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Executive Summary

A neighborhood public library provides residents with resources that can be used to enhance educational levels, connect with fellow citizens, foster personal interests and enjoy safe meeting spaces. But unfortunately, Chinatown, a dense and vibrant ethnic community in the heart of the city, does not have its own branch of The Boston Public Library (BPL).

Since Chinatown’s residents cannot enjoy the privileges of a neighborhood branch as easily as other Bostonians, the Chinese Progressive Association (CPA), a community advocacy organization, initiated an advocacy campaign to bring a library back to Chinatown.

The CPA has worked for four years to campaign for a library. In its efforts, the CPA first identified the need for a library and the desire among residents to have their own branch. Next, the CPA investigated the political processes that characterize the approval of a library by the city. And finally, the CPA solidified support for a library among organizations within Chinatown that desire one.

Despite all the work done by the CPA thus far, the campaign for a library is still in its initial phases. The CPA partnered with a UEP Field Projects Team and as consultants, we worked with Lawrence Joe, its Youth Coordinator and Lydia Lowe, its Executive Director. In concert with Lawrence and Lydia, our team developed a research scope that would help the CPA to better understand the critical components of the library-building process.

Our team conducted research on the political, budgetary and physical developments that occur when libraries get built. The Boston investigation was based on how the projects in Allston and Mattapan, the two most recent additions to the Boston Public Library system, got approved. Information from these local case studies was augmented by an examination of how other Chinatown neighborhoods in the U.S. were able to build libraries.
An analysis of the Boston library approval process reveals that the support of a neighborhood’s city councilor and the Boston mayor in favor of a library project are essential prerequisites to getting a library built. Another critical factor is steady, strong advocacy on the part of the neighborhood library activists. Based on our evaluation of the library-building process, we deliver recommendations that will help the CPA streamline and focus its advocacy efforts for the reinstatement of a library in Chinatown.

The recommendations delivered in this report are as follows:

1) Develop a 10-year advocacy plan which will provide an organizing strategy for the CPA’s library campaign efforts. Such a plan should include short-term and long-term advocacy milestones which can be categorized under the following approaches:
   a. Political Advocacy
   b. Institutional Advocacy
   c. Community Advocacy
   d. Media and Marketing

2) Assign existing members and recruit new members to carry out elements of the advocacy plan.
Role of Field Projects Team
The Chinese Progressive Association and the Chinese Youth Initiative have identified Chinatown’s need and desire to have a Boston Public Library branch reopened within its neighborhood. After four years of campaigning efforts, the CPA solicited support from a UEP Field Projects Team. In the capacity as consultants for the CPA, the Field Projects team is delivering a report based on qualitative and quantitative research of the political, budgetary and physical processes that recent Boston communities, along with Chinatowns in other metropolitan areas, have used to build a public library.

Project Goal
The goal of the project was to research the steps involved in developing a library in the City of Boston and nationwide in order to provide the CPA with knowledge that will inform and support their future library campaign efforts.

Project Methodology
Phase 1: Project Definition and Client-Team Communication
The Field Projects team worked with the CPA to define the scope of work and project goal. The CPA decided to have the team devote their time to researching the two most recent successful library campaigns in Boston as well as the development of libraries in other major metropolitan Chinatowns. Furthermore, they were interested in knowing what the minimum size of a library Chinatown would be.

We developed a schedule of times to meet with the CPA in addition to a work chart (see appendix B). In these meetings we discussed our latest research findings. This created an open line of communication and allowed us to incorporate our client’s feedback into the project.

Phase 2: Qualitative and Quantitative Research
Research focused on the political, budgetary and physical steps Boston neighborhoods and other Chinatown communities in major metropolitan areas took to build a public
library. We conducted interviews with a range of individuals involved in the library-building process; analyzed data generated from Geographic Information Systems (GIS), 2000 US Census, Boston Redevelopment Agency (BRA) studies; and researched the physical planning of libraries based on spatial design standards.
History and Context

Chinatown Then and Now

Two developments in United States history led to Chinese immigrants populating Boston. The first was the anti-Chinese sentiment that began to emerge in California in the 1860s. Chinese people became victims in race riots and began to lose legal status, such as when the California Supreme Court banned the Chinese, including other minorities, from testifying in court. The hostile Californian environment, coupled with the next development — the completion of the transcontinental railroad — meant that Chinese people could migrate to eastern cities and find employment in the booming industrial economy.

Boston’s first Chinatown was located in a small area delineated by Essex, Harrison and Oxford Streets. Chinatown quickly expanded to include a six block area around this settlement. In 1882, however, any further expansion was halted by the federal government, which passed the first of four “Chinese Exclusion Laws.” These laws banned Chinese immigration and required that all Chinese carry proof of residency. Failure of any Chinese to show residential proof to authorities could result in deportation. These laws were in effect until 1941 when the start of World War II created a demand for more laborers, leading the federal government to allow the resumption of Asian immigration.

Expansion of Boston’s Chinatown gained momentum in the 1960s. The Immigration Reform of 1965 allowed more Chinese immigrants to enter the United States from Asia and become reunited with family members in Boston.

Boston Chinatown’s built environment has undergone radical changes throughout its history. During the Great Depression, nearly a third of the neighborhood’s housing stock was destroyed because owners found it less expensive to destroy buildings rather than to pay taxes on property that was of little financial value. Several developments since the Great Depression have greatly reduced the land area available for Chinatown residents to live and work. First, the construction of two major highway projects, Boston’s Central Artery and the Massachusetts Turnpike Extension, displaced over 300 families and
reduced the land area of Chinatown significantly. Second, the expansion of Tufts University and the New England Medical Center further limited land area available to residents.¹

While Chinatown’s physical space has been reduced, an increasing population, in which the Asian population of Boston has more than doubled in size since 1980, further limits the provision of services such as affordable housing, education, economic opportunity and open space. Furthermore, Chinatown residents face several internal challenges, including low levels of education, income and English language proficiency.

At present, Chinatown’s residents are working hard to assert control over the direction of land development as gentrification is threatening the neighborhood’s residents and businesses. Land development in Chinatown is booming due to its high property values, proximity to the downtown, convenience to MBTA bus and subway lines and real estate marketing of it as the new, hip neighborhood in which to live. Additionally, the depression of the Central Artery is rendering land available that is being competed over by developers. High-rent office space threatens the affordability of the commercial space occupied by Chinatown’s business owners and the availability of affordable housing units is severely lacking. Despite an estimated waiting list of 15 years for affordable units at Tai Tung Village, less than 300 new affordable housing units have been added to the Chinatown housing stock over the last twenty years.²

In light of the development pressures and the challenges specific to Chinatown including low education levels and English language proficiency, community advocacy groups must work very hard to engage a significant portion of the Chinatown public to participate in the development of their community space.
**Chinese Progressive Association**

The Chinese Progressive Association (CPA) is one such community advocacy group whose mission is to empower Chinatown’s residents. The CPA was founded in 1977 out of a series of community organizing campaigns. Parental input into the school desegregation process and community control over land development were some of the events that inspired the CPA’s formation. The CPA’s members are predominantly Chinese immigrants and Chinese-speaking residents; and most are workers in low-wage industries, working families and/or low-income elderly.

The CPA has led and is currently leading diversified campaigns to tackle Chinatown’s challenges. It runs workshops and projects which address adult education, workers’ rights, democratic participation, transportation, and land-use planning and environmental issues, among others. The CPA strives to enhance the community’s health, safety and progress by empowering Chinese residents to stand up for their own welfare.

One of the CPA’s most recent successful community organizing campaigns has been the battle over Parcel C. Development on Parcel C was once slated for a hospital parking garage, but due to the efforts of numerous community activists, the CPA among them, Parcel C will now be preserved for community development. It will house a mixed-income project called the Metropolitan Project, with office space, community exhibition space, and meeting rooms. As a result of its capital campaign efforts to raise $1.5 million, the CPA was able to purchase its office headquarters at the Metropolitan in 2005. The organizing efforts of the CPA were integral to the Chinatown community retaining influence over the development of Parcel C.
Metropolitan Project/Parcel C Timeline:

1968: Chinatown community organizes and saves buildings at 34-36 Oak Street (now part of the Metropolitan parcel) from demolition, later renovated and used by the Quincy School Community Council (QSCC).

1985: CPA, QSCC and other organizations protest a proposal to build a hospital parking garage on Parcel C, adjacent to the Oak Street buildings and tot lot.

1987: CPA, QSCC and others organize against a second 800-car parking garage proposal for Parcel C and to claim 34-36 Oak Street. The City of Boston turns over 34-36 Oak Street to the community for $1.

1990: The City of Boston’s 1990 Chinatown Community Plan designates Parcel C for development of a community center by CPA and five other agencies. The project is never realized due to lack of financing.

1993: CPA leads third and final 18-month organizing campaign to oppose another hospital parking garage, organizing a community referendum in which 1,692 people vote against the garage. Parcel C is preserved for community development.

1998: CPA organizes residents for a strong voice in development of the Parcel C vision, calling for a mixed-income project with an open courtyard, a large multi-function room and non-profit space to fulfill the community center vision.

2002: Metropolitan project breaks ground on Parcel C.

2005: CPA purchases its permanent home at the Metropolitan. 1
Chinatown Library History

Chinatown is one of the few neighborhoods in Boston without its own public library branch and the CPA has initiated the push to bring a library back to Chinatown. Currently, Chinatown residents must commute about 1.5 miles to either to the Boston Public Library’s (BPL) main Copley branch or to the South End branch.

The old Chinatown library was located at 130 Tyler Street and first opened on January 6, 1896. Library members were of Syrian, Greek, Jewish, Italian, Polish, French, Spanish, German and Chinese descent. The library had two rooms; one Reference Room and another Adult Room. The Adult Room had a special collection of foreign books in Arabic, Yiddish, Greek, Italian and French, in addition to books on U. S. Citizenship. ³

The library’s collection included several hundred volumes of children's literature and a large number of "easy English" books. To address unemployment, there were also non-fiction books that members could study to help them qualify for better jobs. The library hosted a ‘Story Hour’ for children, as well as essay contests, concerts, recitals and community meetings.⁴

The Tyler Street branch served the community for just over forty years and was closed in July, 1938. Over 200 school children, carrying placards reading ‘No Library-No School’ and ‘Closed Library-Closed Minds’, protested its closing. Not until 1951 did the city respond to the community’s demands. Mayor John B. Hynes announced the reopening of the Tyler Street library on December 7, 1951 and it served as a reading room for five years. ⁵

There are conflicting testimonies from Chinatown residents about the reason behind the destruction of the building that housed the Chinatown Library. Some attest that the library was closed in 1956 and the building demolished to accommodate the Central Artery road construction. Others believe that the reason was to make room for the building of Tai Tung Village, a housing complex, because it stands there now.
The confusion among the residents may be because the lot the library stood on was originally slated for the Central Artery but since the Tai Tung Village now occupies the site, it is unknown for what project the city initially knocked it down.

In the years after its closing, bookmobiles served the community for a short time. The bookmobile was a small van that came to Chinatown once a week. Bookmobiles were shared with other Boston neighborhoods and this service later stopped as well.

The Tyler Street Branch Library in Chinatown which was permanently closed in 1956.
CPA’s Library Campaign

In 2001, the Chinese Progressive Association renewed the fight to get a library to Chinatown. The Chinese Youth Initiative (CYI), a program the CPA runs to engage youth in learning organizing and leadership skills, spearheaded the library campaign. First, the CYI solidified the need for a library by listing reasons for a library to be reestablished in Chinatown; these included: community meeting space, resources for student study and a nearby facility for the neighborhood’s elderly residents. When the CYI surveyed 301 residents about their desire for a library, the results were overwhelmingly supportive—only one respondent did not desire a library.

Next, the CYI contacted Bernie Margolis, the president of the BPL and asked him for advice on how to get a library to Chinatown. Finally, the Chinese Youth Initiative held a meeting in September 2001. This initial kickoff meeting for the library committee was attended by 4 agencies, the Asian American Civic Association, Tufts University, Asian Community Development Corporation and the Chinese Progressive Association (in addition to the Chinese Youth Initiative). The committee was formed in order to generate more publicity and to begin the work necessary to bring a library back to Chinatown.

A timeline of the activities of the Chinatown Library Campaign, detailed by Lawrence Joe, the CPA’s Youth Coordinator, follows on the next several pages.
Chinese Youth Initiative’s Library Campaign Efforts

Summer 2001  CYI surveyed 331 residents of Boston (56% of whom were Chinatown residents) about the idea of bringing a library to the neighborhood. The results of the survey were overwhelmingly supportive. All but one respondent wanted a library in Chinatown.

September 27, 2001  First Library Committee meeting (attendees: Anita and Adam Smith – Sampan, David Hendrickson – Tufts University, Stephanie Fan – Chinese Historical Society, Jeremy Liu – Asian Community Development Corporation, Karen Chen and Amy Leung – CPA, Julie Wong – CYI). It was decided that this group should meet every month to plan the actions for the library campaign.

October 31, 2001  Meeting with Bernie Margolis, President of Boston Public Library.
- mentioned that the Boston Public Library used to run a multilingual library in Castle Square (one example of a branch in a private space).
- helped to outline the process of getting a new library.

November 15, 2001  Presentation by the Library Committee to The Chinatown Coalition (TCC), a coalition of Chinatown agencies that meet every month to share information and resources. The presentation at the TCC helped to spread the word about the library campaign to different community agencies in Chinatown.

November 15, 2001  The Library Committee began talking about the possibility of temporary library space to offer weekend library services. The committee brought up the question of temporary space as a discussion item so that they would know how to react if such an opportunity should arise. This was discussed within the committee.

November 19, 2001  Presentation by the Library Committee to the Chinatown Neighborhood Council.

(The Chinatown Neighborhood Council is significant because at the time, it was recognized as the neighborhood entity through which decisions about what happened in Chinatown got made. Currently, there are two neighborhood bodies that are recognized in Chinatown for this purpose: the Chinatown Neighborhood Council and the Chinatown Residents Association.)
January 22, 2002  Meeting with Katherine Dibble, Director of Public Services at BPL, about bringing temporary library services to Chinatown.

January 31, 2002  Meeting with Councilor Charles Yancey who said that CYI should contact Councilor Kelly (due to jurisdiction and protocol).
- Councilor Yancey said that the Chinatown Library Campaign will need the support of other councilors.
- The Mayor can veto a loan authorization/loan order.
- Discussed the progress/history of Allston and Mattapan Library branches.

February 25, 2002  Meeting with Councilor Kelly.
- Kelly said that he is working with Margolis so he’s familiar with the Capital Budget and the long list of requests Margolis has.
- Suggested maybe two steps: (1) temporary space until the economy improves, (2) look for permanent building.
- Said that he would get maps of Precincts 7 and 8 to help the Library Committee identify potential sites.
- Mentioned that the BRA has given development rights to the Tyler Street parcel to AACA/Kwong Kow and that they are open to combining a library.

April 3, 2002  Meeting with Katherine Dibble.
- Dibble interested in getting temporary services and in getting families to go to existing branches – making the branches and activities more culturally accessible/appropriate.

April 9, 2002  Meeting with Carla Richards from Senator Wilkerson’s office to let Carla know what has been happening in the Library Committee.

April 19, 2002  SAMPAN published article spotlighting the Library Campaign.

May 11, 2002  The Chinatown Library Committee sponsored a field trip to the South End and Allston-Brighton branch libraries for members of the Chinatown community to tour the facilities, explore potential library services and develop ideas about future Chinatown library possibilities. 26 people went on the field trip.

May 20, 2002  Q&A about Chinatown Library Campaign w/Boston Chinatown Neighborhood Center students.

August 16, 2002  Storytelling event with activities for children and their parents at Mass Pike Towers Community Room on Saturday, August 24 from 11-1pm.
December 12, 2002  Sent Bernie Margolis a letter asking him to submit an application for planning and design funds from the Massachusetts Public Library Construction Program.

January 6, 2003  Bernie Margolis sent a letter responding by saying that “Applications cannot be submitted for funds under the Public Library Construction Program until those projects are a part of the City’s Capital Budget Plan and have received approval of the Mayor and City Council.”

January 27, 2003  Trip to Boston Public Library’s Higher Education Information Center (unfortunately not many Chinatown youth could attend; mostly just CYI).

March 14, 2003  Meeting with Bernie Margolis and Katherine Dibble
- Usually a library proposal is rejected first (by mayor?), then the city councilors. Negotiate with the mayor to get some of the budget set aside for “planning and design.”
- First, a potential Chinatown library would need to get into the Capital Budget (vs. Operating budget) with the City first before applying for the construction grant.
- The Library Committee needs to lobby the City Council because they have the power to accept/reject budgets.

March 27, 2003  Meeting with Alice Hennessey, who works with the Mayor on Special Projects, including libraries. Alice worked with the Mayor on the last demographic study of Boston libraries needed (Hyde Park, Allston, Upham’s Corner); also, helped to bring addition to West Roxbury branch.
- Suggested renaming group to “Friends of the Chinatown Public Library.”
- Suggested that committee start looking for space – this might enhance our chances of getting funded by the city if the community has a piece of land.

March 31, 2003  Sent out endorsement letters requesting people’s support in bringing a Chinatown Library back to the community.

September 2003  Chinatown Library Campaign hosted a booth at the Oak Street Fair to build visibility and support around Library Campaign.

May 2005  Currently, the CYI is conducting a ‘Postcard Campaign’ to generate more publicity. The youth are soliciting signatures from community members on postcards that support a library. They plan to mail these postcards to Mayor Menino’s office to illustrate how much the community desires a library.
Additionally, the CYI plans to give a presentation about the Library Campaign to City Councilor Kelly in the next few months.

*A library campaign flyer developed by the Chinese Progressive Association.*
Chinatown Libraries: Models and Experiences

From the 1960s through the 1980s, Chinatown communities in the U.S. witnessed dramatic demographic, educational, socio-economic and cultural changes due to a series of national policies and international events: the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 was followed by increasing numbers of immigrants from Hong Kong and China; the 1974 Supreme Court decision of *Lau v. Nichols* ruled that school districts have to accommodate the needs of limited English speakers; the end of the Vietnam War in 1975 resulted in massive migration of Southeast Asian refugees into the country; and the normalization of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and China in 1979 ushered in a new flow of immigrants.6

Under these circumstances, community activists in Chinatowns nationwide worked to accommodate their community’s growing needs in the areas of English literacy, acculturation, cultural identity, education, and information access. Thus, the need for public community libraries was prioritized by Chinatown communities so as to revitalize and better serve the community.
The initiative of building a public library branch in Los Angeles’ Chinatown was launched in 1971 by a resident professional librarian and a social worker. The initiative encountered challenges when the Los Angeles Public Library administration suggested a site that was too small for a library branch. The initiators persisted, mobilized the whole community, and formed a Chinatown Library Ad Hoc Committee. The committee, with supporters from Chinatown and the greater Los Angeles area, was critical to the establishment of the Chinatown Library. It enabled the initiative to reach out to the broader community and recruit a key player in the building of the Chinatown Library—Dr. William Chun-Hoon, principal of the local Castelar School.

The committee and the school agreed to convert an old, vacant school auditorium into a new public library to serve both the community and the school and the idea gained broad support from the school district, public library system, and the city. At the dedication ceremony on February 7, 1977, the Mayor called this inventive “a first breakthrough and represents the first such joint sharing of school and public library facilities in Southern California.”

Another milestone in this process is that the “Friends of the Chinatown Library” was organized in 1976 to better implement and coordinate the library initiative, and it was incorporated in 1977 as a 501(c)(3) non-profit community support group for the Chinatown Branch Library. As demand grew for Chinese library services, the Chinatown Branch Library experienced two expansions in the 1980s, which added a total of 11,812 square feet to the original 2,600 square feet. The 1998 city election allowed residents to vote for the designation of a 12,500 square feet site for a new, stand-alone Chinatown Branch Library.
The Chinatown Branch of the Los Angeles Public Library system.

The Chinatown Branch Library is one of the largest and the second busiest branch in the Los Angeles Public Library system, with the largest collection of Chinese language and Chinese heritage materials in the system. The library offers a wide range of programs such as English Conversation Center, Grandpa and Books, and Homework Center and the Friends of the Chinatown Library has provided $192,000 in college scholarships.

This library initiative was made possible through a creative partnership between a community and a local school. By developing a relationship for the mutual benefit of the local school and the community, the two entities were able to establish a library for the community, thereby contributing to the vitality of the community's culture, raising student achievement, and serving as a model for Chinatown communities nationwide.
The Oakland Model: The Power of Federal Grants

The Asian Branch Library in Oakland, California was founded in 1975 with the support of a Federal Library Services Construction Act grant. When the grant ended in 1978, the Oakland Public Library continued funding the branch and it was moved from its original location to the Main Library. In 1980, a Federal grant enabled the Asian Branch to move into its own building. The current location of the library opened to the public in 1995.

Oakland’s Asian Branch Library is unique among public library branches as it houses eight Asian languages (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Thai, Cambodian, Tagalog and Laotian) in major reference titles and general subject titles, an Asian Studies collection and an in-depth Asian American collection in English. Non-English holdings comprise 70% of the total library collection which has approximately 70,000 books, CDs, videos, DVDs, VCDs, magazines and newspapers.
The San Francisco Experience: Community Efforts for Community Good

The San Francisco Chinatown Branch Library was originally named the North Beach Branch and built in 1921 by architect G. Albert Lansburgh with a $67,589 Carnegie grant. The branch name was changed in 1958 to more accurately reflect the community it serves. In the early 1980s, Community Block Development Grant funds were used to create a community garden behind the branch. In 1991, a major renovation and expansion project was launched with the support of public and private funds and the branch was expanded to twice its original size. The Grand Reopening of the Chinatown Branch Library was held on June 15, 1996.

The San Francisco Chinatown Branch has a large Chinese language collection along with a medium-sized Vietnamese language collection. There is also a large Asian interest collection in English. The branch maintains a Chinatown history clipping file which includes pamphlets, newspapers and magazine articles of interest to the Asian-American community.

The Chinatown Branch of the San Francisco Public Library system.
Boston Library Case Studies

There are 25 branches in the Boston Public Library (BPL) system. Allston and Mattapan were selected for in-depth study based on the fact that they were the most recently approved for building a new branch and have comparable demographics with Chinatown.

Each case study is organized in the following order: Neighborhood Profile, History of the Library, Important Dates Timeline, The Role of the Community, The Role of Local Government, Planning and Implementation.
Allston Library Case Study

Neighborhood Profile

Allston is officially recognized as a neighborhood of Boston in conjunction with Brighton, and is therefore generally referred to as Allston-Brighton. The 2000 Census calculated the Allston-Brighton population at approximately 70,000. Approximately 70% of the neighborhood’s population is classified as White (not Hispanic) and the remaining 30% is comprised of Asian, Hispanic, Russian and Brazilian immigrants.8

The 1990s witnessed significant growth of the Asian and Hispanic populations. Interestingly, Asians make up 14% of Allston-Brighton’s population, the majority of whom, 54%, are of Chinese origin. From 1990 to 2000, Allston-Brighton’s Chinese population grew by 21.7%, from 4,245 to 5,167.9

![Racial Composition Chart]

Source: 2000 BRA Census Report

Sixty percent of the Allston-Brighton population is 22-49 years old and an additional 13% of the population ranges from 18-21. This is due to the large number of students and young professionals living in the neighborhood due their association with the numerous area educational institutions such as Boston University, Boston College, and Harvard University.

The combination of high numbers of students and immigrants contributes to the higher poverty rate of the neighborhood relative to the city of Boston. According the 2000
Census, 23% of the Allston-Brighton residents experienced poverty compared with the average of 19.5% for all of Boston.\textsuperscript{10}

Allston specifically is characterized as being home to a large numbers of Indochinese, Russian, Hispanic, and Brazilian immigrants. The neighborhood has more than 2,000 children under the age of 15 who found it difficult to reach the library branches in Brighton Center and Oak Square after the Allston library was shut down in 1981.\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{education_levels.png}
\caption{Education Levels}
\end{figure}

\textit{Source: 2000 BRA Census Report}

\textbf{History of Allston’s Library}

The Allston library branch operated as a full-service Boston Public Library branch in rented space from 1924 until 1981, when it was closed down due to budget cuts.

Since the closing of the branch in 1981, residents and representatives appealed for years for the reinstatement of a library without success. In 1984, Brian McLaughlin, who had picketed at the main BPL Copley Square building to protest the closing of the library in 1981, was elected to the City Council where he advocated consistently for a library in Allston. In 1992, he called for a $3.5 million bond issue by the city to fund construction of a branch library as well as greater local educational institutional support through payments in lieu of taxes (i.e. from Boston College, Boston University and Harvard University).
It was not until 1994, when newly elected Mayor Thomas Menino publicly supported building a library in Allston, that the neighborhood's appeal was recognized by the city administration. Menino, who had served on the City Council with McLaughlin, declared his commitment to set aside funding in the city's capital and operational budget.

It took another three years for the mayor to include the cost of building a library in the city's capital budget and in 1997, he published a 5-year capital plan which amounted to $1.2 billion spending on capital projects, including $3.5 million to build a library in Allston. From that point on, the process moved relatively quickly, with land being obtained through a land swap (with a private developer later revealed to be representing Harvard University) in 1997, groundbreaking happening in 2000 and the library's opening in June, 2001.

The library is now the busiest branch in the city and the due to the growing number of Asian immigrants in Allston, the library's Asian language collection has been increased to meet the needs of the diverse community.\(^{12}\)

### Honan-Allston Library Features
- 20,000 square feet
- 50,000 books, magazines and videos
- Courtyard gardens
- Space for leisure reading
- Research area
- 19 Internet-connected computers (first BPL with wireless technology)
- Community room for civic meetings

### Library Building Cost
- $6.5 million
Important Dates in the History of the Allston Branch Library and the Development of the Honan-Allston Library

1889  Allston’s library service begins in a delivery station in Frank Howe’s drugstore at 26 Franklin Street.

1905  Allston Reading Room at 354 Cambridge Street is opened in response to increased demand for books.

1924  Allston branch becomes full-service branch of the Boston Public Library.

1981  Allston library branch, which operated in rented space, is closed due to Proposition 2 1/2 budget cuts.

1984  Brian McLaughlin is elected to the City Council where he champions the cause of a library in Allston. McLaughlin picketed at the main BPL Copley Square building to protest the closing of the library in 1981.

1992  Allston-Brighton City Councilor Brian McLaughlin calls for $3.5 million bond issue to fund construction of branch library and local educational institutional support through payments in lieu of taxes.

1992  Boston Globe editorial (December 24, 1992) expresses need and support for building a library in Allston.

1993  Thomas Menino is elected Mayor on November 2. Menino served as Hyde Park's City Councilor alongside Brian McLaughlin.

1994  Mayor Thomas Menino promises a new branch for Allston and funds are designated for design and construction in the capital budget.
1995  Boston Globe editorial (March 2, 1995) calls for Allston’s “immediate need” for a public library branch.

1997  1/2 acre library site is secured through negotiated land swap between Menino Administration and developer Robert Beal, later revealed to have been representing Harvard University. The 57,000-square-foot parcel at 308 North Harvard Street is earmarked as the site for a library.

1997  Mayor Menino publishes 5-year capital plan which amounts to $1.2 billion spending on capital projects, including $3.5 million to build a library in Allston.

1998  Allston branch library design is developed in partnership between the Department of Neighborhood Development, the Boston Public Library, a Library Advisory Committee appointed by the Mayor (includes City Councilor Brian McLaughlin and Allston residents), and architects Machado and Silvetti Associates, Inc.

1999  Library design is presented to community and eventually approved after alteration of initial exterior design.


   Boston Globe editorial (January 21, 2000) praises Mayor Menino’s administration for its commitment to building and improving libraries and library services, highlighting the Allston library groundbreaking.

2001  Allston Branch is officially opened to the public on June 16, 2001.

   Boston Globe editorial (June 16, 2001) compliments Mayor Menino’s support of branch libraries and criticizes BPL President Bernard Margolis for his lack of focus on library branches.
2001  Harvard donates $25,000 for library collection.


The Honan-Allston Library was opened to the public on June 16, 2001.
The Role of the Community

The 2002 Allston-Brighton Community Needs & Assets Assessment Report published by the Allston-Brighton Healthy Boston Coalition cites that “both residents and elected officials commented on the fact that the area is not seen as a ‘voting district.’ Because of this, there is a perception that Allston-Brighton is ignored by City government, and that it does not carry the political clout of other neighborhoods in the city.”

The report clearly illustrates the significantly low voter turnout of the neighborhood. In the November 6, 2001 City of Boston election, in which the offices of the Mayor, Citywide and District City Council were elected, Allston-Brighton, alongside the Fenway neighborhood, produced the lowest voter turnout of 26% of neighborhood residents. In addition, a voter registration rate of 50% of the total Allston-Brighton population is of particular concern to community leaders, especially when compared to those few Boston neighborhoods with registration over 70% of the total eligible population (i.e. West Roxbury/Roslindale). Such low voter turnout reflects the transient nature of Allston-Brighton and large immigrant and student populations.

Such a sense of under-representation and inability to leverage the city’s political support may have contributed to the lack of response on the part of the city to appeals of residents and representatives to reinstate a library in Allston after its closing in 1981.

The interviews with Nancy Grilk, currently the Mayor’s Cabinet Chief of Environmental Services and former aide to City Councilor Brian McLaughlin, and Paul Berkeley highlighted that while there was "a lot of talk" among residents and consistent demand at community meetings for a return of a library from the community, there was no organized community lobbying for a library.

"Once it got some momentum, people rallied around," Berkeley said. Over 70 residents turned out to see the proposed design of the library and there was active participation in finalizing the design.
The Role of Local Government

The neighborhood’s perceived lack of political clout highlights the instrumental roles City Councilor Brian McLaughlin and Mayor Menino played in ultimately getting a library built in Allston.

Paul Berkeley, President of the Allston Civic Association, a grassroots community organization and Allston resident for 55 years, emphasized Brian McLaughlin's instrumental role, "I give a lot of credit to Brian McLaughlin, he really made it happen… I tip my hat to him. There was a lot of talk among residents, but he was leading the charge. He is a great reader himself and really wanted a library."

Berkeley also noted McLaughlin and Menino's close relationship as city councilors and suggested that McLaughlin most likely solicited Menino's support for a library before he was elected mayor in 1993.

Finally, Berkeley noted the significance of what new library means for a mayor: "Any mayor would like to have his name on a library. That plaque is always going to be there, saying it was (Menino) who built it. It's a great legacy to have."

Planning and Implementation

In 1994, one year after his election, Mayor Menino publicly stated his support for a new branch in Allston. And while funds for the design and construction of a library were designated in the capital budget in 1995, a significant challenge lay in identifying a suitable site. There was discussion of buying a suitable parcel of land and possibilities included locating it on Harvard Avenue, or in the retail space adjacent to I-90 which currently sites Stop & Shop. A 1995 Globe editorial argued for accelerating the process of identifying a suitable site for the library as a keystone of neighborhood revitalization efforts and suggested the Allston VFW Post on Cambridge Street.

In 1997, Menino published a 5-year capital plan that included $3.5 million to build a library in Allston and the challenge of where to locate the library persisted. Furthermore,
in 1997, a 1/2 acre library site is secured through a negotiated land swap between Menino Administration and developer Robert Beal, later revealed to have been representing Harvard University. The 57,000-square-foot parcel at 308 North Harvard Street was earmarked as the site for a library.

At the time of the land swap in 1997, the Menino Administration was not aware that Harvard was giving the parcel of land in exchange for a piece of property that signified a key access point for other parcels they had procured through Beal. In 1998, Harvard University revealed that it had owned the parcel of land that was given to the city for a library. A complicated series of events unfolded between Harvard University and the City of Boston when it was revealed that the university had secretly procured 52 acres in Allston through Beal, resulting in a commitment from the university to develop an institutional plan with a community process component.

Interviews provided conflicting information about the library site and how it came to be given to the city. In an interview with Nancy Grilk, she said, “I believe the mayor just asked the president of Harvard for the land.” However, Paul Berkeley, Allston Civic Association, stated, "It was not a donation. Beal (developers) owned the property when it was given to the city.” He noted that it was given as a part of land swap, so that it could not be considered a donation. (Ultimately, the land is referred to as a "donation" by Harvard University on the library's website.)

In February 1998, it was announced that the 57,000 square foot parcel at 308 North Harvard Street would serve to locate the Allston library. Once the land was identified, Mayor Menino appointed a Library Advisory Committee. The committee comprised of Brian McLaughlin and Nancy Grilk, residents of Allston including Paul Berkeley, and members of different city agencies including the Boston Public Library and the Department of Neighborhood Development. The committee worked with the architectural firm, Machado and Silvetti Associates, Inc. to develop a library design that would meet community needs while fitting budgetary constraints.
While the committee originally hoped to design a two-story building, the cost factor limited the design to one story. After going through a community process and obtaining majority approval for both the interior and exterior building design, ground was broken for the library on January 19, 2000.
Mattapan Case Study

Neighborhood Profile

Boston’s Mattapan neighborhood is located on the southern edge of Boston. The neighborhood was once a part of Dorchester until the city annexed Mattapan in 1870. The Mattapan Neighborhood became known as one of Boston’s “streetcar suburbs” during the 1900s, consisting primarily of a residential mix of public housing, small apartment buildings, single homes and two and three family homes.14

The 2000 Census provides the following Mattapan demographics: 37,371 residents, its median income is $32,749 ($6,880 less than Boston) and its poverty rate is 22.3% (2.8% higher than Boston’s average). Over 80% of the neighborhood’s population is African American or Black and 12.2% of Mattapan’s are Hispanic or Latino.

Since the opening of its first branch library in 1931, Mattapan’s community has changed considerably. A 2001 Boston Globe editorial stated that Mattapan has become home to the largest Haitian population in Boston. Additionally, it is one of the fastest growing neighborhoods in Boston with one of the largest youth populations.

Mattapan’s education levels are overall lower in comparison with the City of Boston: 32% of residents graduated from high school with no further education; 8.5% of
residents received a bachelor’s degree at 8.5% (in comparison with 20.2% for Boston); and 4.7% of residents attained a graduate, professional degree or more.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{education_levels.png}
\caption{Education Levels}
\end{figure}

\textit{Source: 2000 BRA Census Report.}

\textbf{History of Mattapan’s Library}

The community drive for a library was officially launched on December 18, 1849 when Increase S. Smith founded the Mattapan Library Association. Over the next 41 years, the Mattapan branch evolved into a reading room attached to the delivery station in the Oakland Hall Building with a book collection of 98 volumes. From 1924 to 1926, the annual circulation grew significantly—from 20,000 volumes to 75,010. In 1923, the reading room was granted branch status and integrated into the Boston Public Library system.\textsuperscript{16}

As demand for library services grew in correspondence with the growing population, Mattapan residents requested a new library in 1926.\textsuperscript{17} As more and more citizens wrote letters and signed petitions, the community activism paid off and the present branch was opened on June 22, 1931. The Mattapan Library continues to be located at 10 Hazelton Street.
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Important Dates in the History of the Mattapan Branch Library and the Development of a New Branch

1849  Community support for a library is mobilized.

1923  Reading room with limited resources opened and is granted branch library status.

1924-26  Book circulation grows from 20,000 to 75,010 leading to the growing demand for a new library.

1927-31  Citizens build greater support for a new library through letter writing and signed petitions.

1931  The new Mattapan Branch Library is opened to the public on June 22, 1931.

1980s  Growing community support for a new library.

1983  Mattapan community activist Charles Yancey is elected District 4’s City Councilor.

1983-1996  City Councilor Yancey advocates for community capital projects including a community center and new branch library.

1997  Loan-order authorization $10.2 million approved to build a new Mattapan Branch Library as a part of 1997 capital budget.

2001  Boston Globe editorial reports that Mayor Menino’s administration moves the project onto its priority capital spending list leading to the commissioning of the Mattapan Branch Library Program & Siting Study.
2002 Mattapan Branch Library Program and Siting Study is developed in partnership among city agencies, an Advisory Committee including Mattapan residents, and Schwartz/Silver Architects.

2004 City Councilor Yancey states in a Globe op-ed that Boston’s properties and construction management division renewed its site selection process for a new library.

2005 Mattapan Advisory Committee site selection meetings put on hold by the City of Boston.
The Role of the Community

A November 11, 2001 editorial in the Boston Globe noted that even Mayor Menino has stated publicly that the Mattapan branch is outdated and inadequate. It also noted that the existing branch is on a residential street with no off-street parking, is set back from a busy avenue and easy to miss, and is difficult to access using public transportation or on foot.18

Louis Elisa, Boston City Councilor Charles Yancey’s aide who is working on the development of the new Mattapan branch, noted that at the time of construction of the existing branch in 1936, the location met the needs of the community. However, Mattapan has evolved from a “streetcar suburb” into a densely populated community with a diverse ethnic fabric. Mattapan’s population has expanded immensely since 1936 and a now largely Haitian and Hispanic has a need for a new library that met their cultural needs.19

In the early 1980s, Mattapan residents overwhelmingly supported the initiative to work towards building a new library for the Mattapan neighborhood. However, no formalized library advocacy group was developed to lead the efforts during the 1980s and 1990s.20 Yet residents understood that a new branch library would greatly benefit the growing needs of the community, especially Mattapan’s children.

In an interview with Mattapan’s Director of Neighborhood Services, Lillie Searcy noted that during this time period, there were two community meetings that focused on the process of gaining community support for the construction of a new library.
While a structured Mattapan Branch Library advocacy group did not exist, Mattapan residents expressed their support in different community meetings and through the election and reelection of City Councilor Yancey.\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{The Role of Local Government}

City Councilor Yancey began his role as a community activist long before the Mattapan community elected him to office in 1983.\textsuperscript{22} Once elected, he worked to bring not only a new branch library to Mattapan, but also a community center and economic development plan. Councilor Yancey persisted through the difficult political climate of the 1980s and early 1990s. In 1997, he was able to create a window of opportunity by garnering the political support of four other Boston Councilors to block the passage of Mayor Menino’s Capital Budget in a five to four vote.\textsuperscript{23}

Councilor Yancey stated in an interview that his maneuver enabled him to ask for three additions to the Mayor’s capital budget:

1. Loan authorization for the construction of a new Mattapan branch library.
2. Loan authorization for the construction of a new Mattapan community center.
3. Development of and economic development plan for the Mattapan Community.

Mayor Menino agreed to these additions to the 1997 capital budget. The City Council subsequently approved Mayor Menino’s amended capital budget that included a loan authorization of $10.2 million dollars for the construction of a new Mattapan branch library.

\textbf{Planning and Implementation}

The construction of a library by the City of Boston is a multi-phase project that takes time. The changing state of the economy and the prioritization for other capital projects
impacts the rate at which the Mattapan Library project has moved forward since funding was approved in 1997. The 2001 Boston Globe editorial highlighted the fact that library projects are very time-consuming by noting that the new Mattapan library would be only the second library to be built in the last twenty years (after the Allston library).

Four years after the 1997 loan authorization, the administration of the City of Boston took the first step toward constructing a new library by commissioning a programming and siting study for the new Mattapan library. “The Office of the Mayor of the City of Boston, the City of Boston Department of Neighborhood Development (DND), The City of Boston Public Facilities (BPF) Department, and the Boston Public Library (BPL) initiated the study to establish a building program and select a site for a new library for the Mattapan neighborhood.”24 A Mattapan Advisory Committee (MAC) consisting of Councilor Charles Yancey and several dedicated members of the Mattapan community aided in the development of this study.

The 2002 Siting Analysis and Program Report Volume 1 was the first of a two-volume study. Volume 1 of the report focused on the Architectural Space Program and building systems requirements. As presented in the report, “the program defined the functions of individual spaces within the library, there sizes, components and relationships.”25 The study determined the gross building area for the library to be 20,748 square feet.

The completion of the study did not result in the establishment of a new site for the Mattapan Library. Volume 2 of the Programming and Siting Study will conduct a site analysis, develop conceptual building plans, and estimate the building cost. The City of Boston recommissioned Volume 2, the siting analysis portion of the study, in October 2004 and it has yet to be completed. The last two siting analysis meetings were canceled without explanation by Ms. Anderson of the City of Boston’s Public Facilities
department. Mr. Louisa noted that the cancellation of these meetings was not a part of the agreement in terms of the process for conducting Volume 2 of the study. Ms. Anderson did tell Mr. Louisa that the meetings would resume, however, a time for the next meeting has not been scheduled.²⁶

Proposed Mattapan Library Details

- 20,748 sq. ft.
- 43,785 books, magazines and videos
- Large meeting room for community meetings
- 15 public space computers
- Spaces for crafts programs
- Expansion of children, young adult and adult selections
Developing a Physical Vision for the Chinatown Library

This section of the report will provide the CPA with a general estimate of the Chinatown Library’s space needs. With this estimate, the CPA and supporters of the Chinatown Library Campaign will have a clear picture of the library they are fighting for.

In the field of public library planning, Anders C. Dahlgren’s *Public Library Space Needs: A Planning Outline* is one of the most authoritative guides. According to Dahlgren, library space needs are based on what a library must provide to meet community needs.\(^2\)

A public library contains six broad types of space, each with identifiable spatial requirements—collection space, reader seating space, staff work space, meeting space, special use space, and non-assignable space. This report will use Dahlgren’s methods to calculate the space needs of a Chinatown Library.

This section attempts to provide an estimate of Chinatown Library’s space needs to serve as a useful tool for the Chinatown library campaign. It is important to note that there are many factors that may affect library service projections and space needs which are beyond the scope of this project. This section neither presumes to produce an exhaustive estimate of space needs of a Chinatown library, nor serve as a detailed plan for the library. Detailed calculations are not included in this report, but the working formulas can be found in the Appendices section.
Overview of the Process

The process of estimating and calculating a public library space needs, based on Dahlgren's outline, involves the following three steps:

Step One: Identify Service Population

Identify the library’s projected service population, known as the design population, based on resident demographics and potential outside users from the surrounding area.

Step Two: Estimate the Six Types of Library Space Needs

1. Estimate the *collection inventory* the library will provide to meet future service requirements and calculate how much floor space is needed to house that projected inventory.

2. Estimate the *number of seats* the library will need to accommodate in-house use of the collection and how much floor space these seats will require.

3. Estimate the *number of staff workstations* that will be necessary to support the staff’s projected routines and how much floor space they will require.

4. Estimate the type and capacity of *meeting rooms* that the library will need and how much floor space these will require.

5. Calculate an allocation for *miscellaneous public- and staff-use space* (called special use space).

6. Calculate an allocation for vestibules, furnace rooms, rest rooms, and other types of *nonassignable space*. 
**Step Three: Compile Estimates to Calculate Gross Library Space Needs**

Assemble the estimates for the six types of space into an overall estimate of space need.

This process requires data collection that will support the estimation and calculation of space needs. Data was gathered through interviews with CPA staff and members of the Chinatown community, research of libraries in other Chinatowns and demographic information in the U.S. Census, and performing web-based research.
Calculating Boston Chinatown’s Public Library Space Needs

**Step One: Identify Service Population**

Physical planning for a library begins with determining the library’s design population. Knowing the design population helps library planners calculate several of the service parameters used to assess space needs.

There are two key factors to consider in establishing the design population for Chinatown library. First, the design population should take into account the fact that the typical Chinatown library serves an area that extends beyond the boundaries of the Chinatown and that may include a broader Asian community in Boston area. Secondly, since the library will be an important capital investment for the Chinatown community, it is crucial that it is planned to respond to current and future needs. Specifically, the design population should also include a projected population increase in the library’s service area.

**Boston’s Chinatown Demographics**

The Boston Redevelopment Authority defines Chinatown as a 42-acre neighborhood. Chinatown is a community largely comprised of people of Asian descent, the majority of who are from China. According to the 2000 census, the population in Chinatown was 5,500. Based on interviews with CPA staff, the Chinatown population has remained almost unchanged since 2000, and the current population is about 5,500.

**Outside Users of Boston’s Chinatown Library**

Because of its unique characteristics such as large Asian and Chinese collections, the Chinatown Library will serve a broader Asian community in the Boston area. The estimate of outside users takes into account the fact that a Chinatown Library will serve
as an irreplaceable learning center for Boston’s Asian and Chinese community. Of course, the number of non-resident users will be smaller than the number of resident users.

Furthermore, unlike other Chinatowns, Boston’s Chinatown is adjacent to a number of world-class universities, such as Harvard University, that have library systems with relatively comprehensive Asian and Chinese collections. Therefore, it is appropriate to develop a conservative estimate of the number of the potential outside users.

With a consideration of all these factors and based on the GIS map of Boston’s Asian population below, it is estimated that the potential outside users of Boston’s Chinatown Library would be around 2,000.

**Estimate of the Design Population of Boston's Chinatown Library**

Based on Chinatown’s the current population and the estimated 2,000 potential outside users, the design population of users of the Chinatown Library are approximately 7,500. Furthermore, due to a potential population increase in the service area, the estimated design population is **about 8,000.**
Step Two: Estimate the Six Types of Library Space Needs (Based on the Design Population)

As defined by the Dahlgren’s Outline, the following six types of space constitute the common and basic needs of a public library. Calculating these types of space needs quantify by far the largest share of a library’s overall projected space needs.

1. Collection space:
Collection space is used for collections such as books, periodicals, nonprint and digital resources, and an estimated space need for Chinatown Library is about 3,400 sq.ft.
2. Reader seating space:

It is commonly recommended that a library should provide five reader seats for every 1,000 people in its service area. Meanwhile, planning manuals usually suggest allocating reader seating on a sliding scale, decreasing the number of seats provided per 1,000 populations as the total population increases. Dahlgren’s Outline recommends the following reader seating schedule based on a library’s design population. Therefore, since the designated population of Chinatown Library is 8,000, the library needs a total of about 62 reader seats, and a total of **about 1,800 sq.ft.** reader seating space.

Table 1: Reader Seating Schedule from Dahlgren’s *Public Library Space Needs: A Planning Outline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th>2,500</th>
<th>5,000</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>25,000</th>
<th>50,000</th>
<th>100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seats per 1,000 population</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total seats</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Staff workspace:

Staff workspace consists of workstations for checkout, book storing, check in and technical services. Based on formulas in the *Planning Outline* and interviews with CPA staff, the personnel need of Boston Chinatown Library is estimated equivalent to about 7 full-time employees. An estimate of the staff workspace need is **about 1,050 sq.ft.**

4. Meeting room space:

Many public libraries provide meeting rooms to accommodate library-sponsored programs and other community meetings. The number and size of meeting rooms should be determined by the library’s anticipated programming activities and by the availability of similar rooms elsewhere in the community.
There are four broad types of meeting room space commonly found in public libraries. General program space (with lecture hall or theatre seating), conference room space and children’s space are found in many libraries; and increasingly, libraries are choosing to provide dedicated space for a computer-training lab. Based on related needs of the Chinatown community, the library is estimated to be in need of a space of about 1,350 sq.ft. in total for these above-mentioned purposes and functions.

5. Special use space:
Special use space must be allotted for special types of equipment and furnishings, such as index tables, newspaper racks, pamphlet files, microfilm readers or photocopiers.

Typically, special use space accounts for about 10% of the gross area in a public library building. However, in specific cases, the allocation of special use space depends on the service programs a library desires to offer. Based on the 10% guideline, the library is estimated to be in need of special use space of about 1,100 sq.ft.

6. Non-assignable space:
Non-assignable space is the portion of a library’s floor space that supports the operation of the library and is not used directly for library service. Furnace rooms, janitorial closets, storage rooms, vestibules, corridors, stairwells, elevator shafts, and rest rooms are typical kinds of non-assignable space. The Chinatown Library is estimated to be in need of non-assignable space of about 2,000 sq.ft.

**Moderate and Minimum size for Boston Chinatown Library:**
Putting all the space needs above together while considering the fact that space in Chinatown is very limited, the minimum size for Chinatown library in Boston should
about 10,700 sq.ft. Meanwhile, in order to adequately and better serve the community, an estimated moderate size for Boston Chinatown Library is about 13,000 sq.ft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Types of Space Needs Estimates</th>
<th>Gross Library Space Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection space 3,400 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Total 10,700 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader seating space 1,800 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff work space 1,050 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting space 1,350 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special use space 1,100 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonassignable space 2,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum size: about 10,700 sq.ft
Moderate size: about 13,000 sq.ft.
Comparing the estimated size of Boston Chinatown Library with that of newly built libraries in Boston and libraries other Chinatowns in the U.S.

Comparing the Chinatown Library’s space needs with the newly built Allston Library and Mattapan Library’s space requirements demonstrates the unique nature of Boston’s Chinatown community. The comparison of Boston’s Chinatown Library with libraries in other Chinatowns will inform the readers of the regional differences and contexts of building a Chinatown library.

Table 2: Chinatown, Allston and Mattapan: population and library size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinatown</th>
<th>Mattapan</th>
<th>Allston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2000)</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>37,371</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (sq.ft.)</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>20,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Boston, Los Angeles, Chicago and San Francisco Chinatowns: population and library size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Population</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (sq.ft.)</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some potential unique features of a Chinatown library

1. **Chinese books and newspapers collection:** Since a Chinatown library will serve a large Chinese immigrant population, the quantity and quality of its collection in Chinese and about China largely determines how well it will serve the community.

2. **Bilingual librarian:** Given the demographic characteristics of Chinatown, a library should have one or more bilingual (English and Chinese) librarians in order to better serve the community.

3. **English program and after school program:** Given the fact that there is a relatively large foreign-born population in Chinatown and learning resources are limited in the community, the library aspires to act as the learning center for the neighborhood.

4. **Minimum opening hours per week:** A public library is usually open for a minimum of 25 hours per week; however, considering the special and high needs of the community, Chinatown Library needs to increase the minimum opening hours to about 50 hours per week.
Analysis and Conclusions

The following are the headings under which the analysis and conclusions are organized:

2. Two Tipping Points: Mayoral Support and Funding
3. Analytical Framework
4. Comparison of Allston and Mattapan Case Studies
5. Lessons for Chinatown: Challenges and Opportunities
6. Reasons to Be Encouraged


The Allston and Mattapan case studies reveal that the two communities undertook similar steps to build a new branch library. The critical steps involved in building a library in Boston can be synthesized into the following:

1. Identify why the community needs a library and develop a consistent message for its advocacy within and outside of the community.
2. Build community support with a “Friends of the Library Campaign.”
3. Advocate to the City Councilor and the Mayor for their support.
4. Advocate to the Mayor to designate funding for a new branch library in the City of Boston’s capital budget.
5. Look for and try to create “windows of opportunity” through grassroots advocacy and political or institutional leveraging.
6. Receive Mayor’s and City Council’s approval of a new branch library in the Capital Budget.
7. Work with city administration to maintain project momentum.
8. Lobby for initiating a Programming and Siting Analysis (funded by already allocated capital funds). Such a study would result in estimating the size of the library and program spaces and list of potential sites for the location of a library.

9. Work with city agencies (Department of Neighborhood Development, Boston Public Library, and Boston Redevelopment Authority) to identify land.

10. Work with Library Advisory Committee on the library design. The committee is appointed by the Mayor and includes the City Councilor (or an aide), community members, and representatives from the Boston Public Library and Department of Neighborhood Development.

11. Attend groundbreaking ceremony.

12. Transition Friends of the Library Campaign committee into a permanent Friends of the Library committee which supports library acquisitions and programs through fundraising efforts.
2. Analytical Framework

The many steps involved in building a library in Boston can be categorized into the following three phases: advocacy, planning and implementation. Following are definitions and key elements of the phases:

- **Advocacy Phase:** This phase is inevitably the longest and begins with organized lobbying for a library and ends when formal mayoral approval is obtained and funds are allocated in the city’s capital budget. The key players in this phase are the community, local representatives and the Mayor. The CPA is currently in this phase.

- **Planning Phase:** Defined as the time period after capital funds have been allotted, yet key elements still have to be decided including where the library will be situated, who will design it, how big it will be and what it will contain. The biggest challenge during this period is finding a library site. The Mattapan Library is currently in this phase.

- **Implementation Phase:** Defined by the time period after the library has been sited. A Library Advisory Committee is formed, including BPL planners, other city officials, community representatives and the architects. A community process helps finalize the design, ground is broken and the library is built. The Allston Library has experienced all three phases.

This analytical framework identifies the library building process as one that is driven by the community and grassroots advocacy efforts, defining it as a bottom-up process.

The following table provides the details of each phase including the key challenges that are faced during each phase, who the key players are in overcoming those challenges, and which city agencies are involved throughout the process.
Table 4: Analysis framework: The 3 phases involved in building a library in Boston.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main goal</strong></td>
<td>To obtain mayor’s support and capital funding.</td>
<td>To conduct a Programming &amp; Siting Analysis and obtain a library site.</td>
<td>To physically build the library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Begins when:</strong></td>
<td>Resident and organizational advocacy for a library is launched</td>
<td>Funds have been allocated to build a library.</td>
<td>Library Advisory Committee is formed to guide the design and building process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ends when:</strong></td>
<td>Formal mayor approval is obtained and funds to build a library are allocated in the capital budget.</td>
<td>Library site has been secured.</td>
<td>Ground is broken and the library is built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Leveraging political support which will translate into capital funding. Can take a long time (over 10 years).</td>
<td>• Major challenge of obtaining an appropriate site for the library determines how long this phase will be. • May need to continue to advocate for city resources to keep the planning process moving.</td>
<td>Finalizing a design which will meet community’s needs, obtain community support, while falling within budgetary guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key players and roles</strong></td>
<td>Community advocates, city councilor, mayor, media</td>
<td>Community advocates, community institutions, media</td>
<td>Community residents, Library Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City agencies involved</strong></td>
<td>BRA is involved if city land is a possible site.</td>
<td>Boston Public Library, Department of Neighborhood Development</td>
<td>Boston Public Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Two Tipping Points: Mayoral Support and Library Funding

Mayoral Support
It is clear that Mayoral support, which translates into capital funding allocation, is one of the critical tipping points of the entire library building process. The support of the mayor translates into a commitment to set aside both capital funding to build the library as well as annual operational funding to operate the branch. Ultimately, the mayor’s support serves as a promise that the city will take the project on.

Library Funding
Federal and State Funding:
Since the 1980s, federal funding has decreased and the 1964 Library Services and Construction Act, which helped establish Oakland’s Asian Branch, was replaced by the 1996 Library Services and Technology Act, which provides funding through state agencies for technology and information access programs.

State funding is allotted annually to support the construction and improvement of public libraries. *The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners* appropriates these funds to library applicants. The two major sources of funding that the state administers are:
1. State Aid to Public Libraries
2. Massachusetts Public Library Construction

Each of these grants has requirements for eligibility, however, that would prevent Chinatown from applying as a private actor to build and operate a library.

The State Aid to Public Libraries program grants awards to municipalities whose libraries qualify for aid. This would mean that money for a potential Chinatown library would be administered by the municipality of Boston. Next, one of the requirements for the Library Construction grant, the second source of funding, stipulates that any project funded under this program must meet the 20-year needs of the applicant’s municipality. For Chinatown, this also translates into approval by the City of Boston as a prerequisite.
Therefore, in order for the state to dispense money to a branch, a library would already have to be part of a municipality’s system.

Ultimately, in order to be eligible to receive any federal or state funding support, a library in Chinatown would have to be approved by the mayor first. 29

Local Government Funding and the Boston Public Library:
Due to the decrease in federal, and subsequently state funding, over the past 20 years, local government has become the greatest funding source for capital and operational library expenses.

According to the Chief of Staff for the Boston Public Library, Ruth Kowal, the top priority for the BPL in the short term is the rebuilding of its current operations. The economic downturn over the past few years has led to a 20% loss of staff and a 40% drop in the book budget for 2003. Such loss of funding and employees poses a challenge for the BPL to maintain its current branches and resist the national trend of branch consolidation, which has not yet begun in Boston, but has happened in various districts across the country.

At the same time, the BPL has spent tens of millions of dollars to restore its main Copley branch and since Mayor Menino’s election in 1993, there have been a series of branch additions and renovations that have been supported by the Mayor. The BPL Foundation actively raises funds for major renovation projects. And while the library’s operating budget has been strained over the past several years, the city recently designated over $12 million in capital funding for a new branch library in Uphams Corner.
4. Comparison of Allston and Mattapan Library Case Studies

Challenges Faced

1) Lack of political clout and ability to leverage mayor’s support:
Both Allston and Mattapan are neighborhoods that lack political clout for a range of reasons. Voter turnout for local elections is low in both neighborhoods (26% in Allston-Brighton, District 9; 39% in Mattapan, District 4). Both neighborhoods have higher poverty rates than Boston overall with Allston at 23% and Mattapan at 22%. The combination of lower voter turnout and higher poverty makes it difficult to leverage political support from the Mayor. Additionally, even when both library projects made it onto the City’s capital budget, Mayor Menino still controls the process of prioritizing capital projects. The lack of political clout in Mattapan may be contributing to the delays that are occurring in the planning phase.

2) Land and library location.
The question of where a library would be located presented for Allston, and still presents for Mattapan, a critical challenge to be overcome. Both neighborhoods are densely populated and land is scarce.

The scarcity of land, however, did not present an insurmountable challenge as illustrated by the Allston case study: Menino’s administration was instrumental in securing a site from developer Robert Beal who was later revealed to be representing Harvard University. This further represents the important role Mayor Menino plays in moving projects to completion on the city’s capital budget.

Factors that Led to Success:

1) Strong city councilor advocacy.
Both in Allston and Mattapan, the city councilor played a critical role in consistently advocating for capital funding to be allocated for the building of their neighborhood library. And while City Councilors McLaughlin and Yancey took different approaches in leveraging the mayor's support, the end result was the same: Mayor Menino's support translated into the allocation of funding for the construction and operation of a library in the city's 1997 five-year capital budget.
The differences between the two city councilor's approaches are interesting to note. While both McLaughlin and Yancey ultimately elicited Mayor Menino's support for their respective libraries, Yancey took a much more aggressive approach by garnering the support of four other Councilors to reject the Mayor's 1997 proposed capital budget in exchange for supporting three Mattapan initiatives including a library.

Both McLaughlin and Yancey were advocating for a library under Mayor Menino’s predecessor, Mayor Ray Flynn. Menino’s speedy support of the Allston library after one year of becoming elected mayor is an indication of the positive relationship he and McLaughlin shared as city councilors (Menino was Hyde Park’s City Councilor).

These developments illustrate the mayor's political power and how challenging it is for city councilors to add projects to the capital budget. For only through the rare and extreme political tactic of rejecting the mayor's proposed capital budget and strong-arming him into modifying his capital projects priorities was the Mattapan library included in the 1997 capital budget.

Different interviews with public officials underscored the absolute necessity of securing the mayor’s support for building a library. “The City Council can’t add anything to the capital budget, they can only take items out,” one public official, who preferred not to be identified, stated.

2) The critical role of the media.
Both case studies illustrate the critical role the media plays in identifying and articulating to the public a local neighborhood need. It is important to note the consistent support on the part of the Boston Globe's editorial board in advocating for a library in Allston and Mattapan. There were two editorials published to express support for a library in Allston (in 1992 and 1995) and two editorials published after ground was broken complimenting the Mayor's support of the library (in 2000 and 2001).
Similarly, in the Mattapan case study, an editorial published in 2001 expressed support for a new branch library, citing it would be only the second library to be built in the last 20 years. Interestingly, Yancey's aggressive approach is reflected by the fact that he published an op-ed piece in the Globe in 2004. This approach reflects the media as a medium through which to communicate with one's constituency and apply political pressure on the mayor and/or city administration. Furthermore, this indicates Councilor Yancey's appreciation of the power of the media to leverage the mayor and communicate the needs of the Mattapan community to the larger Boston metro region.

3) The critical element of community support.
Community support is a fundamental element of success and serves as the foundation which roots and contextualizes the interplay between local and city politicians. This critical element is easy to underplay because it is not easily captured by the media. Instead, the media tends to highlight the political process and focus on key political players such as local representatives and the mayor.

Throughout the national and local case studies, there is a key element of community support for the library campaign. Each community organized itself to complement or supplement its local political representatives and played a critical role in persistently advocating for a library until it became a reality.

4) The critical element of persistence.
The timelines of both case studies highlight the critical element of persistence as a factor of success. Both the Allston and Mattapan timelines include both lengthy advocacy and planning phases.

The Allston community advocated for a library for 13 years before solidifying the mayor's support. Mattapan's library was included as a capital project after 15 years of city councilor advocacy.

Allston's advocacy period of 13 years was followed by a 7-year planning and implementation period. Mayoral support expressed in 1994 translated into inclusion in

Once included in the capital budget, the biggest hurdle is overcome and yet persistence is still necessary to implement the project. Land and space become the major challenge to overcome, as highlighted in Mattapan's case study: loan authorization for $10.2 for Mattapan's library was included in the 1997 capital budget and yet site selection persists, eight years later, as a major obstacle.

Louis Elisa, Yancey’s aide, stated that the major obstacle to moving a Mattapan library project to completion is getting the Mayor’s Office to commit time and resources. The fact that meetings for coordinating the siting analysis component of the Mattapan Programming and Siting Analysis were canceled without explanation highlights the potential challenges faced during the planning phase.
5. Lessons for Chinatown: Challenges and Opportunities

Comparing the case studies of Allston and Mattapan with Chinatown's experience yields interesting similarities and differences. More interestingly, the contrasts between Chinatown and the two local case studies highlight the challenges that are specific to Chinatown.

Chinatown most closely resembles Allston in terms of having had their library taken away. (While Mattapan is in dire need of new library, it currently has one.) The circumstances under which Chinatown's and Allston's libraries were closed down were very different: while Chinatown's library was overtaken by government through eminent domain, Allston's library was closed down due to budget cuts which translated into the loss of the branch because the space was leased. However, the communities' experiences are ultimately comparable: both local libraries were shut down by public officials' decisions made independent of community input.

Challenges Specific to Chinatown:

In contrast with Allston and Mattapan, Chinatown faces two critical challenges:

1) Lack of political clout and challenge in leveraging city councilor's support:
As a neighborhood, Chinatown is more politically marginalized in comparison with Allston and Mattapan due to the manner in which Boston's voting districts are configured. So while Allston and Mattapan have had the distinct advantage of having strong city councilors which persistently advocated for a library in their community, there are a range of reasons for which Chinatown may not enjoy such strong support from its city councilor.

More specifically, Chinatown makes up a very small percentage of the voting district in which it is located as compared with Allston and Mattapan. Though Chinatown’s population continues to grow, it makes up only 8% of the registered voters for District 2. Therefore, even if everyone voted during local elections, the chances of electing a representative to advocate for the needs of the Chinatown community are much smaller in comparison with the remaining voting district. This reality combined with high poverty...
rates makes it difficult for Chinatown to leverage the political support of Mayor Menino and Chinatown’s City Councilor, Jim Kelly.

Table 6: Registered Voters as Percentage of District: Comparing Chinatown, Allston and Mattapan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>City Councilor</th>
<th>Other Neighborhoods Represented</th>
<th>Total Voters Registered in District</th>
<th>Registered Voters in Chinatown, Allston or Mattapan</th>
<th>Mattapan, Allston or Mattapan Registered Voters as % of Total District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allston (Ward 21 Pcts 3-8; Ward 22 Pcts 1-2)</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>Jerry McDermott Elected in 2002</td>
<td>Brighton (Ward 21 Pcts 9-16, Ward 22 Pcts 3-12)</td>
<td>27,368</td>
<td>8,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattapan (Ward 14 Pcts 5, 8, 14; Ward 18, Pcts 1-2, 4)</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Charles Yancey, Elected in 1983</td>
<td>Dorchester (Ward 14 Pcts 1-4, 6-7, 9-13; Ward 15 Pcts 2,5; Ward 17 Pcts 1-3, 5-11),</td>
<td>23,076</td>
<td>5,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table illustrates that Mattapan and Allston both consist of a significant percentage of their respective voting districts and that each neighborhood only competes with one other neighborhood for its city councilor’s attention and city resources (Allston competes with Brighton and Mattapan competes with Dorchester).

In contrast, Chinatown faces a distinct challenge as an ethnically independent community that must compete with several different neighborhoods including South Boston and the South End for Councilor Kelly’s attention. As a small percentage of voters in the district,
it continually faces a critical challenge in obtaining the councilor’s support for issues that are important to the Chinatown community.

2) Land, space and density.

Chinatown shares the critical challenge of locating a library with Allston and Mattapan. All three neighborhoods have similar land-use patterns including a combination of mix-use commercial/residential, commercial and high-density residential zoning. Land is therefore a scarcity resulting from the high-density land usages.

Locating a site for a new library in Chinatown may prove more difficult than in either Mattapan or Allston due to Chinatown’s smaller physical size, higher-density land use patterns (see map below), and most recent development activity.
6. Reasons to Be Encouraged

While there are significant challenges facing the CPA, there are numerous reasons to be encouraged in the pursuit of building a library in Chinatown:

1. Mayor Menino, especially when compared with his predecessor, Mayor Flynn, has a strong track record as a supporter of branch libraries. Before the Allston branch was built in 2000, there had not been a new branch library built in 20 years. Since his tenure as Mayor, he has approved the building of three new branches (Allston, Mattapan, and most recently, Uphams Corner). These are in addition to the numerous renovations and expansions that have occurred throughout the city’s branches.

2. The CPA’s successful advocacy track record, as highlighted by the Parcel C timeline, demonstrates that they are well placed to organize the community, lobby city officials, and persist in their library campaign until city funding is approved.

3. Despite the challenge of land density, current development and land availability created by the Big Dig may create a window of opportunity for a library site. While this is recognized by the CPA as potentially problematic, their advocacy efforts can work to create an opportunity that is acceptable to the Chinatown community.

4. Momentum has been created by the CPA’s library campaign:
   - Community support has been well documented and has been voiced clearly enough that there has been verbal recognition among several public officials, including Mayor Menino, of the community’s demand for a library.
   - There is an existing structure through the Friends of the Chinatown Library through which to ramp up advocacy efforts.

---

**Mayor Menino on Libraries**

“Libraries really are the life of a neighborhood. It gives kids a place to go after school. It’s the nucleus of what’s going on. It’s the place where community groups meet. We have very strong neighborhoods. We have very strong libraries.”

Mayor Thomas Menino at the Allston Library groundbreaking, June 29, 2000
Recommendations

The first recommendation is to develop a 10-year plan which will provide an organizing strategy for advocating for a library. Such a plan, with the inclusion of markers of success, will guide the CPA and maintain momentum and encouragement as it pursues the mayor’s support and capital funding. Since the advocacy phase is the lengthiest phase, we recommend that it be a 10-year plan, with short-term and long-term strategies.

This plan will allow the CPA to be more deliberate and efficient in their advocacy efforts. Most importantly, because of the potentially lengthy advocacy phase involved, strategic tasks and milestones will help prevent a loss of momentum or sense of discouragement.

The hope is that, equipped with the information provided in this report, the CPA will be better able to navigate the complicated local political landscape. We recommend that they adopt a series of short-term strategies that will concentrate their efforts on leveraging the support of the city councilor and the mayor.

The second recommendation is to assign existing members and recruit future members to carry out elements of the plan. As capacity is a challenge in any grassroots environment, it will be important to consistently recruit members onto the Friends of the Chinatown library committee who can dedicate time to supporting the CPA’s advocacy activities.

The team took the approach of developing short-term (6 months to one year) and long-term (1-year and on) advocacy milestones. All strategies have been developed with an awareness of the CPA’s rich advocacy history, both for the library and during other advocacy campaigns. The team also recognizes that some of the listed activities are currently being implemented and have listed them to recognize their importance as key advocacy efforts (i.e. meeting with City Councilor Kelly).
**Short-term Advocacy Milestones**

The following recommended short-term advocacy milestones were formulated to build on Friends of the Library existing efforts:

---

### Short-term Advocacy Milestones

- Develop an advocacy plan with the following short-term strategies.
- Recruit members onto "Friends of the Chinatown Library" committee to take on advocacy roles and implement tasks.

### Political Advocacy

1. Continue to lobby Councilor Kelley.
2. Write a letter to the mayor formally asking for his support for the reinstatement of a library in Chinatown.
3. Lobby BRA, as appropriate, regarding potentially available land (i.e. Parcel A).

### Institutional Advocacy

1. Develop strategy to approach Tufts University.
2. Meet with Community Relations representative.

### Community Advocacy

1. Continue ramping up lobbying activities including petitions and postcard campaign.
2. Organize residents to express demand for a library at community organized by the city (i.e. held by the BRA for Parcel A).

### Media & Marketing

1. Develop a library campaign flyer with potential branch characteristics and disseminate throughout the community.
2. Solicit media coverage.
**Political Advocacy**

Ruth Kowal, Chief of Staff for the Boston Public Library, advised the CPA to stay on the radar of the political decision-makers. She recalled how in Allston, a core group of community members was consistently campaigning throughout the years. For the Chinatown community then, writing letters, establishing personal connections with the decision-makers and persistent presence at public meetings may be one of the keys to getting approval for library funding. 30

City Councilor Kelly and Mayor Menino are the two critical decision-makers involved with providing potential support for a Chinatown library. Once meeting with Councilor Kelly, it will be important to formalize the community’s request to the mayor in the form of a letter.

**Institutional Advocacy**

While it is unlikely that Tufts University would be capable or interested in donating space for the development of a new library for the Chinatown community, the institution can play a critical in supporting the CPA’s advocacy efforts. For this reason, it will be important to develop an approach to recruit the university’s support: from meeting with the Community Relations representative to the President, there are several possible avenues to solicit their expressed support for a library. Furthermore, by establishing a need for their support early on, the stage will be set for soliciting a contribution for purchasing books during the implementation phase.

**Community Advocacy**

Community advocacy provides the foundation of support for political and institutional advocacy. The CPA has a rich history of community advocacy and applying its organizing skills and experience from past advocacy campaigns to the current library campaign will be a key factor of success. It will be important to continue organizing residents to attend public meetings and publicly advocating for a library, particularly as the BRA holds public forums to solicit community input on its planning and development efforts.
Media & Marketing

The media serves as a powerful tool as it would shine a spotlight on Chinatown’s need and serve to leverage political and institutional support. Soliciting newspaper coverage could include the following activities: writing letters to the editor, submitting op-ed pieces, and recruiting reporters and editors to cover the Chinatown library campaign in an article or address it in an editorial. Other modes of media coverage could be solicited as well including television and radio.

One potential approach would be to develop a press release (one-page, “Did you know?” format) which is faxed to major media outlets on a regular basis. As reporters are generally always looking for story leads, this would be a proactive approach to recruiting media coverage.

Finally, the CPA could render their library campaign more visible by developing a campaign flyer (perhaps using the spatial design estimates from this report) which could be regularly distributed at local businesses and handed out at community meetings. Such a flyer could reinforce the CPA’s community advocacy efforts.
**Long-term Advocacy Milestones**

The following are a list of possible ideas that the CPA can adopt as part of its long-term advocacy plan:

- Develop a calendar of advocacy activities (i.e. postcard campaign is organized every May-April, etc.). By developing a calendar of events, certain short-term advocacy milestones can become standardized. Such a calendar would contain a series of advocacy activities throughout the year and serve to show the city’s administration that the demand for a Chinatown library is not going away.

- Write to and meet with trustees and staff of the MA Library Commission and Boston Public Library. Even though obtaining the mayor’s approval is the first step to being considered for any state or local library funding, it could potentially help to advocate to local and state level library administrators.

- Lobby at-large city councilors, state representative and senator.

- Write letters to the editor of the Boston Globe and Boston Herald.

- Write to and meet with foundation staff in an effort to solicit philanthropic gifts to help build a library (and possibly leverage matching funds from city).

- Organize a demonstration in front of the Copley Branch.

The most critical long-term strategy is that of persistence. As this report has illustrated, building a library in Boston is a very lengthy process and undertaking a persistent approach is a key factor of success.

**Table 5: The critical element of persistence.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mattapan Library</td>
<td>1980s-1997</td>
<td>1997-present</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22(+) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (+) years</td>
<td>8 years/ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Map of Chinatown

The Boston Redevelopment Authority defines Chinatown as the 42-acre neighborhood bounded by Essex Street (North), the Surface Artery (East), Marginal Road (South) and Washington - Tremont Street (West).

Source: [http://www.asiancdc.org/demographics.html](http://www.asiancdc.org/demographics.html)
### Appendix B: CPA Library Project Work Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Process</th>
<th>Budget/Finance</th>
<th>Physical Planning &amp; Cost</th>
<th>Library Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political process CPA would engage in</td>
<td>Private funding sources</td>
<td>How big should a library in Chinatown be?</td>
<td>Research 2 Boston Libraries &amp; how they were built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sam &amp; Tali</em></td>
<td><em>Kara</em></td>
<td><em>Ying</em></td>
<td><em>Sam &amp; Tali</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State role</td>
<td>State funding sources</td>
<td>What's the minimum size?</td>
<td>1) Allston Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kara</em></td>
<td><em>Kara</em></td>
<td><em>Ying</em></td>
<td><em>Tali</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City role</td>
<td>How to get into city &amp; capital budgets</td>
<td>How many would it serve?</td>
<td>2) Mattapan Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sam &amp; Tali</em></td>
<td><em>Sam &amp; Tali</em></td>
<td><em>Ying</em></td>
<td><em>Sam</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship btw city &amp; state</td>
<td>How other neighborhoods &quot;pay&quot; for their libraries</td>
<td>Census research: Chinatown &amp; Chinese Greater Boston population</td>
<td><em>Ying &amp; Kara</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sam, Tali &amp; Kara</em></td>
<td><em>Sam &amp; Tali</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of state library commission <em>Kara</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76
Appendix C: Detailed Formulas to Calculate Library Space Needs


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Current population of the municipality / primary service area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Projected population of the municipality / primary service area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Estimate of nonresident service population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Design population (b+c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Collection space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Periodical (display)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Periodical (back issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Nonprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Digital resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Total (a+b+c+d+e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: Reader seating space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. seats x 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: Staff work space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. stations x 150 (list specific work stations on reverse)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4: Meeting room space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. General meeting space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conference room space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Storytime space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Total (a+b+c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Step 5: Special use space**

a. Collection space (from 1.f)
Reader seating space (from 2.a)
Staff work space (from 3.a)
Meeting room space (from 4.d)

b. SUBTOTAL 1

c. Divide Subtotal 1 by 6 (for a minimum allocation), by 5 (for a moderate allocation), or by 4 (for an optimum allocation)

**Step 6: Nonassignable space**

a. Subtotal 1 (from 5.b)
Special use space (from 5.c)

b. SUBTOTAL 2

c. Divide Subtotal 2 by 4 (for a minimum allocation, or by 3 (for an optimum allocation)

**Step 7: Putting it all together**

a. Collection space (from 1.f)
b. Reader seating space (from 2.a)
c. Staff work space (from 3.a)
d. Meeting room space (from 4.d)
e. Special use space (from 5.c)
f. Nonassignable space (from 6.c)
g. GROSS AREA NEEDED (a+b+c+d+e+f)
## Appendix D: Quantitative Standards by Municipal Population

“Municipal population” is the population of the city, town, village, or county establishing the library, or the total population of communities establishing a joint library.


### FTE Staff per 1,000 Population

*Regardless of the population served, minimum total staff is 1.0 FTE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Population</th>
<th>Less than 2500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 9,999</th>
<th>10,000 to 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 to 49,999</th>
<th>50,000 to 99,999</th>
<th>100,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Volumes Held per Capita (Print)

*Regardless of the population served, the minimum total volumes held is 8,000 volumes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Population</th>
<th>Less than 2500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 9,999</th>
<th>10,000 to 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 to 49,999</th>
<th>50,000 to 99,999</th>
<th>100,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Periodical Titles Received per 1,000 Population (Print)**

Regardless of the population served, the minimum periodical titles received is 30 titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Population</th>
<th>Less than 2500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 9,999</th>
<th>10,000 to 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 to 49,999</th>
<th>50,000 to 99,999</th>
<th>100,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Audio Recordings Held per Capita**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Population</th>
<th>Less than 2500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 9,999</th>
<th>10,000 to 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 to 49,999</th>
<th>50,000 to 99,999</th>
<th>100,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Video Recordings Held per Capita**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Population</th>
<th>Less than 2500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 9,999</th>
<th>10,000 to 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 to 49,999</th>
<th>50,000 to 99,999</th>
<th>100,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hours Open**

*Regardless of the population served, the minimum hours open is 25 hours per week*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Population</th>
<th>Less than 2500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 9,999</th>
<th>10,000 to 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 to 49,999</th>
<th>50,000 to 99,999</th>
<th>100,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials Expenditures per Capita**

*Regardless of the population served, the minimum materials expenditures is $10,000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Population</th>
<th>Less than 2500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 9,999</th>
<th>10,000 to 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 to 49,999</th>
<th>50,000 to 99,999</th>
<th>100,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>$5.67</td>
<td>$5.67</td>
<td>$5.67</td>
<td>$5.31</td>
<td>$4.96</td>
<td>$4.61</td>
<td>$3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$7.33</td>
<td>$6.67</td>
<td>$6.46</td>
<td>$5.37</td>
<td>$5.37</td>
<td>$5.37</td>
<td>$3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>$9.86</td>
<td>$8.46</td>
<td>$7.40</td>
<td>$6.56</td>
<td>$6.41</td>
<td>$6.27</td>
<td>$4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>$14.65</td>
<td>$10.03</td>
<td>$9.42</td>
<td>$9.07</td>
<td>$7.05</td>
<td>$6.53</td>
<td>$4.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collection Size (Print, Audio & Video) per Capita**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Population</th>
<th>Less than 2500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 9,999</th>
<th>10,000 to 24,999</th>
<th>25,000 to 49,999</th>
<th>50,000 to 99,999</th>
<th>100,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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