

Main Library Renovation
Advisory Committee
October 23, 2003

Members present:

Eugene Holland, Faculty, Comparative Studies
Jerry Ladman, Faculty, International Studies
Karen Lawson, University Libraries
Tony Mughan, Faculty, Political Science
Joy Reilly, Faculty, Theatre
Katie Schmees, Undergraduate Student Government
Dona Straley, University Libraries
Lewis Ulman, Faculty, English
Julia Watson, Faculty, Comparative Studies
Chris Zacher, Faculty, Humanities Institute

Members unable to attend:

Sarah Iles Johnston, Faculty, Greek & Latin

Architects:

George Acock, Acock Associates Architects
Pete Confar, Acock Associates Architects (PC)
Graham Gund, Graham Gund Architects (GG)
Youngmin Jahan, Graham Gund Architects (YJ)
David Zenk, Graham Gund Architects (DZ)

University Libraries:

Wes Boomgaarden (WB)
Joe Branin (JB)
Tom Cetwinski
Betty Sawyers

JB: Thanked the attendees for participation in this critical stage of a very important project. We are trying to maximize both collection size and reader seating in the renovated building. We had thought of building module three of the Book Depository as a part of this project to store materials temporarily until they could be moved back into the building. It's been decided that wouldn't be the best use of the funds or the best handling/processing of the materials. With all the record changes that would need to be made, it is better to move items to the Depository only when moves of material are permanent.

Serious thought is also being given now to moving Technical Services, Preservation, and Information Technology out of the Main Library to Sullivant Hall to provide adequate space to incorporate the Social Sciences collection now housed in Sullivant Hall into the Main Library.

A draft *Program of Requirements* is being submitted today to Facilities Planning and Development, with a three-week response time expected. This document addresses the big programmatic decisions relating to collections and services to be in the building after renovation. Large projects have Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) between the building occupants and the University administration indicating financial responsibilities for the project. The MoU for the Libraries indicates that the building size cannot exceed 220,000 assignable square feet and 330,000 gross square feet. Preliminary design concepts will be presented to the Design Review Board this evening. We are aiming for a collection size of two million volumes, but that will be very difficult to achieve. We currently have ca. 1,100 reader seats and are hoping for 1,500-1,700 in the renovated building. We are also looking at the phasing of the project and are trying for a single phase; this would involve vacating the building, which would save both time and money. The current plan is to rent space at the ABB facility at 650 Ackerman Road, which is an eight building complex including a large warehouse, plus research and office space.

Fund raising is another important aspect of this project. We have thus far raised \$13 million and need \$17 million more. We are planning to go public with the campaign next spring and hope to have at least \$15 million by that time.

The floor was thrown open for questions and comments. *Committee Member: Concerned about the location of materials during the construction. If library materials are located at ABB, it is mandatory that there be adequate bus service to both move people and provide a courier service.*

JB: There is ample parking available at ABB, but not everyone has a car, and parking isn't adequate on central campus for library personnel who would need to come to central campus for meetings, etc. We need to plan for shuttle service to and from central campus.

Committee Member: Assumes that some number of books would need to be reduced and sent to the Book Depository in order to make space for the Social Sciences collection currently housed in Sullivant Hall. Access to books is mandatory for the Humanities students who are being assigned projects that need to use materials in the library. JB: We're determined to live within the building and can do this by moving materials constantly to the Book Depository; all collections on campus are moving materials to the Depository. We need to have a balanced library, balancing seats and collections. There are currently 2.3 million volumes housed at the Book Depository out of a total collection of nearly six million volumes. Approximately 55,000 new volumes come into Main Library each year; a comparable number needs to go out. There are currently three deliveries from the Book Depository per day and that could be increased. Environmental conditions for preserving materials are much better at the Depository.

GG: Michael Van Valkenburg, the landscape architect who has been working on the Oval, is now incorporating the library project as well. Everyone agrees that the most successful part of the Oval is where the buildings conform to the shape; a picture from earlier times shows the Library as an object within the Oval. The current building has served as a barrier for people coming to the library from the west. The renovated building will have entrances both east and west with traffic moving through the library at the first floor level. There would be re-enforcement of the West entrance/facade with a large reading room on the second level. The paths of the Oval would be extended around the building. Following the construction, Neil

Avenue would be curved around the building to complete the west end of the Oval. The building originally had a majestic, monumental façade to the east that will be restored by removing the pavilions that were added to the front of the building. The landscaping to the west will be designed to funnel folks to the west entrance of the library building.

At this time there are three major design options. All three schemes are relatively interchangeable on the first floor. All show the central passage from east to west through the building; it is hoped that this space can be used as exhibition space to show what the library has and give a feel for what is in the building. All three schemes also include the restoration of the Grand Reading Room, as well as adding a second large reading room on the west side and a larger atrium with lounge space. They all also go an additional floor underground under the portions of the building that are taken down, although an underground utility tunnel and the water table pose potential problems.

Option 1. Retain the stack tower and add to the west of the tower with bays to the north and south that would hold classrooms, etc. The tower would be used for other purposes that book storage to provide interesting, important spaces high in the building to take advantage of the views, e.g., rooms where receptions could be held and other public spaces. Any extension to the west would maintain the height of adjacent buildings. The atrium would bring light down into the center of the building.

Option 2. Remove the tower and build new. Doing this would allow 20-foot high ceilings rather than the 16-foot ceilings that would be needed to match the existing floor spacing of the tower. Twenty-foot high ceilings would maintain flexibility for other purposes in the future. The advantage of this option is fewer floors, a larger footprint for housing the collections, and a generous amount of height for the areas holding collections. Some sort of an iconographic tower would be added to the building.

Option 3. Build to the south with a four-story addition. The east west flow would not be as obvious, but there would be a portion of the building near Mirror Lake. Such an addition would take away from the symmetry of the building and also moves into an area where there are important trees and landscape elements.

Issues with the reuse of the tower were discussed. The tower would need to be retrofitted for seismic load. Neither the existing stairways nor the elevators meet current building codes. The column spaces are not efficient for current needs and make browsing more difficult, and the aisles not sufficiently wide. The portion of the tower that remains a tower could be used for purposes other than book storage. If it was used for book storage we could take out every other floor or make use of mezzanines, but clearance space between the ceiling and the top of shelving units could be a problem. Demolition would cost additional money, but on the other hand, renovations impose a larger uncertainty factor, as you don't know what you'll find until construction really begins. Experience has been that there will be a far greater uncertainty factor and need a larger contingency fund; they are estimating \$2 million more.

Committee Member: Expressed concern that this project was causing parking on South Oval Drive to be removed. JB: Parking on the south side of the building will be going away because

of Oval restoration, and the situation will be helped with the new garage that will be going in adjacent to the new Psychology build. *Committee Members: There will be a need, however to have drop off and turn around areas, as well as a possible shuttle service from the garage. Parking is needed adjacent to the library; it's also an issue for the Faculty Club. Lighting will also be an issue with longer walks necessary at night.*

Is the real question then whether we keep the tower or not? Which is more important external appearance or internal use? GG: The resulting building needs to look good, but it also needs to be flexible and efficient. Retention of the tower would make it more difficult to make the building look like and function as an integrated whole. The current structure is really three separate buildings adjacent to each other, and the goal is to create a more seamless building. There are more options and flexibility down the line if the tower is replaced. A view corridor is needed from the east; they plan to remove low bushes, reduce the amount of pavement, and increase the green space at the east entrance.

JB: These designs will be taken to the Design Review Board this evening. The DRB is an advisory group to the University Architect, Jill Morelli; input from them will be important, but it is not a decision making body. The Core Group, consisting of representatives from the Libraries, Facilities Planning and Development, and the architects, will make the final decision on the design to be followed for the renovation. They will be obtaining input from a variety of groups, will weigh all the input, and make a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees.

Development remains a major issue. Constraints put on projects by major donors have been known to cause problems, but thus far the two major donors have placed no constraints on how their funding is to be used

Committee Members: Those present did not object to the idea of removing the tower as long as the resulting building would meet the Program of Requirements. A question was raised, however, as to whether there would actually be more room in the building if the tower were retained.

JB: There will be a meeting of the Core Group next week to determine what will be presented at the open meetings on November 12 and 13. Design ideas will continue to be brought to this group for review.