Thomas Memorial Library Planning Committee

Analysis & Recommendations to the Town Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Council Charge to the Library Planning Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ The committee shall prepare a plan for public library services and facilities to serve Cape Elizabeth for the next 25 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The committee shall seek public input in its deliberations and shall consider lower cost alternatives than the library proposal that was not approved in November 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The committee shall review past materials and information relating to library facilities but shall take a fresh look at possible future actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The committee shall look at utilization of space for other library services. The committee shall meet with the town center plan committee to consider opportunities for enhancing the town center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The Thomas Memorial Library has served the needs of the Town of Cape Elizabeth for almost 100 years. Since 1944, at least every 20 years TML has gone through major upgrades, expansions, and renovations to meet the town's evolving needs. This pattern was interrupted in 2005 by a renovation planning process that spanned eight years and recommended an $8.4 million project that ended in rejection by voters in a proposed building bond.

Now, 27 years after the last major renovation, options for library services and programs have shifted with the advent and expanded use of technology. The demand for library services has grown and changed, and the number of structural, mechanical, and electrical deficiencies has multiplied. Recognizing this and encouraged by community support, the Town Council commissioned the Library Planning Committee to develop a plan for TML facilities and services for the next 25 years, avoiding the pitfalls of the last planning effort.

This final report is the result of the Committee’s work, and it reflects both the concerns and enthusiasm expressed in several public input sessions, meetings with key user groups, as well as the advice from a Portland, Maine-based architectural firm with extensive experience in library projects in Maine. The Committee was dedicated to delivering our recommendations within a concentrated time frame that would force great focus and attention to the ultimate objective of a plan for the next 25 years that was economic, efficient, and appropriate for the town of Cape Elizabeth. We believe we have achieved this and strongly urge the Town Council to adopt our recommendations summarized here:

- A Building Committee should be appointed to develop a plan for renovation with new construction for the Thomas Memorial Library that will yield a facility of approximately the same square footage as the current building, costing no greater than $4 million, and funded with town resources. (For reference, a $4 million 20 year bond at 4% interest would cost the median household about $1 per week of increased taxes.)
- Funding opportunities in the range of $400,000 for furnishings and fixtures in such a renovated library should be further explored and developed. In addition, endowment funding for future programming needs should be considered in anticipation of the continuing digital revolution;
- Shared services between TML and other Town departments, as well as between TML and other nearby community libraries, should be further explored as a way to maintain and expand services in an efficient manner; and
- The Council should further explore the needs of, and financial support for, the Historical Society separate from this library project.

The remainder of this report will provide the Council and the citizens of Cape Elizabeth the details of the Committee’s work and further define and expand upon the recommendations above.
Introduction.

The heritage of Cape Elizabeth has been preserved over many years by a commitment to good stewardship of our town’s important assets, including Thomas Memorial Library. For close to 100 years, TML has provided the people of Cape Elizabeth with access to the world. Originally comprised of a one-room schoolhouse, relocated in 1944, expanded to and connected with the Pond Cove Annex building in 1986, the library has remained a vital part of the town landscape for generations. From 1944 through 1986 the library has gone through major renovations and upgrades at least every 20 years or so (in 1957 it was after 14 years), but that cycle was interrupted in the last decade. Now, years have passed, hundreds of thousands of patrons have visited, technology has evolved, and this well-used community resource has become worn down, less efficient, dated, and difficult to access for many. In this technology-driven age, TML’s functions have become limited by the facility’s structural, mechanical, and electrical capacities and configurations.

From 2005 through 2012 members of the community, the Town Council, and Library Trustees worked with library consultants and an architectural firm to develop a solution to the library’s limitations and deficiencies, but in 2012 the voters rejected a proposed bond to fund $6mm of the proposed $8.4mm project.

In February of 2013, the Town Council appointed the Library Planning Committee (LPC)—a committee comprised of 3 Councilors, a member of the School Board, and a TML Trustee, and assisted by the library director and the town facilities manager. The Council charged the Committee with planning for library services and facilities for the Town for the next 25 years. In addition, the LPC was directed to seek public input in its deliberations, to consider lower cost alternatives than the proposal of November 2012, and to meet with members of the newly formed Town Center Committee.

The LPC has responded to this charge by

- Reviewing the previous reports and recommendations
- Hosting a public input session and a follow-up focus group meeting
- Providing members of the community with an online survey document for comments, suggestions, and feedback on needs and expectations in the library
- Meeting with the Town Center Committee
- Visiting nearby community libraries
- Assessing opportunities for reuse of other town-owned properties
- Considering the options for shared services with other communities as well as with other departments in town
- Selecting a Maine-based architectural firm with extensive experience with library development and renovation projects
- Providing regular updates of the Committee work on the Town and TML websites as well as in the Cape Courier.

This report will provide a more comprehensive accounting of the Committee’s process and actions, as well as with specific recommendations for moving ahead with a plan for library services and renovations for the future. Finally, the appendices of the report will provide
interested parties with more detailed information on the process, the research, and the results. The town website will maintain all LPC meeting minutes and materials.
Committee Process and Work
In order to maximize efficiency and maintain committee focus, the Library Planning Committee (LPC) and subcommittees have met regularly, for a total of 29 meetings over a 31 week period. All meetings were posted and open to the public. In its initial meetings, the Committee identified the following areas as most important in meeting the charge of the Council.

I. Cape Elizabeth Focused Research:
   A. Review of Past Work
   B. Review of Existing Building Conditions
   C. Review of Other Town-Owned Facilities for Consideration for Re-use by TML
   D. Exploration into Opportunities for Shared Services
   E. Community Input

II. Evaluation & Visits to Nearby Community Libraries

III. Future Oriented Research for Planning Purposes
   A. Research into the Future of Libraries in General
   B. Future Considerations of Library Services for Cape Elizabeth In Particular
   C. Funding Sources
   D. The Architectural Program

Each will be discussed in further detail, below.

I. Cape Elizabeth Focused Research

A. Review of Past Work

TML – An Evolving Library With A Tradition of Upgrades At Least Every 20 Years
Cape Elizabeth’s library planning process began in 1919 when the Thomas Memorial Library was dedicated with the donation of the 1849 schoolhouse. In 1944 it was moved to its present site on Scott Dyer Road. Since that time, the community library has established a pattern of major changes and renovations at least every 20 years or so. In each case the town has sought to upgrade and improve the capabilities and functions of their community library:

1919 – 1849 Spurwink schoolhouse donated; TML established.
1944 – Spurwink schoolhouse moved to current location.
1957/58 - Original schoolhouse expanded, with $14,250 of town funds, and a $2,000 donation from both the Sprague and Thomas Memorial Foundations.
1966 – An additional expansion takes place; a rear addition and foundation are added to the original Spurwink School building.
1986 - The former Pond Cove School is annexed with the construction of the current connecting corridor.
2005 – Workshop conducted by Town Council and Library Board of Trustees to consider library space needs.
2007 – Comprehensive Plan includes recommendation for a library facility review.
2008 – Study committee formed to conduct an extensive facility review (hired Wisconsin-based library consultants Himmel & Wilson.)

2009 – After receiving the review, which included citizen engagement, engineering assessments, interactive design sessions, and a community workshop, Town Council postpones consideration of any actions until the following year.

2010 – Town Council set the determination of future library services as a goal.

2011 – Consultants and architects present a series of reports supporting an $8.4 million renovation plan for the library, partially funded by a $6 million bond offering.

2012 – Citizens vote down $6 million bond.

2013 – This committee formed to take a fresh look the needs of the community in light of the deteriorating state of the library along with its well-known deficiencies, to “prepare a plan for public library services and facilities to serve Cape Elizabeth for the next 25 years”, with its report due to the Council in October 2013. The charge to the Committee, has informed all of the LPC’s work over the last 7 months.

B. Review of Existing Building Conditions

An extensive architectural and engineering review, completed in 2009, indicated a number of building deficiencies ranging from accessibility to mechanical, electrical, and structural concerns. The Committee reviewed this material and also provided it to Reed and Co. for further understanding of the facility conditions (the complete 2009 report is provided in Appendix B). The question facing the Committee was: what is the most cost effective way to update the present building to meet the town's library needs for the next 25 years, while also addressing well-documented safety and accessibility deficiencies?

The first concern in addressing this question was the existing building deficiencies. TML is in compliance with building codes as they existed at the time of construction. However, we learned that any major renovation of the library would likely trigger the need to address safety and accessibility requirements in the entire building. Any significant renovation would then dictate additional and substantial costs to bring the entire facility up to current life safety building codes.

The second concern in answering this question was whether the existing building, with minor updates, could achieve the flexibility and adaptability in use that we believe future libraries will need? The simple answer is no. Without re-positioning rooms, walls, floor levels, ceiling heights, bathroom locations, and universal accessibility, any attempt to achieve the flexibility in use that we believe is necessary for the future would be futile.

Given our conclusions, we believe that the most economical way of achieving our goal of planning for the next 25 years requires the scale of renovation for TML that we are recommending in this report.

C. Review of Other Town-Owned Facilities for Consideration for Re-use by TML
Four buildings, the Police Station, the Fire Station, the Town Hall, and the Community Services building, were considered for possible re-use by the library. None of these buildings individually will provide a better location or facility for library services and the cost in time, effort, and money would far exceed the proposed solutions in this report. However, each will be discussed below.

The police station is the newest of these buildings and is mentioned most frequently for potential reuse as a library. It is presumed to meet ADA accessibility guidelines and its structural capacity is presumed to be able to accommodate the library collection as well as any programming activities. However, at 9,440 square feet it won’t accommodate the 15,000 to 16,000 square feet of space the library requires. There are only 23 parking spaces and the library needs close to 80. Addressing these needs will require the purchase of additional land as well as a renovation and addition budget that appears to be at least as expensive as that of the library on the existing site. There are also elements of the police station building that were originally designed to serve police department operations. If police functions were to be moved to another location, replicating these capabilities in a new space would add to any cost of relocation.

The fire station, at 13,464 square feet, is presumed to be ADA compliant for library use and could accommodate the structural load requirements of the library. However, its location—while convenient to the schools—is important in relation to the police station building. The fire station building has unique characteristics given its function of housing trucks, safety equipment, and providing space for training. While meeting space is available in the building, public availability is currently limited by training schedules. Significant renovations would again be required to transform this facility into a library, and the fire department and its equipment and services would need to be relocated at additional cost.

At 9,118 square feet, the Town Hall is a 19th century 2-story structure. Its 61 parking spaces and existing square footage will not accommodate the needs of the library without additional land, considerable renovation and expense, and again, the existing services in the facility would need to be relocated.

Finally, the community services building at 11,649 square feet, cannot accommodate the needs of the library, and while it offers 120 parking spaces, many of these are used for high school student parking. Access to the building would be difficult for library patrons during school hours, and since the facility is located farthest away from the elementary and middle school buildings, access for these students would be difficult as well. Finally, this facility is well utilized by the Community Services programs, its renovations would be extensive for library use, and the Community Services functions would need to be housed in another renovated facility at some considerable expense.

In summary, while each facility has some potential, none of these would accommodate the needs of the library programs and services as efficiently and cost-effectively as a renovation of the library on the existing site without setting in motion a chain of consequences that would ultimately require a number of revisioned and repurposed town facilities. Because this would exceed the charge of our Committee, we have not looked at this in any greater detail.
A REVIEW OF TOWN FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>TML</th>
<th>Police Station</th>
<th>Police Station Excess Space</th>
<th>Town Hall</th>
<th>Fire Station</th>
<th>Community Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,440</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>9,118</td>
<td>13,464</td>
<td>11,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>38+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Overflow parking available</td>
<td>Slab floor - load not a factor; 2 meeting rooms available accommodating 8-12 people, and 20 people.</td>
<td>Unutilized space (contained in the 9,440 total) would need major renovation to allow complete separation from police functions.</td>
<td>Fully utilized; significant upgrades recommended by CIP plan.</td>
<td>Slab floor - load not a factor; includes 100 person training room with kitchen, which is unavailable Mon-Wed due to training needs.</td>
<td>Two parking slots mostly used for students; 3 meetings rooms heavily used by a variety of groups, including daycare and after school programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Compared with alternatives, renovation plus new construction is more economic.</td>
<td>Programming study indicates major addition would be required, additional parking would be required, and existing functions would have to be relocated.</td>
<td>Inadequate for library function but may be suitable for other town requirements.</td>
<td>Programming study indicates major addition would be required, major renovation would be required, existing functions would have to be relocated, and not ideal location.</td>
<td>Training room may be suitable for larger off-site TML programs when not in conflict with existing needs.</td>
<td>Programming study indicates major addition would be required, additional parking would be required, and existing functions would have to be relocated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Exploration of Opportunities for Shared and Offsite Programs and Services

In its deliberations, the Committee sought to make best use of available resources in town and nearby in the interest of both efficiency in use of space and in saving money operationally. The Committee considered three avenues for shared and offsite services that would improve the efficiency of the library operations:

1) The Committee assessed opportunities for off-site programs and services, and sought public input specifically on this topic. Generally speaking, survey respondents were supportive of off-site programs/services, assuming such programs and services were conveniently located and could not be accommodated in the TML building. While holding larger programs and services off site would certainly be a more efficient approach than building additional little-used larger meeting rooms in the TML, regular programs and services, and those of a smaller nature are more efficiently held in the building rather than offsite for a variety of reasons. First, 366 of the 387 programs held in FY2013 had 50 or fewer attendees that can be accommodated in the existing facility, and presumably in a renovated facility. No space sized appropriately for this level of intensive usage is generally available in other town owned facilities. Second, the extent to which programs of this size and frequency were held off-site, would significantly negatively impact staffing at the library itself. Third, the complexity of logistics associated with planning this many events affecting many people on a regular basis, for efficiency and cost reasons, require that they be housed in a single facility.

2) The Committee surveyed other Town-provided services that might overlap with those of the Library. In meeting with members of the School District Leadership Team, the Library Planning Committee determined that there are opportunities for more and better collaboration between Community Services and the TML. In particular, users of certain technology-based programming and services could benefit from expanded offerings that might be available if offered jointly between TML and Community Services. Given that the LPC’s charge was specific to library services only, we have not pursued this beyond
recognizing that the opportunity exists. However, our Committee also recognizes that an inherent conflict exists between the traditionally free programs and services of TML and the for-fee programs and services of Community Services. Such a conflict will need to be resolved in ongoing deliberations in the future. In addition, in regard to sharing services and programs with other town departments, the Committee believes more work needs to be done to clarify and define functions. This would avoid the perception and reality of any overlapping offerings as functions evolve in the future.

3) Members of the Committee met and spoke with library representatives in Scarborough and South Portland in the interest of assessing the possibilities for expanded and shared programming. Library representatives of those communities indicated a continued willingness to work with the Thomas Memorial Library in the future.

E. Community Input
The Committee welcomed and encouraged public input, and provided a number of opportunities for education and outreach as well, as summarized below:

• The LPC held 29 public meetings. All meeting dates, agendas and minutes were posted on the Cape Elizabeth Website and the TML Website. Meeting dates were mentioned at monthly School Board Meetings and televised Town Council Meetings.

• The LPC advertised (in the Cape Courier) and held a Public Input Session on August 29th in the High School Cafeteria. Approximately 70 attendees participated in the session. (See Appendix C and D, which summarize community input garnered from this session as well as a subsequent focus group session held with attendees of the Public Input Session.)

• The LPC held one follow-up Focus Group session after the Public Input Session and the notes of that session were posted.

• The LPC Chair wrote 4 articles explaining the Charge and giving LPC updates in the Cape Courier. These updates were also available and posted on the Town and TML websites.

• The LPC met with the Town Center Planning Committee in a publicized meeting.

• The LPC held several meetings with the Architectural Firm Reed and Co., including two with Reed and Co. presenting to the Committee in a scheduled public meeting, one with the Historical Society, one for members of the Business Community, and one with the School Administration Team and School Board members.

• The Thomas Memorial Library Planning Committee received emails from the public throughout the process and one guest joined one of our committee meetings. In addition, three people reached out to the LPC through the TML website.

• The Library Planning Committee posted an online survey document to the Town website, and sought community input on a variety of library-related issues. The survey and a graphical representation of responses are in Appendix E. Written comments which respondents offered were extensive and can be found on-line with all supporting documents at:
After assessing the input, concerns, and recommendations of the committee, the conclusions of the LPC are as follows:

1. Library programs and services are the top priorities for the majority of participants in this process and children’s (including teen’s) programs and services are seen as most important. Access to state-of-the-art computers and tech services, a media center, and further expansion of electronic access to information are all areas of interest to town residents as well.
2. Print media such as books and magazines continue to be important and there was general consensus that books should remain at the library rather than offsite allowing book browsing patrons immediate access to the collection.
3. Multi-generational programming and shared programming with the schools is interesting to most participants, but concerns about security for the schools and the students were expressed frequently.
4. Participants support some off-site programming opportunities, particularly for larger group events, as long as those programs are easily accessed elsewhere in town.
5. There was overwhelming sentiment that the current location of the library is ideal, and that it should remain close and accessible to the schools. Pedestrian access to the library should be enhanced wherever possible.
6. Many participants expressed an interest in working with a Maine-based architect to design a “green” building.

II. Evaluation & Visits to Nearby Community Libraries

The Committee’s research included visiting nearby libraries including Curtis Memorial Library (Brunswick), the Topsham Library, The Portland Public Library, and The Gray Public Library. These libraries serve a variety of communities but share one commonality—they have all recently been or are currently undergoing renovations. The Curtis library project included a slight modification as well as a large and attractive addition of new construction. Originally housed in a nineteenth century home in the downtown area, Topsham’s library is an entirely new facility constructed at a new location more distant from the center of the community. The Portland Public Library project included a major renovation as part of an ongoing phased project. The Gray Library is currently being renovated—a large new construction addition will be completed shortly, and once complete, moving all operations temporarily into the new facility will allow for renovations of the existing structure.

In carefully reviewing these renovations, and discussing the objectives of each with library personnel, the committee believes there are key takeaways from these projects applicable to TML planning:

1. All of these facilities are designed to be flexible in response to ongoing changes in technology and programming.
2. Children’s and teen areas are being increased and enhanced. Visibility and line of sight concerns are being addressed, particularly with regard to teen areas.
3. The number of publicly available computers is increasing significantly, as are the needs for individual and collaborative workspaces, small tutorial rooms, and comfortable adult reading areas.

4. Lower stack heights, better lighting, larger windows, gallery space, and flexible meeting areas (often accessible after hours) have all been successfully designed and well utilized in these facilities.

5. Continuing library operations through the construction process offers challenges to the project but allows for ongoing community involvement and enthusiasm for the project.

To gather additional background information on current trends in programming, websites, patronage, etc., additional libraries were either visited or viewed online by individuals on the Committee. This research supports our findings detailed above. The additional libraries studied include the following:

- Turner Memorial Library; Presque Isle, ME
- Patten Free Library; Bath, ME
- Freeport Community Library; Freeport, ME
- Falmouth Memorial Library; Falmouth, ME
- Kennebunk Free Library; Kennebunk, ME
- York Public Library; York, ME
- New Durham Library; Durham, NH
- Portsmouth Public Library; Portsmouth, NH
- Concord Free Public Library; Concord, MA
- Lincoln Public Library; Lincoln, MA
- Westport Library, Westport, CT

III. Future Oriented Research for Planning Purposes

A. Research into the Future of Libraries In General

In order to assess space and facility needs for the future, the Committee researched the predicted trends for public library use in the United States. Some conclusions from our research include the following:

- Demand for organized community activities, areas to congregate, and have access to quiet reading and research space, are and will continue to drive library building usage.
- Access to books and print media will remain a core mission of community libraries for the foreseeable future, although space requirements to address these needs are unlikely to need expansion.
- Demand for access to digital content will continue to grow and library programs and budgets will have to evolve in order to address this need.
- Given the difficulty of projecting digital advances, library physical structures need flexible space, adequate power and ventilation, and the ability to evolve networking capabilities.

B. Future Considerations of Library Services for Cape Elizabeth In Particular

After reviewing national studies as well as results from our own recent local outreach efforts, the following top library uses, trends, and services will likely remain for the foreseeable
future, and should therefore be factored heavily in planning a new or renovated library for Cape Elizabeth.

- Children’s literacy programming
- Browsing shelves and borrowing books
- Reading areas and comfortable seating
- Greater access to technology, digital media and information
- Quiet study spaces for adults, teens and children
- Expanding roles of librarians as navigators in digital information research
- Accessible and flexible community gathering space for people of all ages and for an increasing variety of services and programs

Digital advances are inevitable, but clearly unpredictable in terms of their scope and speed of development. Because of this the physical building that houses Thomas Memorial Library must be adaptable to change. And library operating budgets must adapt to changing needs of content (i.e. licensing of media versus printed material, as an example.) Yet, there is no question that while digital media may replace printed material, key elements of the library functions will always require bricks and mortar. In addition to regular library visitors, programs and services attracted over 8,000 attendees at 387 events in FY 2013. This growing level of attendance and participation will remain whether books are printed on paper or contained in a digital file. The graphic below demonstrates the volume of programs offered and the number of patrons attending. A careful review of each offering reveals that type of the media utilized in the program wouldn’t alter the nature of these events nor likely the resulting attendance. Appendix F contains a listing of FY 2013 programs.
Comparing TML’s current digital offerings with other libraries confirms that its offerings are comparable to similarly situated institutions. It also highlights the opportunities for new offerings in the future which will require careful attention to the allocation of operating budgets between traditional services and new digital offerings.
C. Funding Sources

Aside from taxpayer dollars, there are opportunities for fundraising from sources such as Federal grants, private donations, individual gifts, private grantors, Foundations and Endowments. Research undertaken by the Committee revealed that some libraries in Maine have managed to fund some portions of their renovations and furnishings from these outside sources. In most instances special circumstances have provided these opportunities, and the Committee was not charged with the task of concluding on this possibility for TML. Unfortunately, those special circumstances which have attracted significant outside funding aren’t immediately apparent for Cape Elizabeth.

Reed & Co., our program architects, have built or renovated twenty libraries in Maine over the past 30 years. In their experience, most have been completed with a combined financing model—usually public funds (bonds) for construction with private fundraising, grants and/or large private gifts for furnishings and interior space upgrades. This approach usually makes the planning and execution more predictable and ultimately more efficient, as they are not dependent on a lengthy and uncertain fundraising period.

D. The Architectural Program

In order to best determine the community needs, as well as the corresponding size and types of spaces to accommodate those needs in the TML, the Town Council authorized the expenditure of funds to employ the services of Reed and Co. to develop an architectural program.

An architectural program consists of a narrative list of functions to be included in (and excluded from) a project and how they should relate to each other and to the building as a whole. Specific information regarding functions, activities, relationships, cost, etc. is gathered, analyzed, and documented. The program establishes criteria for a design solution and identifies influences and constraints that will affect the project outcome.
Reed & Co. Work
1) Reed and Co. Architects assessed the existing building and considered the various functions, programs, and services of the library today and in the future based on input from TML staff and users, as well as from the business community and the School’s District Leadership Team and the School Board.

2) Next, they considered what types of spaces would or could support these programs, services, and functions, and looked at opportunities for spaces that could be made available to multiple and varied users, some during regular library hours and others that perhaps could be accessed and used after hours as well.

3) Finally, Reed quantified the needs of each category of use and provided the Committee and the Town with a report that documents these needs. This report provides the foundation for the LPC recommendations for the town library of the future. A complete copy of the report is included in Appendix G.

Based on their research into the needs of our community, their assessment of the opportunities in the existing building, and their extensive experience with other library projects in Maine, Reed has recommended a combined renovation and new construction project of approximately 16,000 sf. on the existing site. Reed estimates that such a renovation can and should be accomplished for $3.9 million, assuming that the project commences in the next 12-24 months.

Recent Library Construction: Perspectives On Variety, Scale, and Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Type of Construction</th>
<th>2010 Census Town Pop (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Before Size (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>After Size (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Cost $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Completed 2006</td>
<td>New/Add</td>
<td>23,055</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddeford</td>
<td>Completed 2011</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>21,277</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrabassett Valley</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,624</td>
<td>$1,405,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherryfield</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornish</td>
<td>Planning 2012</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>$860,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>17,336</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Under Construction 2013</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>7,761</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Completed 2004</td>
<td>Add/Renov</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovell</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Berwick</td>
<td>Under Construction 2012</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>$606,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orono</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>4,215</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>66,194</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Berwick</td>
<td>Under Construction 2011</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>7,220</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan’s Island</td>
<td>Completed 2011</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>$1,370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsham</td>
<td>Completed 2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>8,784</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$609,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldoboro</td>
<td>Completed 2007</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterville</td>
<td>Completed 2011</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>15,722</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>18,953</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Completed 2012</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>$721,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook</td>
<td>Under Construction 2011</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>17,494</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
<td>Addition/Renovation</td>
<td>4,116</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Completed 2001</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>12,529</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>$4-5 mil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) Instances where “Type of Construction” is denoted as “New”, “Before Size” column refers to size of previous/abandoned building.

(2) York is included here, despite construction having been completed in 2001, because it has comparable attributes to Cape Elizabeth and may be a library familiar to Cape residents.
We believe that the Reed recommendations provide a model of a library that meets the needs and desires of most Cape Elizabeth Residents. Their work portrays a vision of the library as a multi-generational resource that promotes a shared culture of lifelong learning and interaction and is located on the existing site in the center of town. It is designed with an emphasis on the technological infrastructure as well as on providing a welcoming atmosphere. It will be a magnet for so-called “digital natives” as well as for readers of hard copies, and with a flexible design it will support future programming and service developments as well. Finally, the building will be designed and constructed with recognition of the importance of the need for a “green” building that operates efficiently with as little impact on the environment as possible, and, importantly, will respect the financial concerns of the community. In sum, we believe the recommendation reflects key objectives of the library committee’s work, that is to deliver a plan for TML that can accommodate the needs of the community over the next 25 years.
Recommendations
The Committee has a number of recommendations for the future of the library services and for the facility itself. This section of the report will first provide the Committee’s assumptions underlying our approach to our recommendations. The Committee’s recommendations follow.

Assumptions
The Committee has based its recommendations on the following assumptions:

We Anticipate No Major Demographic Shifts. The most active library users tend to be the young and the old, and planning for these groups is therefore particularly important. As with the State of Maine as a whole, our population mix may be aging; however, with housing turnover leading to a larger-than-expected school-aged population, in 2013 we have a surprisingly stable population mix in Cape Elizabeth. We have assumed the size and composition of the community will remain similar to that of today over the upcoming 25-year period.

We Anticipate Both Evolutionary and Revolutionary Changes in Technology. The library facility must accommodate both brand new as well as evolving changes in technology on an ongoing basis. Flexibility must be incorporated into every design and construction decision.

We Anticipate Certain Library Functions Will Endure Well into the 25-Year Future. Based on our research, as well as on the input received from the community, we believe, that despite the digital revolution, there are and will continue to be certain values and functions that Cape residents expect from their library and these must also be incorporated into design and construction decisions. These include:

- Dedicated but separate children, teen, and adult spaces for casual reading, gathering, programming, and accessing books and media.
- Appropriately sized meeting space to accommodate existing programming needs as well as any new offerings.
- Collection shelving and stacks (of approximately the current capacity) for books and media accessible for browsing.
- Universal accessibility – Given that the dominant user groups of the library are the very young (ushered in with strollers, bags, and necessary accessories) and the elderly, making the facility accessible and comfortable to these patrons is a paramount planning consideration.

We Believe Form Should Follow Function. All committee recommendations originate from a fundamental belief that the building design and construction decisions will be derived from the functions and uses of the library programs and services.

We Believe the Library Facility Should Relate Comfortably with the cultural, environmental, and historical community context.
Recommendation: Re-Use & Re-Build

1. Elements Of The Existing TML Should Be Renovated and Newly Constructed and It Should Remain In Its Present Location.
   A. Near unanimous input from various constituencies indicated a strong desire for an emphasis on a so-called “Green Building.” Given the ability to re-use and recycle much of the existing space efficiently and attractively, the potential to make the facility significantly more energy efficient, and the limited impact on landfill, the greenest option is a renovation of the existing building.
   B. Renovating the existing facility maintains a strong tie to the community’s history in general and to the Library’s history in particular. It also continues a tradition of responsible stewardship stretching back to 1944 when town residents undertook major upgrades and renovations to TML every twenty years or so.
   C. Specifically, we recommend a renovation of that portion of TML which was the Pond Cove Annex, replacement of the connecting corridor with efficient and economic new space, and a separation of the old Spurwink schoolhouse building which could be repurposed for other town needs.
   D. Consistent with the overall tenor of citizen feedback, input from the Town Center Committee, and the recommendations of the architects, maintaining the library on the existing site is important to the community. The Committee considered the possibility of locating the library in other town-owned facilities (including the police station, the fire station, community services, and the town hall building). However these options were rejected, due to the benefits of the existing site: lower overall project costs associated with renovating the existing building; access to adequate parking; easy access to and from the Schools; and the possibility for greater street presence than could be achieved on some other sites.

2. The size of the facility should remain approximately the same as the current facility, 15,000 to 16,000 square feet, based on the programming results of Reed and Co. Architecture. The building must be designed to maximize future flexibility.

3. The total cost of the renovation should not exceed $4 million. This project should address the work to be done on the Pond Cove Annex, an area of new construction, and the separation of the Spurwink schoolhouse building to be dedicated, potentially, to other non-library functions. The budget should include all design, construction, permitting, and associated costs and fees for all necessary building and site work. **NOTE:** This budget does not anticipate any costs associated with any off-site improvements.

4. The Spurwink School building should be used as the temporary library during construction. Upon completion of renovation the Town Council should determine the future and best use of this historic building.

5. Construction Costs should be borne by Taxpayers; Furnishings and Fixtures should be paid for through Fundraising Efforts. In our research, we have identified an array of funding approaches undertaken by libraries and their communities in Maine and around the country. In most cases, taxpayers have fully funded library construction as this tends to be the most expeditious and efficient approach, with at least a portion of furnishings and interior upgrades funded by non-public sources. In the 1984 renovation of TML, which constructed...
the connector between the Pond Cove Annex and the Spurwink School building, furnishings were obtained through private fundraising that represented about 10% of total costs.

As is the case with other town-owned facilities, (roads, schools, municipal buildings), we recommend construction costs should be paid for by the citizens of the Town. However, we also recommend fundraising efforts to furnish the new facility, and provide any upgrades or refinements desired by library users, donors, and any other interested parties. Thus, funding opportunities in the range of $400,000 for furnishings and fixtures in such a renovated library should be further explored and developed. In addition, endowment funding for future programming needs should be considered by the TML Foundation in anticipation of the continuing digital revolution.

Finally, it is the Council’s responsibility to determine how construction costs should be financed. Whether funded by long-term debt issued by the town, or through the annual operating budget, or in some combination thereof, it will be the Council’s responsibility to assess the options and to consider these recommendations in the overall context of the Town’s CIP plans and needs, including those of the town, the schools, community services, and the pool.

For illustrative purposes, it is worth noting that at current interest rates, a 20 year $4 million bond would cost the median household about $50 per year, or approximately $1 per week. Half of all households would pay a dollar or less per week. About one-third would pay between one to two dollars per week. And, 13% of households would pay more than $2 per week. Because we believe this cost/benefit balance is reasonable and attractive we strongly support our recommendation of up to a $4 million budget for the renovation of the TML.

6. The Town Council Should Appoint a Building Committee Immediately. This committee should be comprised of elected officials, staff, and citizen volunteers, and the committee should be prepared to meet a deadline that will allow for a town-wide referendum approving the project no later than November 2014. The Committee believes one of the shortcomings of the previous library planning effort was the fact that the process extended over many years. This drawn-out process resulted in a lack of focus on the part of the committee, the Council, and the citizens, which resulted in a recommendation that was not embraced by the community and ultimately rejected through the failed bond referendum. We believe a concentrated time-line will result in a design aligned with the interests of the community due to increased committee, Council, and citizen engagement in the process.

7. Shared services between TML and other Town departments, as well as between TML and other nearby community libraries, should be further explored. This represents a possible way to maintain and expand services in an efficient manner.

8. Significant and continuing community input should be a key part of the development of the building project. A successful library plan requires community support, engagement, and ownership of the final product.

9. The Town Council Should Consider the Appropriate Location for the Historical Society Functions and Holdings. The Cape Elizabeth Historical Society holds valuable materials germane to the history of our Town, and it provides a valuable function for all
citizens. However, it is our view that these holdings and functions are not necessarily best located within the Thomas Memorial Library.

The Historical Society is neither a town department nor legally connected to the Town, though through the efforts of volunteers it does archive certain Town documents for which it receives a modest stipend. It is our recommendation that plans for the library not include space for the Historical Society. Its costs and operations should be separate and identifiable, and we can find no compelling reason it should occupy space in the Library. However, given the important activities of this volunteer group, it is our recommendation that the Council should consider making space available elsewhere for the Historical Society’s holdings and functions. This space must be accessible, environmentally stable, secure, and conducive to maintaining and displaying important objects and texts. Some possible options for the Historical Society might include space in the Police Station, or in a (separately) renovated Spurwink School adjacent to the Library.

Conclusion

Our library is and should be a well-used and adaptable facility; however, every building, and especially an older and re-purposed facility, needs periodic updating, refreshing, and ongoing maintenance. Given the structural concerns, mechanical and electrical systems limitations, and the size and configuration constraints of the library building, TML needs much more extensive work. The Thomas Memorial Library is a well-used but underperforming asset in town, and as such it’s time for a significant renovation that will position the library to address community needs well into the future. In a renovated facility, blending traditional services and collections with the virtual world of e-content, digital research, mobile computing and other information resources and technologies, the Thomas Memorial Library of the future will be well positioned to respond to the needs of the community for the next 25 years or more.
Appendix A

2013 Thomas Memorial Library Facts at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>100,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Requests</td>
<td>18,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Programs Offered:</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Attendance</td>
<td>8,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Circulation:                              |            |
| Adult                                     | 74,686     |
| Young Adult                               | 8,425      |
| Juvenile                                  | 69,546     |
| Digital Format                            | 2,529      |
| Total Circulation (items):                | 155,186    |
| Total Borrowers:                          | 5,167      |

| Interlibrary Loan:                        |            |
| Borrowed From Other Libraries:            | 19,209     |
| Lent to Other Libraries                   | 16,569     |

| Resources:                                |            |
| Catalog:                                  |            |
| Adult Print Items                         | 27,627     |
| Juvenile Print Items                      | 19,572     |
| Young Adult Print Items                   | 2,865      |
| Audios                                    | 2,429      |
| Videos                                    | 3,178      |
| Periodical Subscriptions                  | 74         |

| Computers:                                | 14         |

**Policy on Catalog Items:** all items that are not checked out a minimum of once in the past year or twice in the previous 5 years are to be removed from the collection... unless: 1) there are no other copies in MINERVA and they are found listed in one of the standard collection development resources like the "Public Library Catalog"; or, 2) there are no other copies in MINERVA and the title completes (the backfile) a series of books that is still being actively read by patrons. Applied sciences (technologies) and hard sciences works (even those still circulating) are considered for replacement if they are more than 5 years old in technology or 10 years old in sciences to prevent outdated and erroneous information from circulating.

**Note:** Minerva is a Consortium that brings together nearly 60 libraries of all types from across the state of Maine using a shared Integrated Library System (ILS) developed by Innovative Interfaces, Inc. for the purpose of software-facilitated resource sharing including Interlibrary Loan.
Appendix B
Review of TML Building Existing Conditions

ADA Compliance: Required by law (Note once any project cost exceeds $100k, full compliance required)
- Exterior Ramp to be built
- Interior Ramp incline angle to be adjusted
- Restroom facilities lack required clearances and hardware
- Stacks/shelving not accessible (height and aisle widths)
- Other: Circulation counter height and access, handrails.

Structural
- Water damage to walls/windows upper floors; musty smell (water-related?) lower level. Potential structural damage and mold infiltration in wall cavity of Spurwink Building.
- Wood framing has been “in service beyond the normal design life” and is “being used to support loads larger than originally intended for this type of construction.” Floor “loading capacity is likely less than the 150 lbs. per sq. ft. required by current code.”
- Low ceiling heights do not meet building code and limit the “ability to reinforce or replace... floors to ensure necessary performance in the future.”

Mechanical
- No central air conditioning system. Ventilation limited to toilet areas and operable windows leads to indoor air quality/health concerns. Maine Collection and Historical Society archives susceptible to damage.
- Systems at the end of useful lives and out of compliance w/codes.
- Layout and structural systems limit ability to bring existing systems up to code.
- Plumbing facilities below current standards for water usage and efficiency. Too few plumbing fixtures (only one in children's wing, none in upper level of Pond Cove Annex).
- Heating system inefficient and expensive to operate. (Foundation walls not insulated, increasing heating costs.)

Electrical
- No three-phase power available in the building (limiting ability to upgrade mechanical and other systems). Existing 400-amp service should be upgraded to 600-800 amps.
- Wiring is non-metallic sheathed cable and should be replaced.
- Service entrance located in Records Storage area.

General Building Deficiencies
Life/safety issue: egress from the Meeting Room and the upper Spurwink School building.
- Ceiling system design prevents access for electrical and mechanical system upgrades to allow for code compliance
- Lack of appropriate ventilation leads to moisture buildup.
- Circulation desk area too small: no room for self-checkout and automated sorting; no separate delivery area; no thermostatic controls. Public printer inconveniently located. Location disconnected from other areas of building.
- Multi-level design (5 levels) leads to overall operational/staffing inefficiencies
- Lifts are outdated, parts unavailable.
- Data panels in unsecured locations. Data lines are exposed and unprotected. Wireless signal broadcast quality is poor due to configuration of building.
- Limited parking.
- Spurwink School roof requires repair and resurfacing.
- Poor lighting levels, poor lighting quality, and poor fixture placement.

Appendix C

September 12, 2013
Library Planning Committee
Narrative Summary:
Public Outreach Evening August 29, 2013
At Cape Elizabeth High School Cafeteria

ACCESSIBILITY: Accessibility (ADA issues) for all citizens was a high priority item. Comments included the concern that restrooms should be accessible, and elevators, if any, should be accessible and well functioning. Mention was made of a letter written by a physically challenged Cape Elizabeth High School student who has great difficulty using the library. A one story building may provide maximum accessibility.

BUILDING EXTERIOR, GROUNDS AND PARKING: The look of a new or renovated building should fit in well in Cape Elizabeth, have New England charm, and keep some historical elements, such as the cupola. There should be a welcoming entrance for school children. The building should be closer to Scott Dyer Road for increased visibility and presence within the town, and have beautiful landscaping.

The need for more parking space was mentioned several times though one participant did not want additional parking to decrease green space.

COST: Little was said about cost. The only comments made were the following; 1) cost savings decisions should be available to the public and include past work review, 2) efforts should be made to combine resources with the schools, and 3) if school and town libraries were combined, the added security costs should be studied.

INTERIOR SPACE: There were many comments concerning various types of spaces desired in a new building. The need for more and better space for children and teens services and programming was the most frequent concern for interior space. People want more comfortable and inviting adult reading areas, and adult areas that are separate from children’s areas.

There is interest in small tutorial workrooms, collaborative workspace, an arts and performance area, meeting space for smaller groups (8-10) and larger meeting space. It was noted that a large meeting space could be flexible, or multi-purpose. It was also noted that large meeting space in a new library is not necessary; large meeting space would be found elsewhere in town.

Keeping a poetry room, and a “Maine” room, space for book sales and for more staff office space were mentioned also.

A coffee and café-style area for quiet conversation is desired. Feng Shui design concepts should be considered, and that the interior space be “green”, healthy, safe, and mold-free were also noted.

LOCATION OF THE TML IN CAPE ELIZABETH: There was overwhelming sentiment that the current location of the library is ideal, and that it remain close and accessible to schools. Also noted was that it should remain in the Town center no matter how the physical building may change, and that pedestrian access to the library be enhanced.

NEW BUILDING: There was overwhelming sentiment expressing no particular attachment to the current buildings. Mention was made of the desire for a local architect, and that any
building design should reflect New England style. It should be an “iconic” building that is special and fits in Cape Elizabeth. The possibility of a “green” two-story building with minimal footprint was noted. A new or renovated Thomas Memorial Library will have a stronger presence in town and will make Cape Elizabeth more desirable to prospective homeowners.

People are interested in a new library that is beautiful, fun, has flexible space and can accommodate high use. The intimate feeling of the current library should be reflected in a new building. It will be important to keep the current square footage. The entrance should be inviting. It was noted that the Cape Elizabeth Historical Society wants to keep the old buildings.

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES: Children’s (including teen’s) programming, space, and services were the top priorities among participants. There was interest in before school access to the library for K-12 students, and in increasing after school programming. There was also mention of the schools and town libraries coordinating and duplicating reading materials.

Access to state-of-the-art computers, technology services, as well as a technology and media center, were follow-up priorities. There is interest in expanding electronic access to information, help and services from home and other locations. The possibility of regional electronic library cards and newsletters was mentioned. Librarians should be able to assist patrons with traditional library services and with current digital technology. More computer docking stations, in chairs as well as on tables, are wanted.

Print media such as books and magazines are still important. Books should remain at the library and not be stored off-site. The desire for books was mentioned several times.

There was support for multi-generational programming and shared programming with the schools. There were divergent views concerning off-site programming. Participants wanting programming to remain at the TML only slightly outweighed those who were OK with off-site programming. Of those who support off-site programming, some would only attend programs within town, and some support off-site programming for large group events only. There were two different views on costs associated with off-site programming: one participant feared that off-site programming would increase staffing and equipment costs while another thought that it would save money.

Lastly, there were two opposing comments about staffing. One mentioned a need for more and friendly staff; another mentioned that current staffing is too high and money could be saved by decreasing staff.

RE-PURPOSING EXISTING TOWN SPACE: Little was mentioned on this topic, but the sentiments were consistent. Participants thought that both the Police Station and Community Services buildings be studied as a possible new library location, and other spaces in town should be considered for off-site library programming.

VALUE TO THE COMMUNITY: Sentiments were generally consistent in this category. Participants feel that the library should be a focal point – a “magnet” in town for meeting people; it should promote a sense of community and literacy. It should be a place for multigenerational space and programming. The importance of the town library and of literacy advocacy increases as more children move into town. A beautiful library will demonstrate town priorities and this will attract new citizens.
Appendix D

Focus Group Preliminary Meeting Minutes

The focus group, comprised of 7 members of the community,* met on Thursday evening, September 26, 2013 in the Maine Room of the TML. There seemed to be consensus around the inflexibility and inefficiency of the existing building, as well as around the importance of library programs and services driving the architectural programming for the library of the future located on the existing site. Many participants mentioned that the stacks, and book storage in general, should not drive the design of the project, nor should oversized, single-purpose areas be considered as important as multi-functional and flexible spaces that can be re-purposed in the future as needs change. Of lesser importance—the look of the building exterior and the style of the interior as long as it is welcoming and efficient.

Committee members were asked to name the most important and least important themes and concerns they heard at the August 29th public input meeting, and to provide their own ideas about the most and least important points to consider in a library renovation or new building project.

The most important themes/concerns participants heard at the August 29th meeting were: emphasis on programs and services (mentioned by 3 focus group participants), the importance of the library as a focal point in town (mentioned by 2 participants), the desire for a new building vs a renovated building (mentioned once), and cost (mentioned once).

The most important themes/concerns to the participants themselves were programs and services (mentioned 4 times), new vs renovation (mentioned once), building exterior/parking/grounds (mentioned once), and cost (mentioned once).

Least important to the community (according to focus group participants) were the building exterior/parking/grounds (mentioned 4 times), location (mentioned 2 times), and layout/fitup of interior space (mentioned once).

Least important to the focus group members were whether the building was new or newly renovated (4 times), the building exterior/parking/grounds (mentioned 2 times) and the building as a focal point of the community (mentioned once).

*Bollie Bollenbach, Trish Brigham, Marialice Wallace, Carrie Croft, Sara Lennon, Anita Samuelson, and Jo Chalat. Martha MacAuslan facilitated, and Kate Hewitt acted as recording secretary.
Appendix E

Statistical Summary of Survey Monkey

Participation in the survey was strong (219 respondents) and captured a diverse cross-section of library usage patterns.

There is great consistency among respondents of what the most important functions of the library are.
Generally speaking, the mission statements were probably not sufficiently differentiated to produce clear conclusions on the preferences for TML:

Using Offsite Locations for new programs not capable of being housed in TML were supported, presuming that programs were compelling, conveniently timed, and easy to get to.
Appendix F

**TML Program Summary**

### Number of Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer '12</th>
<th>Fall '12</th>
<th>Winter '13</th>
<th>Spring '13</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Programs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>387</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer '12</th>
<th>Fall '12</th>
<th>Winter '13</th>
<th>Spring '13</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Programs</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>6,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult Programs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Programs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,593</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,048</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,804</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,076</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Reed & Co. Architectural Program (separate file provided)