

VII. Executive Summary

History / Need

In the past, the Irondequoit Library had carried out several discussions and studies regarding facility needs. In June of 2004, the Board sought Proposals from architects / library planners to assist them in evaluating their current and future (15 – 20 year) needs. The scope of the project was described to include the following:

- *Provide a feasibility study for the following facility options:*
- *Do Nothing / Asset Preservation*
- *Refurbish the two existing branches without increasing square footage to accommodate program needs.*
- *Extensively renovate and provide additions at each of the two branches, increasing square footage to accommodate program needs.*
- *Construct two (2) new larger branches on either their existing or new site(s).*
- *Construct and / or renovate a building to house one library facility of approximately 50,000 square feet at a site to be determined.*

The Thomas Group was selected, along with Panz Library Consulting for the commission.

The Library Board indicated that there were no pre-conceived ideas of which solution might be best, and requested a non-biased approach to the evaluation.

Process

A process was developed and meetings were held to review the various options, solicit input and involve various members of the community. Stakeholders were invited to participate, most of which attended every follow-up meeting.

Input was received from various stakeholder and constituency groups within the community. Over 16 separate meetings were conducted to allow these various groups the opportunity to voice their desires and opinions on the needs of the Library.

A factual Building Conditions Survey was conducted to ascertain the condition and facility needs of the two (2) current facilities (Evans and McGraw branches).

An open public Design Charette was conducted in February 2005 to involve additional interested community members. Conceptual design options were developed

Land

It was determined that because of the variety of options, and uncertainty of which would be recommended for further study, this report / effort would NOT focus on specific parcels of land within the Town of Irondequoit.

In lieu of specific site / parcel review / selection, generic parcel needs were identified to satisfy zoning, space and practical needs. Minimum site sizes were identified as 2 acres (each) for a 2-branch facility, and 4 acres for a Single Library facility. Thomas strongly suggests that if the Board considers Options including new sites, they consider land in excess of the minimum acreage requirements (to accommodate any future expansion needs, as well, as allowing more “green space” for aesthetic reasons..

Analysis and Evaluation

The five (5) options were identified and compared in a matrix format.

Pros and Cons of each of the options were outlined.

Conceptual Cost / Budget Ranges for each of the options were identified.

Note: Forecasting inflation and market conditions at the anticipated time of construction is a difficult task. Some consideration for inflationary factors was taken into account, however a multitude of unknowns bear influence on conditions of the construction industry in the future.

The following is a summary of Conceptual Cost / Budget Ranges identified for the various options:

Option A: Do Nothing / Asset Preservation:	\$ 1,984,000
Option B: Renovations / NO Additions:	\$ 4,149,000
Option C: Renovations WITH Additions:	\$ 10,208,000
Option D: Two (2) New Branch Facilities:	\$ 11,275.890
Option E: One(1) Single New Library Facility:	\$ 10,255,500

An Evaluation Matrix was developed to assist in describing various criteria and how each option satisfies that criteria.

Opinions / Suggestions

While not asked to provide opinions, we have been very active throughout this process and would like to offer our perspective.

Generally we agree with the opinions and suggestions, logic and reasoning as outlined in the Panz Library Consulting report (preference toward a single-library facility for reasons of economics and future flexibility).

We do understand however that many communities run successful branch systems. And we also understand that psychological, emotional, location, proximity, historical and neighborhood needs may dictate the majority of public opinion in support of one choice over the other.

We believe the Library Board has been open-minded, fair and unbiased in development of the various options and throughout discussions and reviews during this planning process.

We are confident in the Board's ability to choose the proper course of action in seeking public input and consensus building; ultimately leading to the decision deemed "right" for the entire Irondequoit community. One in which the entire community can support and one which will ultimately support the Community needs for many years to come.

Next Steps

The Library Board should review these documents, evaluate the various pros and cons of each option, and develop a unified approach / decision for carrying forth a proposal to the Town Board and community-at-large.

The Library Board should present it's findings and recommendations to the Town of Irondequoit Board and community-at-large, for review and input.

Once a decision / direction is chosen, we would suggest that the Library Board seek additional public input as to the pros and cons of each option. Prior to putting forth a public vote, the Board should consider:

- **Conducting a poll / survey of Community members to seek public opinion on selected approach.**
- **Continued Public information sessions to review, inform and address community comments, concerns (positive or negative).**
- **Continued methods of information sharing and consensus-building among all members in the community.**
- **Identify and evaluate possible land options if either Option for new construction is considered further.**
- **Further review and evaluation with regard to project scope, costs and tax levy should be developed.**

Should the Library choose any new building project, various regulatory agencies will need to have input into the proposal. Any new building project will be subject to a SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act) review and approval process (prior to vote). Other State and local review offices will need to have input prior to building.