	Fixtures				\$		s -		s -		s		s -
	Wheel stops	nr	\$75.00	50	\$ 3,800,00	150	\$ 11 300 00	150	\$ 11 300 00	150	\$ 11 300.00	150	\$ 11 300 00
	Misc. site fivtures	ef	\$1.00	59 764	\$ 59,800.00	90 802	\$ 90,800,00	176 / 65	\$ 176 500.00	176 / 65	\$ 176 500.00	45 123	\$ 45 100.00
	Digital Monument Signage	51	\$50,000,00	35,704	¢ 50,000.00	50,002	¢ 50,000.00	170,403	¢ 50.000.00	170,403	¢ 50.000.00	40,120	¢ 50,000,00
		15	\$30,000.00	1	¢ 50,000.00	I	¢ 50,000.00		¢ 50,000.00	1	¢ 50,000.00	1	¢ 50,000.00
4					φ <u> </u>		· · · · ·		÷ 0.044 700.00		· · · · ·		ψ - • 4 000 000 00

Oakland Main Libray Feasability Oakland, CA

					:	Section 3.6 Site D	etail						
SITE WORKS	SITE WORKS				Option 1	0	ption 2	0	ption 3	0	otion 4	Option 5	
				GIA	59,764 ft ²	GIA	90,802 ft ²	GIA	GIA 176,465 ft ²		GIA 176,465 ft ²		45,123 ft ²
Ref Element		Unit	Rate	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total	Quantity	Total
					\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-
Utilities					\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-
Diversion of existing a	utilities	sf	\$1.00	59,764	\$ 59,800.00	90,802	\$ 90,800.00	176,465	\$ 176,500.00	176,465	\$ 176,500.00	45,123	\$ 45,100.00
Sanitary sewer; conn	ect from existing sewer line; incl. manholes & connections	lf	\$300.00	250	\$ 75,000.00	400	\$ 120,000.00	600	\$ 180,000.00	600	\$ 180,000.00	250	\$ 75,000.00
Domestic water; conn	nect from existing sewer line; incl. manholes & connections	lf	\$360.00	250	\$ 90,000.00	400	\$ 144,000.00	600	\$ 216,000.00	600	\$ 216,000.00	250	\$ 90,000.00
Fire water; connect fr	om existing sewer line; incl. manholes & connections	lf	\$360.00	250	\$ 90,000.00	400	\$ 144,000.00	600	\$ 216,000.00	600	\$ 216,000.00	250	\$ 90,000.00
Fire hydrants; 4 nr as	sumed	nr	\$8,000.00	4	\$ 32,000.00) 4	\$ 32,000.00	4	\$ 32,000.00	4	\$ 32,000.00	4	\$ 32,000.00
Natural Gas; connect	from existing sewer line; incl. gas meter & connections	lf	\$160.00	250	\$ 40,000.00	400	\$ 64,000.00	600	\$ 96,000.00	600	\$ 96,000.00	250	\$ 40,000.00
Electricity; connectior	1	lf	\$320.00	250	\$ 80,000.00	400	\$ 128,000.00	600	\$ 192,000.00	600	\$ 192,000.00	250	\$ 80,000.00
Storm drainage		lf	\$250.00	250	\$ 62,500.00	400	\$ 100,000.00	600	\$ 150,000.00	600	\$ 150,000.00	250	\$ 62,500.00
Stormwater treatment	t areas	sf	\$40.00	1,990	\$ 79,600.00	3,354	\$ 134,200.00	10,007	\$ 400,300.00	9,567	\$ 382,700.00	650	\$ 26,000.00
Electrical					\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-		\$-
Site electrical		sf	\$2.00	59,764	\$ 119,500.00	90,802	\$ 181,600.00	176,465	\$ 352,900.00	176,465	\$ 352,900.00	45,123	\$ 90,200.00
EV Charging; 10 space	ces assumed	nr	\$50,000.00	10	\$ 500,000.00) 10	\$ 500,000.00	10	\$ 500,000.00	10	\$ 500,000.00	10	\$ 500,000.00
Infrastructure for EV of	charging	nr	\$10,000.00	10	\$ 100,000.00) 10	\$ 100,000.00	10	\$ 100,000.00	10	\$ 100,000.00	10	\$ 100,000.00
					\$-		\$-		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
Total Net Cost					\$ 4,850,900.00		\$ 7,041,000.00		\$ 13,978,700.00		\$ 13,667,700.00		\$ 4,398,700.00

Section 3.1 Element Summary							
Basis of Estimate	- 230718_MEC Cost Estimating Diagrams - MEC_MP_SpaceProgram_v11						
Estimate Format	A component cost classification format has been used for the preparation of this estimate. It classifies costs by building system / element.						
Cost Mark Ups	The following % mark ups have been included in each design option: - General Requirements & Conditions (15.00% on direct costs) - Insurance (2.00% on direct costs) - Contractor's Fee (5.00% on direct costs) - Design Contingency (15.00% on direct costs) - Escalation to MOC, 08/16/27 (11.99% on direct costs)						
Escalation	All subcontract prices herein are reflective of current bid prices. Escalation has been included on the summary level to the stated mid point of construction.						
Design Contingency	An allowance of 15% for undeveloped design details has been included in this estimate. As the design of each system is further developed, details which historically increase cost become apparent and must be incorporated into the estimate while decreasing the % burden.						
Construction Contingency	It is prudent for all program budgets to include an allowance for change orders which occur during the construction phase. These change orders normally increase the cost of the project. It is recommended that a 10% construction contingency is carried in this respect. This cost is not included within the estimate.						
Method of Procurement	The estimate is based on a hard bid.						
Bid Conditions	This estimate has been based upon competitive bid situations (minimum of 3 bidders) for all items of subcontracted work.						
Basis For Quantities	Wherever possible, this estimate has been based upon the actual measurement of different items of work. For the remaining items, parametric measurements were used in conjunction with other projects of a similar nature.						
Basis for Unit Costs	Unit costs as contained herein are based on current bid prices in Oakland, CA. Sub overheads and profit are included in each line item unit cost. Their overhead and profit covers each sub's cost for labor burden, materials, and equipment, sales taxes, field overhead, home office overhead, and profit. The general contractor's overhead is shown separately on the master summary.						
Sources for Pricing	This estimate was prepared by a team of qualified cost consultants experienced in estimating construction costs at all stages of design. These consultants have used pricing data from Cumming's database for Education building construction, updated to reflect current conditions in Oakland, CA.						

Section 3.1 | Element Summary

Key Exclusions	The following items have been excluded from our estimate: Project Soft Costs excluded Hazard abatement excluded Parking Car Port excluded Energy Center excluded Loose FFE excluded Works to ground water remedial action center Existing building demolition Specialist Lighting & IT/AV Equipment to Events Roof PV and Battery Storage allowance Item 9 of the Seismic Evaluation Scope
Items Affecting Cost Estimate	Items which may change the estimated construction cost include, but are not limited to: - Modifications to the scope of work included in this estimate. - Unforeseen sub-surface conditions. - Restrictive technical specifications or excessive contract conditions. - Any specified item of material or product that cannot be obtained from 3 sources. - Any other non-competitive bid situations. - Bids delayed beyond the projected schedule.
Statement of Probable Cost	Cumming has no control over the cost of labor and materials, the general contractor's or any subcontractor's method of determining prices, or competitive bidding and market conditions. This estimate is made on the basis of the experience, qualifications, and best judgement of a professional consultant familiar with the construction industry. Cumming, however, cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction costs will not vary from this or subsequent cost estimates. Cumming's staff of professional cost consultants has prepared this estimate in accordance with generally accepted principles and practices. This staff is available to discuss its contents with any interested party.
	Pricing reflects probable construction costs obtainable in the project locality on the target dates specified and is a determination of fair market value for the construction of this project. The estimate is not a prediction of low bid. Pricing assumes competitive bidding for every portion of the construction work for all sub and general contractors with a range of 3 - 4 bidders for all items of work. Experience and research indicates that a fewer number of bidders may result in higher bids. Conversely, an increased number of bidders may

result in more competitive bid day responses.

Section 3.1 | Element Summary

Recommendations

dations Cumming recommends that the Owner and the Architect carefully review this entire document to ensure it reflects their design intent. Requests for modifications of any apparent errors or omissions to this document must be made to Cumming within ten days of receipt of this estimate. Otherwise, it will be assumed that its contents have been reviewed and accepted. If the project is over budget or there are unresolved budget issues, alternate systems / schemes should be evaluated before proceeding into further design phases.

It is recommended that there are preparations of further cost estimates throughout design by Cumming to determine overall cost changes since the preparation of this preliminary estimate. These future estimates will have detailed breakdowns indicating materials by type, kind, and size, priced by their respective units of measure.

One Sansome Street, Suite 3500 | San Francisco, CA 94104

MEMO

То:	Doug Speckhard, Jeff Ocampo, Tatiana Watkins and Rebecca Sharkey of EHDD
From:	Bill Lee and Tanya Chiranakhon, Land Econ Group (LEG)
RE:	Evaluation of Oakland Main Library Site Alternatives from a Funding and City Building Perspective
Date:	December 18, 2024

Introduction

In 2006, the Oakland Public Library (OPL) completed a Master Facilities Plan in response to the community's need for improved library services. This Plan articulated a vision for overall service improvements, and the recommendations included a new or expanded Main Library. OPL is a department of the City of Oakland and serves a regional population of 450,000 in Oakland, Emeryville, and Piedmont.

The Oakland Public Works Department through a competitive proposal process selected EHDD Architects to lead a feasibility study for the Main Library. Land Econ Group (LEG), urban planning and real estate economists serving on the EHDD team, is contributing two memoranda to this feasibility effort. The first memorandum, submitted in August of 2024, covered how five other cities in North America funded the construction of their new main libraries in recent years. This second memorandum evaluates the final site alternatives from a funding and long-term city building economics perspective.

Executive Summary of Site Rankings

The new Main Oakland Library needs to serve the regional population as an education and cultural resource. Given the many challenges currently faced by the City of Oakland, public funding will be extremely difficult without a project that can convey excitement and pride to the citizenry, the elected leadership and potential private foundations and donors. We believe of the five options there is only one site that can achieve this objective – Option 2. This telephone utility site offers an extensive curved frontage on Lake Merritt Drive and Lake Merritt itself. It provides the opportunity for a new

building with design possibilities unmatched by the others. A multi-level building with a curved glass curtain wall acknowledging the curvature of Lake Merritt Drive would provide dramatic lakeview reading rooms and studying nooks. If lighted in the evenings, it would be an aspirational symbol for Oakland's rejuvenation. Providing for expansion on this 1310 Oak Street site would also allow the existing main library to be renovated while maintaining its historic design integrity on the exterior. A new roof deck with a coffee shop could be added to the existing main library which could connect to the new lakefront building via a pedestrian bridge at the roof deck level. The regional visibility and design opportunities provided by Option 2 is clearly unmatched by the others. At this early stage prior to any architectural design, it is also the most cost-effective option.

Rank	Ontion	Pedestrian Access	Auto Access	Cost in Millions	Potential for Iconic Site and Building
1	2	Very Good	Very Good	\$187	Excellent - Best Opportunity for Euroding
1	2	very doou	Very Good	Ş102	Excellent - Best Opportunity for Funding
2	1	Very Good	Very Good	Ş192	Very Good
3	5	Excellent	Very Good	\$213	Fair to Good
4	3	Poor	Excellent	\$186	Poor
5	4	Poor	Excellent	\$193	Poor

Table 1: Summary of Site Ranking

Source: Land Econ Group with cost estimates provided by Cumming Group

The Challenge Ahead

All great cities experience cycles of robust dynamism and struggles against decay. Oakland, like its glamorous sister city across the San Francisco Bay, is experiencing a period of social, cultural and financial challenges. The mayor has recently been recalled. The City's credit rating has been downgraded. The very proud Oakland A's major league baseball team has decided to move to Las Vegas in part due to incentives provided by that City and the State of Nevada to build a new state of the art stadium. The World Champion Golden State Warriors moved across the bay a couple of years ago, and the Oakland Raiders of the National Football League moved to Las Vegas a few years back. Recent press coverage of Oakland has been often negative. Given these setbacks, the city of Oakland needs a beacon to spotlight its social, cultural and economic rejuvenation. A new main library provides that opportunity.

Funding for a new main library will depend upon broad based and passionate political support from the entire city and the East Bay community. It will likely require a new tax and/or bond measure. An iconic

city center location and an inspirational architectural statement that becomes a new symbol of Oakland are essential to the building of political support necessary for the passage of any future tax measure and to attract the funding from foundations and wealthy philanthropists. Our evaluation of the sites advanced by EHDD reflects this perspective which we believe to be existential for the new main library. The sites and preliminary program concepts advanced by EHDD are recapped in Figures 1 through 5 below.



Figure 1: Option 1 - Expansion of Existing Site at 125 14th Street







Option 3: Existing Site Expansion Plus 710 73rd Avenue





Option 4: Existing Site No Expansion Plus Larger Space at 710 73rd Avenue

Option 5: 1911 Telegraph Ave Downtown



Evaluation of Site Alternatives

The evaluation of options includes three key criteria:

- The regional visibility of the site to provide an iconic architectural statement that can be a symbol of Oakland's rejuvenation.
- The number of residents within a 15-minute walk radius augmented by BART station presence.
- The number of residents within a 15-minute drivetime shed.

Option 1

Option 1 is simply the expansion of the existing main library. The existing library is located just off Oak Street which is the extension of Lakeside Drive; however, this library is oriented to 14th Street and does not take full advantage of its near lakefront location. An expansion that adds height to take advantage of its Lake Merritt view potential and reorients the building to Oak Street could create the iconic symbol necessary to convey Oakland's rejuvenation. It would require design excellence to renovate the existing building which has some historic significance and then add several floors on top to take full advantage of the site's view potential.

Option 2

Option 2 is similar to Option 1 but introduces the telephone building site located at 1310 Oak Street for Main Library expansion. The site at 1310 Oak Street is exceptional in that it offers frontage on Oak Street with its quick connection to I-880 on-and-off ramps, on 13th Street which provides a key link into the heart of Downtown Oakland, and most importantly it offers an extensive curved frontage on Lake Merritt Drive and Lake Merritt itself. It is a block and a half from the Oakland Museum, known for its fine collection, award winning architecture and many community festivities. It is also across the street from the historic Cameron-Stanford House and within a short walk of the Lake Merritt Amphitheater where the Golden State Warriors celebrated its multiple world championships in professional basketball. Both Options 1 and 2 have approximately 26,000 residents living within a 15-minute walk shed and 527,000 residents living within a 15-minute drive time. This walk shed also contains three BART stations – Lake Merritt, 12th Street and 19th Street (Figure 6).



Figure 6: 15-minute Walk Shed of Options 1 and 2

This location provides the opportunity for a new building with design opportunities unmatched by the other site options. A multi-level building with a curved glass curtain wall acknowledging the curvature of Lake Merritt Drive would provide dramatic lakeview reading areas and studying nooks. If lighted in the evenings, it could provide a symbol even more impressive than the Cathedral of Christ the Light. Of the case study libraries covered in the previous memorandum, the most similar design idea is provided by the Salt Lake City Library with its five-story glass wall offering dramatic views of the snowcapped Wasatch Mountains (Figure 7).

Providing the main library expansion on the 1310 Oak Street site would also allow the existing main library to be renovated while maintaining its historic design integrity on the exterior. A new roof deck with a coffee shop could be added which could be connected to the new lakefront building via a pedestrian bridge at the roof deck level. The regional visibility and design opportunities provided by Option 2 is clearly unmatched by the other options.



Figure 7: Salt Lake City Library



Options 3 and 4

Options 3 and 4 maintains or expands the existing main library but introduces a second significant library very near the Coliseum BART station in largely industrial area, at 710 73rd Avenue. It is in the Hegenberger Corridor which has been experiencing disinvestment since the Oakland A's decided to relocate to Las Vegas. While regional access is very good via the 66th Street and Hegenberger Road on-and-off ramps from I-880 and the Coliseum BART station, neighborhood pedestrian access is extremely poor due to the surrounding industrial land uses and major thoroughfares. The population within a 15-minute drive time is 700,000 (Figure 8). This site was selected for consideration because the City of Oakland owns the property, and library service in this area is deficient.



Figure 8: 15-minute Walk Shed of Options 3 and 4

Our suggestion for improving library service in this general neighborhood is for the City to negotiate with the selected developer of the Coliseum property to incorporate a branch library into its development. In exchange for development entitlements, the City could negotiate for community benefits that would include at least the site but possibly also a building for a new branch library. This new library could be highlighted in the Coliseum master plan and located in a manner that provides a cultural amenity for the new community as well as the surrounding neighborhood. This 710 73rd Avenue site dos not have the characteristics necessary for a new main library or even part of new main library.

Option 5

Option 5 is located at 1911 Telegraph Avenue very close to the 19th Street BART station. It enjoys excellent local pedestrian, regional automobile and BART access (Figure 9). The population within a 15-minute walk shed is 34,000 and within 15-minute drive time is 586,000. A possible additional advantage of the new main library constructed at this site is that the existing main library could be demolished and the site sold as a development parcel. If 200 condominiums were permitted for the

existing main library site, the sales revenue could bring in the neighborhood of \$40 million towards the construction of the new library. However, the challenges to this disposition strategy include legal constraints to a public agency selling to a developer for profit, community resistance to demolition of the main library due to its historic significance, and the need for the developer to provide below market housing which would diminish the land disposition revenue.

While it is a very workable site, its regional visibility and impact are limited by many adjacent four to five story buildings. Option 5 does not present the iconic lakefront opportunity that conveys Oakland's social, cultural and economic rejuvenation. Such an iconic site which enables a dramatic library building is essential to gain the political support necessary for both public and private funding.



Figure 9: 15-minute Walk Shed of Options 5