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I. Introduction

For over 116 years, the residents of Grand Forks North Dakota have enjoyed the benefits of public library services. After the initial years of operating out of rental spaces, the Grand Forks Public Library (GFPL) was housed for the subsequent 69 years, from 1903 - 1972, in a building funded in part from Carnegie grant funds. In the late 1960’s, it was evident that the 1903 building could no longer house the growing collections and services that the community wanted and needed. A visionary Library Board along with supportive city government officials and residents obtained land for a new Library building near Washington Street at what was then the southern most part of the city of Grand Forks. The new library opened in 1972.

Now, thirty-seven years later, it is apparent again, both to residents of the area, the Library Board and the governmental officials that it is time to look at an improved public library facility. The advent of technology along with the growth in collections, services and the population to be served have all put enormous strains on the existing library facility.

In 2008, after the death of the long term Library Director, a 17 member Task Force was appointed by the Library Board to look at rejuvenating the Library. Its charge was to gather community members’ opinions and visions for the library, its location, structure, services and scope. In part, to carry out its charge, the Task Force worked with the Grand Forks City and County to issue in February 2009, an RFP for library consultants to ‘assist in the analysis of the future library needs for the Grand Forks community’. The consultants were expected to carry out four tasks: (1) Conduct a Community Needs Assessment; (2) Develop a Building Use Plan; (2) Research Possible Funding Sources for Building, Remodeling and GFPL operations; and (4) Provide Consultation during the design and construction process.

In May, 2009 the library consulting firm of Library Consulting, P.A. with Jan Feye-Stukas, Melissa Brechon and Barry Petit was selected to carry out the study and deliver reports to the Library Board and Task Force.

This report is the fulfillment of the first task: the Library Needs Assessment. It includes the results of public input regarding programming, services and facilities; identifies how the Library can support other community organizations, reviews and analyzes the existing facility and investigates shared use opportunities.

The Consultants wish to express their thanks to all of those involved in this study who gave of their time and experience to help. In particular, special thanks are due to Library Director Wendy Wendt, who personally made the arrangements for the interviews and focus groups and responded to numerous inquiries.
II. Executive Summary

Work on the first phase of this multi-part project started in June, 2009 and involved research into the characteristics of the Grand Forks area. Information was gathered from reports, statistics and documents, as well as individual interviews and focus group sessions with stakeholders and elected officials. A physical review of the existing library building was also made.

It is clear from the interviews and focus groups that the public library is appreciated and valued in the community. Furthermore, when compared with public libraries in the U.S. that serve a similar population, as well as other public libraries in North Dakota, the Grand Forks Public Library, is within the norm in regard to a number of critical issues such as number of public computers, hours open and interlibrary loans. However, as identified by the public and also shown in the data, there are significant areas where the GFPL falls short. Among the several issues identified is the inadequate size of the current building and its ability to provide services needed and requested by the community. The analysis of the library building identified a number of issues that seriously affect the possibility of being able to remodel the current structure to meet the needs of 21st century library services. As a result of these findings, Library Consultants identified a need for the following:

**It is recommended that the Grand Forks Public Library expand its library facilities by a remodeling/addition or constructing a new minimum 65,000-70,000 sq. ft. facility in Grand Forks. This will require parking for approximately 123 cars on site.**

In addition, this study identified a number of areas that relate to library operations and proposes areas for improvement in library user convenience, efficiency, collection and public relations. These specific recommendations are discussed in this report.

It is the Consultant’s professional opinions that adopting and acting on these recommendations would provide a library able to meet the community needs for public space and operations for the next 20 years.

The residents of the Grand Forks community deserve to have a first-class public library. Achieving the library improvements described in this report will allow the Library to greatly improve services to its public. At a time when the knowledge economy represents the best opportunity for coming generations, a robust library provides a community asset worthy of significant investment.
III. Purpose of Study and Methodology

As outlined in the Request for Proposal issued by the Grand Forks Public Library (GFPL) in February, 2009, the purpose of this study is “to assist in the analysis of the future library needs for the Grand Forks community.”

The first phase of the study was to conduct a Needs Assessment. Key components of this needs assessment involved gathering and analyzing public input regarding programming, services and facilities. In addition the Consultants looked at how the GFPL could collaborate with local organizations to determine what joint needs the GFPL should address. Finally the Consultants were to review and analyze the existing facility, the possibility of renovations and look at options for shared use.

In gathering information for the Needs Assessment, the Consultants used both qualitative (interviews and focus groups) and quantitative methods (statistical and documentary data about the library and community). They began their work in May, 2009, soliciting and reviewing all manner of statistical and documentary information about the library and area.

In July, 2009 the Consultants met with members of the Library Board, the GFPL Task Force for Revitalization and Library staff. The last week in September the Consultants returned to conduct individual interviews with over 108 community stakeholders, library volunteers, elected and appointed city, township, county and state officials, current and former Library Board members, library users and non-users.

The Consultants also conducted two focus groups sessions. Both the interviewees and focus group participants provided their ideas about the value of the library to the community, the strengths and weaknesses of the library and their ideas about the services, possible partnership opportunities and physical elements of the Library as well as how the community might move forward on obtaining a new library. All interviewees and focus group participants were scheduled by library staff.

Also in September, the Consultants conducted an on-site review of the current library building, size, structure, and parking. They reviewed ADA compliance, functionality and adjacency of spaces. This review included inspection of hidden spaces, construction type, electrical and HVAC.

All of the information gathered was reviewed and analyzed, including comments from the public that were submitted in person in the library and through the Library’s website. All the information has been used in preparing this report.
IV. Community Environment and Context

The environment in which a public library operates plays a significant role in determining the size and scope of services and facilities to be provided. To set the stage, the Grand Forks Public Library is located in the City of Grand Forks ND which is located in the northeast quadrant of Grand Forks County, a predominantly rural, 1,440 square mile county in east central North Dakota.

The Grand Forks Public Library building is located in the south central part of the City of Grand Forks, which is the county seat as well as the center of commerce, education, sports, arts, and cultural activities in County and nearby counties to the north, south, and west.
A. Demographics

Population Characteristics
The size of the population served by the Library as well as the age distribution, educational level, ethnicity and economic well being of the community all affect where and how library services should be delivered. Preschoolers and seniors are often the largest users of public library services, followed by K-12 school age students, parents, and those who work in clerical, professional, informational, academic and cultural related occupations. Adults with average higher levels of education are heavy library users. Where there are groups with lower education and economic status in the community, more outreach services are needed.

From 1990 to 2000, the total population of Grand Forks County declined about 6.5%, from 70,683 down to 66,109, it has since grown 7.7% to an estimated 66,585 in 2008. Most of this growth is occurring within the City of Grand Forks with an estimated 77% of the county population within the City of Grand Forks. The rest of the county’s population is located at the Air Force Base (7.2%), in nine small cities (7%) and in rural un-incorporated townships (8.8%).

Much of the increase in the past few years has been as a result of in-migration from surrounding rural areas. Also, a small, but significant increase in population in the City of Grand Forks can be attributed to a rise in racial diversity. Changes just over the past 2 years are shown below.

Changes in demographics as related to age are also occurring with the most significant being more adults 65 and older. The number of children under 18 is returning to pre-1990 levels.
For purposes of planning future library services, it is best to look at what is being projected by both the City and County Planning departments. Both departments consider the population of the County to remain stable with only slight growth county-wide over the next twenty years and with the majority of the growth within the City of Grand Forks. Assuming a growth rate of 1.2% per year, the 2040 population may be as high as 100,362.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks County, North Dakota</td>
<td>66,585</td>
<td>74,484</td>
<td>83,920</td>
<td>94,552</td>
<td>100,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks City, North Dakota</td>
<td>51,313</td>
<td>55,290</td>
<td>61,925</td>
<td>70,092</td>
<td>78,503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

Since home ownership and library use are strongly correlated, it is worth noting that home ownership remains high, according to the last available data. Seventy percent of single-unit houses are owner occupied.

**Income and Economic Well-being**

Although Library use is strong among all income groups, the emphasis on various types of services needed to be provided and the capacity of the community to fund library services varies depending on the economic well being of the community. Grand Forks County boasts a diverse economy with growing non-agricultural activity. And although this provides for reasonable incomes for most, there are signs of economic stress in the community. 2007 data shows that the average household income in $40,587 which is less than the North Dakota average of $43,753. The value of the average house was $145,650, a number significantly higher than the North Dakota average of $106,800. The cost of living in 2007 was at 84% of the national average.

The participation of students in free or reduced priced lunch programs of the federal government also provides an indication of the relative economic well-being of families with children. The rate of participation in these programs varies throughout the County. The list of school districts in Grand Forks County and their participation in the free or reduced priced lunch program is shown below.

**Schools In Grand Forks County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>R/P</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>% Elig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerado School</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks Public School</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>6933</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimore Public School</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manvel Public School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Baptist School*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Public School</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood Public School</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michaels School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Public School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not participate in Program
Education
Generally the higher the average educational levels of residents, the greater the demand for public library services. According to the U.S. Census, for persons over 25 years of age, 92% had finished high school, 36% had a Bachelor’s degree and 11.7% had a graduate or professional degree.

Grand Forks County has seven public school districts and three private schools. These school districts operate 29 school buildings and serve a total enrollment of 8,700 students. Nineteen of the schools (65%) and 6,933 (80%) of the students are in the Grand Forks (city) Public School district. In addition, county-wide there are 135 students who are home-schooled. Within the Grand Forks (city) Public Schools, 205 (2.9%) students are English Language Learners.

B. Service Area
The Grand Forks community has a varied and healthy economic environment. It benefits from an extensive transportation network that includes a major interstate highway, as well as rail, air and bus service. It serves as an economic hub for a wide area that includes northeastern North Dakota, northwestern Minnesota and portions of southern Manitoba. In the County outside of the City of Grand Forks, the main economic generator is agriculture. Within the City of Grand Forks, the predominant employment generators are the University of North Dakota, medical and health centers, government entities, wholesale and retail trade, professional services, and manufacturing. The area continues to benefit from civilian employment generated by the Grand Forks Air Force Base located 15 miles to the west of the City. Area residents and businesses have access to DSL, T1, T3, Satellite, Cable and wireless services.

To understand the financial well being of a publicly supported library, it is useful to review the financial capacity of the jurisdictions that support the public library.

Grand Forks City and County local governments are professionally managed and in good financial health. The amounts budgeted for the public library operations are slightly below and above 1%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Budget 2009</th>
<th>2009 Amount Budgeted for GF Public Library</th>
<th>% of Local Gov’t Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks County</td>
<td>$34,414,563</td>
<td>$331,690</td>
<td>0.96 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grand Forks</td>
<td>$135,721,254</td>
<td>$1,312,555</td>
<td>0.97 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cultural Institutions and Other Libraries

The people of the Grand Forks community are justifiably proud of their high quality of life. The County has a great variety of cultural amenities which contribute to the quality of life as well as influence the services and programs of the Public Library. These amenities include: high quality K-12 public schools, the University of North Dakota (UND) Northland Community and Technical College (in East Grand Forks), the extensive and excellent Grand Forks Park district with its 43 parks and facilities, performing arts venues which include the city-owned Alerus Center, the Ralph Engelstad Arena and Chester Fritz Auditorium both on the campus of the UND; the Empire Theatre, and two highly respected museums: the North Dakota Museum of Art on the UND campus and the Myra Museum managed by the County Historical Society. All of these entities provide opportunities for collaboration with the Library on any number of activities from joint programming, public relations, to staff training and delivery.

The resources of the Grand Forks Public Library are also supplemented and enhanced by other libraries in the community that serve particular segments of the populations. Most of the public schools in the county have libraries that serve the students and parents of those schools. The University of North Dakota has the Chester Fritz Library which provides full services to students, faculty and staff as well as specific service to members of the general public. Residents of Grand Forks County may also, for a fee, use the Campbell Library, the public library of East Grand Forks, directly across the Red River from downtown Grand Forks. Grand Forks Air Force base residents or anyone with an active duty military or dependent ID card from the GFAFB may use the Campbell Library without charge. Numerous avenues are available for sharing and collaboration with these other libraries in order to enhance services to users, provide efficiencies in operations and avoid unnecessary duplication.
V. Library Profile and Attributes

The Grand Forks Public Library was founded in 1892. It is governed by a 5-member Library Board appointed by the Grand Forks City Council. During the 1970’s, the Library extended service to persons in Grand Forks County who live outside the city limits of Grand Forks in return for funding from the County.

Affiliated with the Library is a support organization called Friends of Grand Forks Public Library. The Friends of Grand Forks Public Library is a member organization whose mission is to help the library, through advocacy, fundraising and volunteerism.

The Library has provided services from its current building since 1972. Since that time, public library services have undergone major changes the most significant of which has been the introduction of technology. It has affected every aspect of library operations from the variety of formats being offered to the way in which basic functions such as circulation, cataloging and administration are performed as well as the availability of computers for the public to use to access the internet. A snapshot of those changes can be seen in the chart below.

**Historical Data** Grand Forks Public Library 1973 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Served</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>66,109</td>
<td>65 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff (FTE)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>130 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Book Collection</td>
<td>81,763</td>
<td>312,392</td>
<td>282 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Collection (1)</td>
<td>10,047</td>
<td>26,215</td>
<td>161 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Collection (2)</td>
<td>5,416</td>
<td>23,122</td>
<td>327 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical Subscriptions</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader Seats</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>341,830</td>
<td>847,547</td>
<td>148 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation per Capita</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Circ per day</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>113 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Turnover</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Service</td>
<td>160,385</td>
<td>165,294</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>300,624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs Provided</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Attendance</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL Received</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL Provided (3)</td>
<td>11,604</td>
<td>11,893</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Hours(4)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-1.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public computers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Users</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookmobile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$160,529</td>
<td>$1,543,334</td>
<td>861 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. Not Available

[4] 1973: 6 days per week  2008: 7 days per week
There are currently 13 full-time Library staff members and 37 part-time staff, a total full-time equivalent of 23 that provide a full range of public, technical and administrative library services from the two floor facility.

**Library Users**

On average 850 people visit the GFPL each day. And each day, over half of these visitors check out 2,400 items. The rest of the visitors use an estimated 1,000 materials within the Library or use one of the 33 public computers with Internet access, and/or attend one the 128 programs sponsored by the Library annually.

The library users come primarily from Grand Forks city and county, but also from the larger five county, two state region. The following chart shows the distribution of the users checking out item on two sample days, on in August and one in October.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrons checking items out</th>
<th>2 day Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within Grand Forks city limits total:</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>83.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Gateway, east of Washington, north of Demers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Gateway, west of Washington, north of Demers</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>15.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Gateway, east of Washington</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Demers, east of Washington</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>32.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Demers, west of Washington</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>28.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks County (outside of the City limits)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail County, Walsh County, Nelson County, Cavalier County, Cass Co.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grand Forks and Polk County</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix B for maps.

**Library Finances**

The library operations are funded from a combination of sources. In 2008, the library received 90% of its budget from local governments, 4% from the State Government, and 6% from all other sources. In 2008, 68% was expended for salaries and benefits, 11.4% for collections, 6.8% for building and all other.
Comparisons to Other Public Libraries
An accepted method of analyzing library resources and operations is to compare resources and operations with peer libraries. Public Library data collected by the National Institute for Library and Museum Services (IMLS) for the year 2007 is the most recent available comparable data.

In constructing a peer comparison group, the libraries within the closest population range to the GFPL which also did not have any branches were identified. The population range of 65,000 – 70,000 was used as a base for the comparator group. In addition, the same data for other North Dakota libraries and the Campbell Library in East Grand Forks is shown.

See the charts on the following pages 14-17

The data shows many areas where the GFPL is on a par with their peers, such as the number of computers, and highlights issues brought up by stakeholders and staff. It also verifies what the Consultants identified as problems in their analysis of the services and facility.

One major issue that this data confirms is the inadequate size of the current building and its ability to provide the services needed and wanted by the community. When one looks at the size of a comparator library, the data indicates that the GFPL building is 26% smaller than the average. At .57 square per capita the Library building is below the minimum .7 usually recommended. For a state of the art, 21st century library one square foot per capita is becoming the new norm.

The data verifies that the number of staff is small compared with many of the comparator libraries that serve a similar population. A rule of thumb has been one full-time staff member for every 2,000 people to be served. The Grand Forks Public Library has one full-time staff member for every 2,874 people.

The area where the GFPL is most out of range with its peers is in the size of the collection. The staff and many library users are very proud of the depth and range of the collection. However, in looking at libraries of a similar size, the GFPL has a collection which greatly exceeds its capacity. On its 1972-1973 Annual Statistical Report, which was the first full year in the current building, the Library reported that “the number of books that could be accommodated on shelves” was 100,000. Since then, much additional shelving has been added not only to accommodate additional books but also the audio and visual formats. With a print collection of 308,497 items, the GFPL collection is more than 30% larger than the average public library serving a similar population. The audio and video collections are more than double the size of similar libraries.

In addition the annual circulation is almost twice the per capita level of its peer libraries. However, the average loan time for most of the other libraries is 30% - 50% longer than GFPL. Since the GFPL material circulates more frequently than peer libraries the data should not be interpreted to suggest that GFPL has substantial more visits.

GFPL is out of the range of the peer libraries in the number of programs that it provides and the total attendance at programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Name</th>
<th>Population of Legal Service Area</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. in Library</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. Per Cap</th>
<th>Total Staff</th>
<th>Print Items</th>
<th>Current Print Serial Subscription</th>
<th>Vide Items</th>
<th>Audio Items</th>
<th>Total All Items</th>
<th>Ave Loan Period in Wks</th>
<th>Circ Per Cap</th>
<th>Collection Turnover</th>
<th>% of Circ from Children's Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group Average</td>
<td>68,600</td>
<td>50,633</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>188,079</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>10,021</td>
<td>207,470</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group Median</td>
<td>67,904</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>151,957</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>8,777</td>
<td>164,861</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELBY TOWNSHIP LIBRARY, MI</td>
<td>65,159</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100,869</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>8,689</td>
<td>8,777</td>
<td>118,335</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGARD PUBLIC LIBRARY, OR</td>
<td>65,196</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>127,710</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>12,105</td>
<td>11,310</td>
<td>151,125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVENFORD TOWNSHIP FREE LIBRARY, PA</td>
<td>65,384</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>118,063</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>5,393</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>130,454</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND FORKS PUBLIC LIBRARY, ND</td>
<td>66,109</td>
<td>37,415</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>308,497</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>21,054</td>
<td>25,108</td>
<td>354,659</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYNTON BEACH CITY LIBRARY, FL</td>
<td>66,872</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>114,311</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>128,411</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPKINSVILLE-CHRISTIAN CO PUB LIB, KY</td>
<td>66,989</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109,724</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5,535</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>118,907</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAYETTEVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY, AR</td>
<td>67,087</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>213,113</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>16,582</td>
<td>13,389</td>
<td>243,084</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSENBERG LIBRARY, TX</td>
<td>67,387</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>174,383</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>7,954</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>189,879</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY, TN</td>
<td>67,504</td>
<td>42,625</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>131,961</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>9,643</td>
<td>145,523</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORBA LINDA PUBLIC LIBRARY, CA</td>
<td>67,904</td>
<td>28,350</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>132,938</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>7,471</td>
<td>149,230</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT VERNON PUBLIC LIBRARY, NY</td>
<td>68,381</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>608,639</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>9,172</td>
<td>22,490</td>
<td>640,301</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CASTLE PUBLIC LIBRARY, PA</td>
<td>68,588</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>123,351</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>4,405</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>129,981</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASANTON PUBLIC LIBRARY, CA</td>
<td>68,755</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>166,899</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>11,504</td>
<td>9,418</td>
<td>187,821</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAD PUBLIC LIBRARY, WI</td>
<td>69,403</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>312,024</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>20,338</td>
<td>14,983</td>
<td>347,345</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY HILL FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY, NJ</td>
<td>69,965</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>141,414</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>11,710</td>
<td>10,897</td>
<td>164,021</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL BLUFFS PUBLIC LIBRARY, IA</td>
<td>71,361</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>151,957</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>164,861</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. K. SMILEY PUBLIC LIBRARY, CA</td>
<td>71,375</td>
<td>64,636</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>172,623</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>3,231</td>
<td>178,438</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERLOO PUBLIC LIBRARY, IA</td>
<td>74,979</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>170,683</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>8,166</td>
<td>11,963</td>
<td>190,812</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISMARCK VET MEM PUB LIB, ND</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>194,333</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>6,971</td>
<td>7,433</td>
<td>208,737</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD CO./MINOT PUBLIC LIBRARY, ND</td>
<td>58,795</td>
<td>47,450</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>183,613</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>8,293</td>
<td>199,186</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARGO PUBLIC LIBRARY, ND</td>
<td>90,599</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>167,998</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>11,185</td>
<td>11,733</td>
<td>190,916</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.GRAND FORKS-CAMPBELL LIB, MN</td>
<td>10,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47,242</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison to Other U.S. Libraries

#### Resource and Service Measures continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Name</th>
<th>Population of Legal Service Area</th>
<th>Library Visits</th>
<th>Total Library Programs</th>
<th>Total Program Attendance</th>
<th>Children’s Program Attendance</th>
<th>Inter-Library Loans Received</th>
<th>Inter-Library Loans Provided</th>
<th>Ave Number of Weekly Public Service Hrs Per Outlet</th>
<th>Users of Public Internet Computers</th>
<th>Number of Public Internet Terminals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group Average</td>
<td>68,600</td>
<td>296,704</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>18,620</td>
<td>15,215</td>
<td>14,658</td>
<td>22,777</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82,815</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group Median</td>
<td>67,904</td>
<td>287,327</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>17,639</td>
<td>12,678</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68,798</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELBY TOWNSHIP LIBRARY, MI</td>
<td>65,159</td>
<td>215,758</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>15,779</td>
<td>13,140</td>
<td>27,376</td>
<td>33,611</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38,825</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGARD PUBLIC LIBRARY, OR</td>
<td>65,196</td>
<td>388,296</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>24,026</td>
<td>20,797</td>
<td>135,930</td>
<td>216,259</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>115,525</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVENFORD TOWNSHIP FREE LIB, PA</td>
<td>65,348</td>
<td>287,327</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>17,964</td>
<td>14,927</td>
<td>12,401</td>
<td>16,538</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31,415</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND FORKS PUBLIC LIBRARY, ND</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,109</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,639</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>786</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,790</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,934</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYNTON BEACH CITY LIBRARY, FL</td>
<td>66,872</td>
<td>296,736</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>11,880</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70,286</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPKINSVILLE-CHRIST, CO PUB LIB, KY</td>
<td>66,989</td>
<td>145,693</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21,820</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAYETTEVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY, AR</td>
<td>67,087</td>
<td>572,185</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>49,303</td>
<td>44,221</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>140,099</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSENBERG LIBRARY, TX</td>
<td>67,387</td>
<td>240,264</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>20,321</td>
<td>12,526</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63,328</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY, TN</td>
<td>67,504</td>
<td>245,075</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>24,584</td>
<td>23,532</td>
<td>4,612</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>113,806</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORBA LINDA PUBLIC LIBRARY, CA</td>
<td>67,904</td>
<td>289,576</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>34,392</td>
<td>31,783</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68,798</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT VERNON PUBLIC LIBRARY, NY</td>
<td>68,381</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>7,276</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>18,024</td>
<td>12,052</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22,298</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CASTLE PUBLIC LIBRARY, PA</td>
<td>68,588</td>
<td>165,373</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10,372</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASANTON PUBLIC LIBRARY, CA</td>
<td>68,755</td>
<td>472,633</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>32,437</td>
<td>27,282</td>
<td>5,911</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAD PUBLIC LIBRARY, WI</td>
<td>69,403</td>
<td>303,833</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>14,414</td>
<td>12,678</td>
<td>48,886</td>
<td>101,460</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69,419</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY HILL FREE PUBLIC LIB, NJ</td>
<td>69,965</td>
<td>421,608</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>18,539</td>
<td>10,136</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>137,231</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL BLUFFS PUBLIC LIBRARY, IA</td>
<td>71,361</td>
<td>268,736</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>22,644</td>
<td>19,656</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61,464</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. K. SMILEY PUBLIC LIBRARY, CA</td>
<td>71,375</td>
<td>241,576</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>11,581</td>
<td>10,391</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53,905</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERLOO PUBLIC LIBRARY, IA</td>
<td>74,979</td>
<td>261,261</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>17,639</td>
<td>13,165</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73,372</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISMARCK VET MEM PUB LIB, ND</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>361,714</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>16,450</td>
<td>12,286</td>
<td>15,849</td>
<td>20,017</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>198,581</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD CO./MINOT PUB. LIBRARY, ND</td>
<td>58,795</td>
<td>216,599</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>11,894</td>
<td>11,253</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67,236</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARGO PUBLIC LIBRARY, ND</td>
<td>90,599</td>
<td>379,7 04</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5,314</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>5,919</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>196,237</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.GRAND FORKS-CAMPBELL LIB, MN</td>
<td>10,951</td>
<td>175,047</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>24,162</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18,019</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grand Forks Public Library Needs Assessment  November 23, 2009  Library Consulting, P.A.*
### Comparison to Other U.S. Libraries

**Revenues and Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Name</th>
<th>Population of Legal Service Area</th>
<th>Local Revenue</th>
<th>Local Revenue Per Capita</th>
<th>State Revenue</th>
<th>State Revenue Per Capita</th>
<th>Federal Revenue</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Revenue per Capita</th>
<th>% of Total Revenue from Local Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Group Average</strong></td>
<td>68.795</td>
<td>$2,113,333</td>
<td>$30.80</td>
<td>$137,444</td>
<td>$2.14</td>
<td>$3,635</td>
<td>$2,499,833</td>
<td>$36.47</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Group Median</strong></td>
<td>67.904</td>
<td>$1,913,302</td>
<td>$25.52</td>
<td>$61,163</td>
<td>$0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,156,779</td>
<td>$30.22</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Township Lib., MI</td>
<td>65.159</td>
<td>$1,114,747</td>
<td>$17.11</td>
<td>$48,228</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,211,409</td>
<td>$18.59</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard Public Lib., OR</td>
<td>65.196</td>
<td>$2,530,836</td>
<td>$38.82</td>
<td>$7,261</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,538,097</td>
<td>$38.93</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverford Township Free Lib., PA</td>
<td>65.384</td>
<td>$1,129,988</td>
<td>$17.28</td>
<td>$455,625</td>
<td>$6.97</td>
<td>$16,189</td>
<td>$1,867,657</td>
<td>$28.56</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND FORKS PUBLIC Lib., ND</strong></td>
<td>66.109</td>
<td>$1,439,553</td>
<td>$21.78</td>
<td>$96,403</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,602,732</td>
<td>$24.24</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton Beach City Lib., FL</td>
<td>66.872</td>
<td>$1,978,589</td>
<td>$29.59</td>
<td>$69,222</td>
<td>$1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,227,404</td>
<td>$33.31</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hpnsville-Christian Co Pub Lib, KY</td>
<td>66.989</td>
<td>$197,500</td>
<td>$2.95</td>
<td>$61,163</td>
<td>$0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>$420,315</td>
<td>$6.27</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville Pub Lib., AR</td>
<td>67.087</td>
<td>$3,097,892</td>
<td>$46.18</td>
<td>$111,907</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,891,579</td>
<td>$58.01</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg Lib., TX</td>
<td>67.387</td>
<td>$2,240,754</td>
<td>$33.25</td>
<td>$17,807</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,193,769</td>
<td>$47.39</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson City Pub Lib., TN</td>
<td>67.504</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
<td>$21.11</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,543,008</td>
<td>$23.15</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown Public Lib., CA</td>
<td>67.904</td>
<td>$3,904,033</td>
<td>$57.49</td>
<td>$213,648</td>
<td>$3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,376,577</td>
<td>$64.45</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon Public Lib., NY</td>
<td>68.381</td>
<td>$3,787,216</td>
<td>$55.38</td>
<td>$388,205</td>
<td>$5.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,312,461</td>
<td>$63.07</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle Public Lib., PA</td>
<td>68.588</td>
<td>$302,716</td>
<td>$4.41</td>
<td>$760,963</td>
<td>$11.09</td>
<td>$7,844</td>
<td>$1,234,407</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton Public Lib., CA</td>
<td>68.755</td>
<td>$3,932,749</td>
<td>$57.20</td>
<td>$119,652</td>
<td>$1.74</td>
<td>$22,712</td>
<td>$4,125,113</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Public Lib., WI</td>
<td>69.403</td>
<td>$3,184,196</td>
<td>$45.88</td>
<td>$46,135</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
<td>$1,729</td>
<td>$3,804,054</td>
<td>$54.81</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hill Free Public Lib., NJ</td>
<td>69.965</td>
<td>$2,809,434</td>
<td>$40.15</td>
<td>$72,453</td>
<td>$1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,093,233</td>
<td>$44.21</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Bluffs Public Lib., IA</td>
<td>71.361</td>
<td>$1,566,918</td>
<td>$21.96</td>
<td>$14,750</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,872,044</td>
<td>$26.23</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. K. Smiley Public Lib., CA</td>
<td>71.375</td>
<td>$1,801,634</td>
<td>$25.24</td>
<td>$41,038</td>
<td>$0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,156,779</td>
<td>$30.22</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Public Lib., IA</td>
<td>74.979</td>
<td>$1,913,302</td>
<td>$25.52</td>
<td>$31,253</td>
<td>$0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,998,667</td>
<td>$26.66</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck Vet Mem Pub Lib., ND</td>
<td>75.000</td>
<td>$1,796,268</td>
<td>$23.95</td>
<td>$55,728</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$2,007,526</td>
<td>$26.77</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Libraries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Co./Minot Public Lib., ND</td>
<td>58.795</td>
<td>$1,098,166</td>
<td>$18.68</td>
<td>$83,001</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,251,563</td>
<td>$21.29</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo Public Lib., ND</td>
<td>90.599</td>
<td>$2,051,368</td>
<td>$22.64</td>
<td>$64,930</td>
<td>$0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,175,658</td>
<td>$24.01</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grand Forks-Campbell Libr., MN</td>
<td>10.951</td>
<td>$319,200</td>
<td>$29.15</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,260</td>
<td>$346,746</td>
<td>$31.66</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Name</td>
<td>Total Collection Expenditures</td>
<td>Collection Expenditures per capita</td>
<td>Collection Expenditures as Percent of Total Expenditures</td>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages Expenditures</td>
<td>Employee Benefits Expenditures as Percent of Total Expenditures</td>
<td>Total Staff Expenditures</td>
<td>Total Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>Total Operating Expenditures per Capita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group Average</td>
<td>$283,260</td>
<td>$4.14</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$1,179,188</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$2,379,969</td>
<td>$34.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group Median</td>
<td>$283,464</td>
<td>$4.08</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$1,145,813</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$2,040,690</td>
<td>$28.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Township Library, MI</td>
<td>$174,790</td>
<td>$2.68</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$610,349</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>$1,079,055</td>
<td>$16.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard Public Library, OR</td>
<td>$377,537</td>
<td>$5.79</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$1,703,989</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>$2,824,297</td>
<td>$43.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverford Township Libr., PA</td>
<td>$371,445</td>
<td>$5.68</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$832,904</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$1,858,307</td>
<td>$28.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks Pub Libr., ND</td>
<td>$283,464</td>
<td>$4.29</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$743,651</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$1,547,758</td>
<td>$23.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton Beach City Library, FL</td>
<td>$223,784</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$1,145,813</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$2,040,690</td>
<td>$30.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hkpnsville-Christn Co Pub Lib, KY</td>
<td>$74,472</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$178,180</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>$409,073</td>
<td>$6.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville Public Library, AR</td>
<td>$424,343</td>
<td>$6.33</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$1,679,868</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$3,324,917</td>
<td>$49.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg Library, TX</td>
<td>$266,662</td>
<td>$3.96</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$1,184,232</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$2,830,616</td>
<td>$42.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson City Public Library, TN</td>
<td>$117,632</td>
<td>$1.74</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$871,984</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$1,580,540</td>
<td>$23.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorba Linda Public Library, CA</td>
<td>$426,735</td>
<td>$6.28</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$1,292,371</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$4,376,577</td>
<td>$64.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon Public Library, NY</td>
<td>$337,165</td>
<td>$4.93</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$1,958,980</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$4,157,699</td>
<td>$60.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle Public Library, PA</td>
<td>$164,307</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$571,120</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$1,161,165</td>
<td>$16.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton Public Library, CA</td>
<td>$384,702</td>
<td>$5.60</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$2,000,065</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>$3,932,749</td>
<td>$57.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Public Library, WI</td>
<td>$440,742</td>
<td>$6.35</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$1,842,577</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$3,455,840</td>
<td>$49.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hill Free Public Lib., NJ</td>
<td>$285,689</td>
<td>$4.08</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$1,706,757</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$3,053,878</td>
<td>$43.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Bluffs Public Library, IA</td>
<td>$217,193</td>
<td>$3.04</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$824,007</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$1,656,370</td>
<td>$23.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. K. Smiley Public Library, CA</td>
<td>$280,848</td>
<td>$3.93</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$1,202,361</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>$2,047,708</td>
<td>$28.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Public Library, IA</td>
<td>$194,817</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$1,139,680</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>$1,984,093</td>
<td>$26.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck Vet Mem Pub Lib, ND</td>
<td>$335,604</td>
<td>$4.47</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$915,680</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$1,898,071</td>
<td>$25.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Co./Minot Pub Lib, ND</td>
<td>$193,437</td>
<td>$3.29</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$602,581.00</td>
<td>141,817.00</td>
<td>$1,196,989</td>
<td>$36.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo Public Library, ND</td>
<td>$443,997</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$1,088,601</td>
<td>229,217</td>
<td>$2,175,657</td>
<td>$28.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grand Forks-Campbell Libr., MN</td>
<td>$32,658</td>
<td>$2.98</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>$168,369</td>
<td>40,702</td>
<td>$531,859</td>
<td>$30.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Library Facility

The objective of this section is to highlight general characteristics of the existing facility and comment on significant issues that should be considered when building new or remodeling.

A. Overview

The current two-story library building was opened in 1972 and expanded in 1985. The original gross area was 30,482. The second level addition added 6,074 SF for a total of 36,556 SF.

The site has 2.9 acres.

Public parking on the east entry side has 53 spaces

Service and staff parking on the west side have 22 spaces.

Esthetically, the building is a simple brick box with few windows. The interior space is gymnasium-like. The south side of the building has a driveway connecting the patron lot on the east with the staff parking on the west.

B. Building Analysis and Issues

This section also includes best practices for library design that should be thoroughly discussed with the architects early in their design process.

Existing Mechanical

The large open spaces in the library are heating and cooled by a forced air system distributed through a below slab, perimeter tunnel that feeds air vertically through a linear grille. The tunnel varies in width from 4' to 5'4" wide and maintains a consistent height of 7'-7". The offices are heated via hot water base boards. There are nine zones within these spaces.

Roof top condensers handle the air conditioning needs.

Issues

The Heating, cooling and the general ventilation system has little flexibility to control and fine tune the temperatures for the wide variety of differing needs. Realistically all buildings must have the ability to control heating and cooling as a function of:

- Activity – passive or active and occupied or vacant,
- Size and volume of the room,
- The amount of glass,
- Building orientation,
- Seasonal changes,
- Interior spaces vs. perimeter spaces

This flexibility is especially important for libraries because it serves the widest variety of users of any building type.

Ultimately the library must design a mechanical systems that is energy smart which translates into responsible use of resources and cuts operational costs.
**Existing Electrical**

Electrical service to the building is 800 amps.

**Issues**

The service is adequate for now, but further distribution would be difficult. Although most computers in contemporary libraries are wireless they still need power. Since the future of libraries is electronic media wide distribution of power is essential. The challenge with the current library’s large span open floor plan would be retrofitting power to study tables and general seating/lounging areas where patrons will use personal computers. The below-slab retro requires good guess-work or an extensive and expensive grid of in-floor outlets.

**Existing Lighting**

The areas with lower ceilings have a mix of surfaced mounted and flush mounted fluorescent fixtures. Throughout the building there is a variety of ceiling mounted incandescent track spot lights. There are seven incandescent pendant lights over the first floor service desk. The lighting in the high ceiling Main Reading Room is 400w metal halide.

**Issues**

Good library lighting requires a great deal of study to understand all of the nuances. Many of the biggest challenges occur with very low ceilings and very high ceilings. These issues may be resolved if they are carefully factored into future planning re-design of the spaces.

There are six important considerations to review with the architect and lighting engineer during any design process, all of which are especially critical in a library environment:

- **Shadowing:** the patron trying to read or find books in the stacks creates a shadow blocking the light source,
- **Glare:** Light reflection on computer screens and glossy mediums,
- **Occupancy Controls:** conservation of energy via lamp source and occupancy controls
- **Day light Controls:** lighting that supplements sunlight
- **Surface colors:** the study and selection of colors to help reflect light.
- **Dark spots:** Areas that simply do not have enough light.

**Existing Acoustics**

Sound absorbing materials exist in two forms, (1) the carpet which is universal throughout the building and (2) acoustical ceiling tile. The ceiling tile exists only in areas with lower ceilings. The high ceiling in the Main Reading Room is the exposed concrete structural ‘double Ts’.

**Issues**

There are no acoustical issues that cannot be mitigated if the building were to be remodeled. The main concern should focus on the exposed precast concrete roof structure, because ceilings are the most important surface to consider when it comes to controlling the sound within a space.
**Existing Windows**

The windows are one inch insulated glass. With the exception of the entry, the windows are unusually small; 5’-8” high and 3’-4” wide.

**Issues**

The current design allows very little day light into the building. It provides for a gymnasium-like quality. Nearly all contemporary libraries bring patron seating, children’s areas and most of the staff offices, to the exterior walls for natural light and views.

Cutting new windows in a bearing wall system is very expensive because each sizable opening must be supported by a significant steel lintel. This also requires temporarily shoring the wall before cutting each opening.

**Existing Roof Structure**

24 inch deep structural double T concrete planks

**Issues**

Cutting through the roof for skylights and mechanical penetrations can only happen through the shallow part of the planks. Cutting through the stems is not recommended, because supporting the new openings is structurally complicated and expensive. The structure cannot carry a third floor.

**Existing Walls**

The east and west exterior walls are 12 inch reinforced concrete block bearing walls with 4 inch veneer brick. The north and south exterior walls are 8 inch reinforced concrete block with a 4 inch veneer. Steel angles create lintels supporting each window opening.

**Issues**

As stated in the window section modifying this type of wall construction to accommodate larger windows and doors openings is very costly.

**Existing Roof Insulation**

The original 2 ¾” insulation was replaced in 1990 with 4 inches of polyisocyanurate rigid insulation. The R-value of this assembly is approx 20.

**Issue**

The R-value should be at least 24 by code.

**Existing Wall Insulation**

1 ½” ‘foam’ insulation is noted on the drawings. It is assumed that this wall assembly has an R Value of 9 to 11.

**Issue**

The wall R-value should be at least 19.

**Handicapped Accessibility**

The American Disabilities Act (ADA) was enacted in 1991, which post dates the original building construction.

**Issues**

A few of the current items that do not comply with ADA regulation:

- Doors widths to toilets are too narrow and stall sizes are not compliant
- Many aisles in the shelving area are too narrow
- Door hardware is not ADA compliant
- ADA Signage is missing in some areas
C. Site Analysis and Issues

This Needs Assessment as stated in the following Section has determined that the appropriate size for the new library should be between 65,000 and 70,000 SF. If it is a two story building, it would need a minimum 35,000 SF footprint. The current footprint of the library is 25,140 SF.

Site Summary
To evaluate the site, this study uses a standard site scoring sheet (see Appendix D). It includes 21 weighted categories for evaluating a site. This initial study does not weight the site against other sites, but simply provides a first pass to indicate problems. The scoring reveals three serious deficiencies (1) lot size (see Appendix F), (2) visibility, (3) parking and (4) expansion potential (see Appendix F).

Site Visibility
The site is one block off of Washington St which is one of the primary north-south arteries through town.

Issues
Public Libraries especially large main libraries need a highly visible location. It is not a good practice to hide an important civic building. The current building is essentially invisible from Washington St (see Appendix E). The problem can only be mitigated by buying strategic properties that currently block the views to the Library. This will become a very expensive fix and takes more properties off the tax roles.

Sun Orientation
The main patron entry faces due east.

Issues
The ideal front door orientation for a Library is southwest. This captures the winter sun from approx 9:30 AM until the 4:30 PM sunset and captures the summer sun from 10:00 AM until the 9:00 PM sunset. This orientation helps with snow melting and general positive feelings about entering a building.

Deliveries
Current deliveries happen on the both the west and east sides of the library

Issues
Since mail distribution and interlibrary loan are separate from circulation, this means that many of the deliveries to the library must cross through the public areas of the main reading room. This constant crossing through the public spaces is extremely inefficient for the staff and less than ideal for the patron. Ideally all deliveries connect directly into staff work areas.

Bookdrop
Current bookdrop is outside of the library building and on the right side of a vehicle driving up.

Issues
An ideal book drop deposits materials directly into the library in the staff work area. The current situation requires staff to go outside several times a day to gather the returned materials. This exposes the materials to possible damage from the elements and is an inefficient use of staff time. The current arrangement also requires drivers to get out their vehicles to deposit materials. Ideally a drive up book drop would be placed so that a driver could deposit materials from the driver’s side directly into the building.
Parking
The total existing parking on the east and west sides is 75 spaces.

Issues
Currently as a proportion of total parking, too many spaces are located on the west staff/service side.

70,000 SF requires approx 123 parking spaces. Most communities have no specific parking ordinance for libraries, but national statistics use a factor of 1.75 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Included in Appendix E is a simple site diagram showing both a building and parking expansion example. The building addition fits, but the parking options appear to leave us short by at least 20 spaces. Off-site parking is available, but it’s not ideally compatible within the surrounding residential neighborhoods.
VII. Library Trends and Public Perceptions

A. Library Roles in the 21st Century

Public Libraries are not just a storehouse for materials or places to find a good book. In the 21st Century, public libraries are expected to play a larger societal role. This expanded role of the public library is seen in national trends.

1 Libraries Are the Social Core of the Community
Libraries have become anchors of community life that facilitate broad, creative interaction and civic engagement. The public library as a democratic space, is one of the few public spaces where people of all ages and backgrounds can mingle and interact.

2 Libraries as Centers for Life-Long Learning
The public library is a key access point for community-based education for lifelong learners. As a community-based organization, the library links independent learners, materials, programs, and other community agencies and provide a common touchstone for all segments of the population. The library is committed to service to all individuals, regardless of educational level, socio-economic status or age. Adults are using the library in increasing numbers to learn computer skills necessary to search for employment, write a resume, complete a job application and in some cases pursue additional educational distance learning opportunities. Students of all ages are studying, accessing their classes via online computers, and library staff is being asked to proctor tests. Public libraries are providing quiet zones, study rooms, lounges and cafes to accommodate these uses.

3 Libraries as Leaders of Learning and Literacy for Children and New Americans
Libraries have a major role to play in early literacy, family literacy, reading development and entry level acceptance of new Americans. Literacy activities have a significant impact on children’s and English Language Learner’s future achievement. Arthur J. Rolnick, Vice President and Director of Research for the Federal Reserve Bank stated in the publication Fedgazette, 'In four major longitudinal studies, the rate of return on money invested in high-quality early childhood development programs was returned to the public in reduced crime'. Access to quality library collections and programs are essential for these groups.

4 Libraries as Centers for Technology Access
Libraries are becoming the key communication centers for mobile populations. The electronic links between homes and libraries will increase and virtual library services are now provided 24 hours a day in many libraries. Librarians have become “knowledge navigators”. Libraries play an important role in bridging the digital divide providing assistance to users so that anyone can access online resources, including tax forms, Medicare information, immigration services and local and national government information. As government agencies continue to digitize government forms and services, public libraries as centers for public access computing in their communities are often the only organizations that can help people interact with government agencies and provide access to e-government resources. Public access to the Internet and computers is transforming public libraries as key access points. Connectivity but quality connectivity which means sufficient bandwidth and physical space to meet user demands.


5 Libraries as Gateway for User-Driven Services

In the 20th Century, libraries relied primarily on Library staff and somewhat on the Library Board to determine how and what services should be offered. Today’s public libraries are more user driven. Library users are able to request and receive almost any item published today in any format. They may have the item held for them at the library, available for pick up at a remote site or mailed to them. Library users may access on-line information or pick up items any time of day through remote ‘kiosks’. Advanced automated systems allow library users to check out items themselves, pay fines on-line, be notified via email or text messaging of reserves, overdues, and programs. In addition, Library users and community organizations are planning and delivering programs of their own choosing.

B. Stakeholder Input: Common Themes – Public Perceptions

In an effort to gain community input the Consultants interviewed 108 individuals including Library Board members, staff and the Task Force. In addition the library hosted two community focus groups. From these meetings common themes emerged relating to a variety of topics as a result of answers to questions:

**Grand Forks Public Library as Place?**
- A public library is a reflection of community values (perception of the importance of a library in the community)
- Library is essential and invaluable to the community
- Library is a equalizing place and important to community culture
- Library is a place to access information, culture and entertainment in a variety of formats for all residents
- People love the library and feel personally connected
- “Sacred cow” in Grand Forks is Education and the library is a center of lifelong learning and education”

**Grand Forks Public Library as Facility?**
- Building is outdated, aging in place and deteriorating
- Library is cluttered, dark, gloomy, poor lighting and is dirty
- Interior surfaces such as carpet and furniture are worn out, torn and may become a safety hazard
- Parking is woefully inadequate, not enough handicapped parking and ADA access into and inside the building is impossible for those in wheelchairs or electric carts
- There are too few meeting rooms, and the existing ones are cluttered and too many barriers to reserve, with no access for use outside of Library open hours
- Current library is built on old “recipe” for libraries, and is seriously behind the times
- Staff work areas are poorly situated and inefficient to meet customer and staff needs
- Convenience and ease of use are important to library users but there are many current impediments to this convenience and ease
- Outside book return requires a customer to leave the car to return materials, not at all family friendly
- Not enough computers, study spaces, comfortable chairs, tables
- There is no coffee shop or other refreshment choices
- Library desks are messy and cluttered and the library does not lend itself to quiet comfortable spaces
Grand Forks Library Services?
- Quality and helpfulness of staff were highly praised, but lack of staff availability and large desks seen as barriers is an emerging problem
- Collection is excellent and offers various formats; (books, CD’s, DVD’s, Books on CD)
- Adult programming is scarce with no library sponsored book clubs
- Public information about the library is not existent to many major marketing of library services is needed
- Children’s programming is well attended, creative and fun for children
- No express check out
- Computer system is not intuitive or user friendly in library or for remote users
- Limited bandwidth for technology makes computer/wireless use problematic
- Payment of $1 to reserve an item, that is already paid for with tax dollars is “outrageous”
- Collection purchasing policy is not adequate to fill user demand for best sellers, wait is impossibly long for few copies purchased
- There are no deposit locations in town for return of library materials in places convenient to where people live, work and shop
- Two week check out is too short to meet student/family/individual needs
- There are not enough extended hours on weekends

Grand Forks Public Library Location?
- Location is very important
- Current library is not visible, the community needs a visible site as a source of community pride and access
- Current library is an embarrassment to the community and not in good proximity to other locations
- Library should be on a major traffic route in the center of the city
- Library location does matter

Grand Forks Public Library As A Partner In A Shared Facility and/or Services?
- Do not share a facility with anyone, library needs to stand alone
- Partner with Technical College, schools, Senior Center, Historical Society
- Partner with Economic Development Agency
- Partner with the Work Force Training Center
- Partner with the Park District /Wellness Center
C. Five Priorities

Eighteen areas for public library service priority have been identified by the Public Library Association. When focus group participants were asked their opinions, the following five responses received the highest number of votes:

1. Be a Comfortable Place: Public and Virtual Spaces
Residents will have safe and welcoming physical places to meet and interact with others or to sit quietly and read and will have open and accessible virtual spaces that support social networking.

2. Create Young Readers: Emergent Literacy
Preschool children will have programs and services designed to ensure that they will enter school ready to learn to read, write and listen.

3. Satisfy Curiosity: Lifelong Learning
Residents will have the resources they need to explore topics of personal interest and continue to learn throughout their lives.

4. Help in Finding, Evaluating And Using Information
Residents will know when they need information to resolve an issue or answer a question and will have the skills to search for, locate, evaluate, and effectively use information to meet their needs.

5. Stimulate Imagination: Reading, Viewing and Listening for Pleasure
Residents will have materials and programs that excite their imaginations and provide pleasurable reading, viewing and listening experiences.

Grand Forks Library: What Next?
- Be BOLD, and Do it Right
- Communicate, Communicate, Communicate
- Library needs an articulated vision for what is possible in library services for the community, then create that opportunity
- “This community needs a new library, not a revision of the current building”
- Start a pattern for public support, market library services, provide information to the media on a daily/weekly basis
- Sell a new library to the community as an “investment” not an “expenditure”
- Library Director, library staff and Library Board need to be more visible within the community, so those opportunities to collaborate with and support other agencies and organizations can be more easily defined.
- Keep the MOMENTUM going...
VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations

Measures for Determining Need
In planning for improved library services and spaces, one first of all considers the environment of the Library as described above and includes the perceptions and desires of the community. Then one factors in the trends occurring in the state and nationally with new and renovated public libraries. Next it is prudent to review national and state guidelines where they exist as well as look at benchmark data from other libraries serving a similar population. Finally, the recommendations are distilled through the lens of experienced library consultants.

A. Operational Improvements Needed
As a result of the public input, analyzing data and infrastructure, and the stakeholders’ response to a series of questions, a number of operational improvements needed became apparent. The following recommendations are based on some of that input along with the Consultants experience with best practices in a variety of libraries.

Staffing
- Establish a library staffing structure to meet current and future library service goals
- Review and/or rewrite all library job descriptions in order to optimize staff efficiencies

Collections
- Define the importance of the Grand Forks Room and its priority within the library
- Define the role of the Circulating Art collection and its priority/relevancy for the future
- Review and/or revise a Library Board Collection Development Policy
- Review and/or revise a Collection Manual which will guide staff in making decisions about the selection, management, and preservation of library materials
- Inform the public of the principles that govern collection development including a public declaration of the library’s commitment to the principles of free access to ideas and information, and to provide a collection that reflect a variety of viewpoints
- Evaluate current reference collection (book and electronic) looking to national models of weeding and incorporating titles into the general non-fiction area
- Define ratio of reserves to titles purchased, increase as appropriate
- Utilize vendor programs where popular new fiction will be automatically pre-ordered in advance of publication
- Designate committee and/or individual staff to purchase collection in all areas
- Inventory collection to determine accurate numbers of circulating/non-circulating items

Technology
- Develop a user friendly website that makes conducting basic library business (e.g. Reserves, e-mail notification, electronic payment of fines user feedback etc.) intuitive and seamless
- Use the current ALEPH Integrated Circulation system to its full capacity
- Obtain and install computer management software to handle the scheduling for the use of the public computers both for user convenience and to enable staff to redirect their time
- Install express self check out machines for improved customer privacy and staff efficiencies
Accessibility and Public Awareness

- Negotiate with Cities Area Transit officials to obtain a bus stop at the Library.

Policies and Procedures

- Review and/or revise/develop current circulation policies to improve customer relations and improve staff efficiencies
- Review/revise current policy/procedure inconsistencies in how library fines/fees are applied to customers in order to make this procedure clear to both customers and staff
- Review/revise money handling procedures for all library staff
- Look to circulation best practices in libraries, in order to implement models of efficient handing of returned materials at the circulation desk, and eliminating the messy appearance for library users

B. Future Collections, Technology and Spaces Needed

Based on all of the above and factoring in the estimated population number for the City and County of Grand Forks in 2030 to be 94,552 - 100,000, the following MI-NIMUN resources are recommended at this point for the Grand Forks Public Library. This is only an estimate as the actual amounts will not be known until the full library building program is developed.

**Adult Area**
- Print Collection/local history: 124,500
- Periodical/Newspapers: 250
- Media Items: 15,000
- Study Rooms: 5
- Public Computers: 65
- Adult Area Seating: 100

**Teen Area**
- Print Collection: 6,500
- Periodicals: 20
- Media Items: 1,500
- Public Computers: 10
- Meeting Room/Media Lab: 1
- Study Room: 2
- Teen Area Seating: 10

**Children’s Area**
- Print Collection: 49,000
- Periodicals: 10
- Media Items: 6,000
- Public Computers: 20
- Children’s Area Seating: 60

**Meetings/Programming**
- Large Meeting Room with dividers seating for: 150
- Board/Conference for: 30
Spaces Needed and Estimated Square Feet
NOTE: This is only an estimate as the actual amounts will not be finalized until the full library building program is developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Entrance</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation Services</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Book Display</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Area</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Library</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Services</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Building Services</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Administration</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Computers</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Services</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction Area</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiction</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local History</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals Collection</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Services</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assignable Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>53,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Assignable Sq. Ft. (@ 22% of Gross):</td>
<td>15,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Square Footage:</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,840</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Building and Site Recommendations

Site
Among several categories used to measure the viability of a site for a library (see Appendix D), there are always three fundamental issues, 1) will the site accommodate an expanded building footprint, 2) is there sufficient parking and 3) is the building visible.

The existing GFPL site will accommodate an expansion from 36,000 SF to 70,000 SF. However, two serious flaws still remain, 1) Appropriate and adequate parking cannot be accommodated on the site and 2) the building is hidden from the public.

Additional parking might be resolved by acquiring the property east of the site for $51,600 and realigning Library Circle or acquiring the property to the north for $441,700. The visibility issue however, cannot be completely resolved even with purchasing the two properties between the library and Washington St, because the dimension from Washington St is still very long (see Appendix E). The assessed value of both properties is $2,438,000.

**Recommendation**
Due to the visibility issue it is recommended that a new site be found. If however, the library should choose to stay they must acquire either the property to the east and realign Library Circle or they must acquire the property to the north.
Sharing the Site
Public Library works very well as a stand alone facility or with other public buildings. However, because public libraries generally have stable funding and draw people from all segments of the community, it is common for other organizations to attempt to link with a library in order to gain support from the libraries natural cache.

A genuine concern with sharing the site is the possibility that ‘other uses’ might economically fail thus leaving an uncomfortable void and detract from the library.

**Recommendation**
Any suggested shared use should not impact how the library needs to function. It is important to fully assess each potential shared use in order to make sure it truly benefits the library and is not a drag on the library’s mission.

Building New
New construction is typically ideal for two reasons; (1) the library can have exactly what is best for serving the public and operating efficiently. Remodeling always requires program sacrifices and (2) the cost of remodeling in order to upgrade the current building with all the 21st century technologies and accommodating all the evolving building codes can be staggering and sometimes more costly than building new. Building new also allows the old library to continue operations. Remodeling requires moving costs (twice), leasing fees and temporary construction.

Often building a new public library takes political courage, because the vocal minority is nearly always against change. There are four types of constituents that will campaign against new construction 1) those patrons who are emotionally attached to the old ‘place’, 2) vocal residents who hate tax increases and distrust government, 3) residents who feel remodeling is environmentally appropriate and 4) those who believe computers will make libraries obsolete.

**Recommendation**
Building new on a new site is the best plan. Skilled public relations to sell a new location is essential. There are several strategies the Library Board should embrace: 1) keep the residents continually informed, 2) make sure the reason for building new is clearly communicated, 3) have a realistic plan for the old library, 4) involve the community through workshops and open house meetings, 5) the Board should create a communications/referendum taskforce, 6) make the process of hiring the library architect a big news item and 7) give concerned residents a voice and spend time with them and above all 8) make certain the tax consequences are perfectly clear and accurate.

Converting the Current Building to Other Use
Finding realistic alternative uses for the library building will be a function of 1) the dollars needed to acquire the property and 2) the dollars needed to appropriately renovate.

This study identified three plausible scenarios:

1) A community center: The high ceilings coupled with the large open floors are ideal for athletic courts, small performing auditoriums, meeting rooms, etc. This could be partially funded through fees, but tax subsidies would be essential and ongoing. This option would require substantially more parking. Obviously, the community center would stay off the tax rolls.

2) Demolish the building, clean the site and sell the raw land. A completely unencumbered piece of property might attract developers.
3) Housing: Rental seems best because condos usually require covered and secured parking. The units would ring the perimeter on both levels with a center atrium. The 26 foot structural bay system would generate 26 to 28 units approximately 26 feet wide and 50 feet deep. Given the nature of the surrounding neighborhood it seems that this modest type of housing would be compatible. Furthermore, housing would put the property on the tax rolls.

Recommendation
A rental housing option would blend nicely with the surrounding neighborhood. Any option will require a costly renovation, but the City could consider auctioning the property rather than setting a fixed price. This unique option means that a city can make a deal more attractive because the land price over time is less important than the in-perpetuity property tax collections. This give-away approach may appear odd, but given the economic climate the auction option takes advantage of a unique opportunity that local governments have.

Addition/Remodeling
There are three critical elements of renovation, 1) surgical demolition, 2) functional sacrifice and 3) aesthetic sacrifice. Surgical demolition deals with the cost associated with the scope and difficulty of the demolition before the new construction begins. Sometimes saving a seemingly good ‘shell’ requires such extraordinary efforts that the margin between new and remodeling evaporates. Functional sacrifice means that every remodeling will sacrifice some ideal operational or program relationship thus it is important that everyone understand the consequences. The aesthetic sacrifice varies. Some old buildings have an inherent design character that is hard to gracefully transform. Even talented designers cannot elegantly weave together old and new. There is nothing worse than spending lots of dollars for a mediocre outcome.

Recommendation
Thinking about the existing library only in terms of architecture, and function there is no doubt that the existing library can be remodeled and expanded. However, after the demolition is completed very little of the original building shell would remain after cutting numerous and expensive openings to make significant windows for much needed daylight.

The value of the cannibalized shell might save 10% - 15% of the cost over a new building. However, the additional cost of preparing a temporary location, paying rent for 20 months (maybe more) and moving everything twice will neutralize this difference.
D. Shared Building Uses

One of the most intriguing shared-use discussions during the stakeholder interviews was the idea of establishing a relationship with Northland Community College in East Grand Forks. The College is a commuter facility with 65% of the students living in North Dakota. Due to the commuter nature of the college it is open few evening hours and no weekend hours. Many students come from busy living situations and need quiet study environments when the college is closed. It is possible that the GFPL could become an ideal off-campus study location.

This relationship would, however, require expanded library hours giving the students more flexible time to balance their work, classroom and study schedules. The College imagines that the work-study programs funded through financial aid could help provide after-hour student staffing and security.

During the stakeholder interviews there was considerable discussion wondering if the proposed ‘Wellness Center’ would make a good neighbor. The project sounded very ambitious and needs more discussion. However, the ‘Wellness Center’ certainly aligns with the library’s mission as a gathering place that serves the entire community.

Even without going so far as to share a physical building, the library can partner with other organizations to provide services that benefit all.

Distant on-line learning for college degrees and retraining is becoming a larger part of this country’s ongoing personal reinventing process. Distant learning requires good computers, high speed connections and quite rooms. Libraries can become an ideal venue for on-line learning.

Video conferencing will dramatically grow in the coming years as a response to travel costs and the global business growth. The cost to setup video equipment will continue to decrease and the quality of the imagining and sound will continue to grow. The library becomes an ideal center for connecting to the world. Video conferencing could also generate dollars for the library by marketing to for-profit local businesses.

**Recommendation**

The library should peruse the all three items mentioned above, 1) study space for the Community College, 2) accommodating distant learning and 3) video conferencing. It should take caution about joining with the ‘Wellness Center’ for two reasons 1) because it requires substantial private dollars that could delay the library and 2) it appears to be an enormous project that needs a site that may not be ideal for the library.

E. New Building & New Site

This final section is added in order to provide additional emphasis to the recommendations.

Library Consulting, P.A. have been involved in designing, assessing and programming over 60 libraries. Many of the projects involved successful remodeling and expansions. Usually the decision to expand was driven by at least one of six reasons: 1) the community loved the original building and would not support abandoning the site, 2) the original building was a good piece of architecture and deserved saving, 3) there were no other sites available, 4) any optional sites were terrifically expensive, 5) the current location was ideal, 6) the cost to remodel and expand was significantly less than buying a site and building new.
However, the Consultants can recall no situation similar to Grand Forks where virtually none of these six compelling assets were present. In the professional opinion of the Consultants, a new building, on a new site is the only solution.

During each of four site visits by the Consultants, the building continues to reveal more expensive challenges to salvage the original building.

As summarized below there are five critical issues that weigh heavily against remodeling.

1) The library is not visible to the public, 2) The demolition and reconstruction to the existing systems and the envelope, in order to create an appropriate space, would be very expensive, 3) The interior spaces of the library would become further away from natural daylight. (see diagram on page 38 in the Appendix), 4) Additional land would need to be acquired and 5) Moving for 20 months to a temporary space during construction would add significantly to the cost.

One of the strongest indictments of the current library is that during the interviews with 108 people, not one single person said they loved the existing library. Such resounding apathy toward an existing facility has never been encountered by the consultants.

Grand Forks deserves a great library. The library should be an important piece of architecture. The incremental cost difference between exceptional architecture and average architecture is quite small. The difference in cost per household, per month to finance a great library is pennies. Frankly, more important than dollars is hiring a great architectural firm. Notable design comes from talent not necessarily dollars. Talented architects will create special places even with average budgets.

A great building will bring people to Grand Forks. The Library will contribute to the economy of Grand Forks. Communities like Grand Forks are in an ongoing campaign to attract discretionary dollars. This can be the best library in the region.

Life-long learning and re-tooling are essential aspects of culture and public libraries are the perfect venue for personal training. The Grand Forks Public Library is poised to become exceptional and change lives for generations. This is a ‘legacy moment’ that will define the character of Grand Forks.
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C. User Maps

942 Total GIS Mapping Locations  August and October 2009

Black  South of Gateway, east of Washington, north of Demers  45 locations.  4.8 %

Orange  South of Gateway, west of Washington, north of Demers  149 locations. 15.8 %

Red  North of Gateway, east of Washington  22 location.  2.3 %

Yellow  South of Demers, east of Washington  302 locations. 32.1 %

Blue  South of Demers, west of Washington  264 locations. 28.0 %

Green  East Grand Forks and Polk County  41 locations. 4.4 %

Purple  Grand Forks County, Trail County, Walsh County, Nelson County, Cavalier County, Cass County only six are marked on the map  119 locations. 12.6 %

Visitors  These locations are not included on the map.
6 Grand Forks (no library card)
2 Canada
1 Minnesota
1 Montana
## D. Site Evaluation Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score 0-7</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanatory Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Size of Lot</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Configuration of the Lot</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adequate Site Parking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Potential for Expansion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ease of Identification - Visibility</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Location of Property to CBD/Retail</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Access to Site by Pedestrians/Biking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Availability of Public Transportation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Site Topography</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Location to Primary streets</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          | actual score | 540 |
|          | maximum score | 1,050 |

| 11     | Sub-surface Soil Conditions | 10    | 7                    | 70 Not totally known. Can greatly add to construction costs |
| 12     | Relationship to Civic Developments | 10    | 1                    | 10 City Hall, Police, Performing Arts |
| 13     | Solar Orientation of the Site | 10    | 1                    | 10 Best Entry Orientation Southeast to Southwest |
| 14     | The Impact on Property Taxes | 10    | 7                    | 70 How many property tax dollars are lost |
| 15     | Land Purchase Price | 10    | 7                    | 70 High price may eliminate site: Consider condemnation |
| 16     | Economic Trend of Adjacent Properties | 10    | 5                    | 50 Very important that the Neighborhood is Improving |

|          | actual score | 280 |
|          | maximum score | 420 |

| 17     | Relationship to Schools | 5     | 3                    | 15 Ideally Closer to an Upper School |
| 18     | Extraordinary Site Preparation | 5     | 7                    | 35 No Major Trees, Boulders, Mounds, Depressions |
| 19     | Perception of the Site: Safe | 5     | 7                    | 35 Important due to Late Closing Hours |
| 20     | Proximity to Office Space | 5     | 3                    | 15 Encourage Business Patrons to Use Library for Research |
| 21     | Zoning Restrictions | 5     | 7                    | 35 Permitted Use, Reasonable Setbacks, Height Limitations |

|          | actual score | 135 |
|          | maximum score | 175 |

| Total Score | 955 |
| Maximum Score | 1,645 |
E. Site Analysis

The buildings highlighted in black create the visual barrier between Washington St and the library.

Sun Path

- Sunrise June 21
- Sunset June 21
- Sunrise Dec 21
- Sunset Dec 21

noon

north

Not to Scale
**F. Expansion Example**

This simple diagram indicates that expanding on the site eliminates most of the green space and cannot accommodate the 123 required parking spaces.