REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS - ADDENDUM #002

ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

Family Focus
5467 S. University Avenue
Chicago, IL 60615

ADDENDUM #002 Issue Date: April 21, 2023

General

1. A copy of the City of Evanston Landmark Ordinance and associated documentation is included in this addendum.

2. An assessment was previously prepared by both U.S. Building Efficiency Solutions, Inc. and IFF. Both assessments are included in this addendum.

3. As a reminder and per the RFQ, respondents must acknowledge all addenda received as part of their submissions. If firms have already submitted their Statements of Interest, please forward acknowledgement of this addendum to the email addresses below.

   a.horn@cotterconsulting.com
   k.johnson@cotterconsulting.com
   dottie.johnson@family-focus.org

Responses to Questions

1. Question: Would you like consultants to fill out the vendor checklist form or just the architect?

   Response: Consultants are not required to fill out the vendor checklist, however, please refer to Section 9 of the RFQ that outlines the Basis of Evaluation for A/E award.

2. Question: Please identify anticipated exterior repairs other than those triggered by an interior renovation.

   Response: The scope of the project will be further defined with the selected AOR.
3. **Question:** Please identify desired site repairs/modifications other than those triggered by a renovation. Or will this be part of the scope to be defined by the selected A/E in coordination with the Owners and OR?

   **Response:** The scope of the project will be further defined with the selected AOR.

4. **Question:** Are listed tenants permanent or do/will they come & go periodically?

   **Response:** Tenants do periodically come and go; however, with the exception of two tenants that joined us in 2022, the remaining tenants have been with the building for more than 10 years. We do not anticipate that any of our current tenants will be relocating. However, we do anticipate the addition of new tenants after the renovations are complete.

5. **Question:** Will tenant space be customized for the tenant or remain flexible for future unknown tenants?

   **Response:** Tenants have provided preliminary input as part of two engagement sessions. Additional Tenant engagement will be required to finalize the scope in each area.

6. **Question:** Will environmental mitigation become part of this contract or be handled separately outside this scope of work?

   **Response:** An environmental consultant has been separately engaged by Family Focus to perform a full building assessment of asbestos containing materials, lead, and hazardous waste. The environmental consultant will prepare scoping documents that will be coordinated with the selected AOR’s design of the renovations as required.

7. **Question:** Does the cover letter count as one of the pages?

   **Response:** Per the RFQ, “Front and back covers, table of contents pages, and tabbed divider pages will not be counted if they do not contain submittal information.”

8. **Question:** Does vendor checklist count in the page limit?

   **Response:** No, the Family Focus vendor checklists do not count in the page limit for the submission.

9. **Question:** Would there be a legend of occupancies that match the room numbers on the signage plans provided?

   **Response:** A legend of occupancies that match the room numbers on the signage plans provided is not currently available.

10. **Question:** There were courtyard spaces to the SW corner of the property; is it fair to assume these are part of the programming requirements?

    **Response:** All the areas within the property limits are potential areas of improvement as part of this project.

11. **Question:** Are there specific MBE, WBE, DBE, and VBE goals? What agency determines certification?

    **Response:** There are no stated MBE, WBE, DBE, and VBE goals, however, MBE, WBE, DBE, VBE Status are included in the basis of A/E evaluation as stated in the RFQ.
12. **Question:** Item C - Firm Experience and Capabilities, the first bullet asks to list all similar clients for whom we have provided services in the last five years. We have far more that can fit on one page. Is there a limit, or should we use our best judgement to fit the best representative projects on 1 page?

   **Response:** Please use your best judgement to fit the best representative projects on 1 page. As stated in the RFQ, a one-page tabular summary is requested.

13. **Question:** How would you like us to include the vendor checklists in the proposal submittal? Shall they all be included in the printed copies of the proposal? Should they be submitted digitally? Please let me know.

   **Response:** Please include the vendor checklists with the RFQ response submittal. Please do not submit them digitally.

14. **Question:** Do Family Focus and their tenants intend to remain operational in the building during the renovation and if so, will the project be phased during construction?

   **Response:** A phasing plan will be developed with input from Family Focus, the Tenants, the selected AOR and the GC/CM. The intent will be to maintain Family Focus and Tenant operations as much as possible during construction.

15. **Question:** If the project has phased construction, will the design services be phased as well?

   **Response:** Design services are anticipated to remain continuous throughout the life of the project. Construction activities (including the selected AOR’s CA services) are expected to be continuous even if the work is phased.

16. **Question:** Can you please elaborate on what you are looking for on the vendor checklist for the following question and does this differ from Item G references in the RFQ? “Please list references from businesses and experiences.”

   **Response:** Please respond to item G in the RFQ as part of the overall submittal. Interested firms may leave this field blank on the vendor checklist.
CITY OF EVANSTON  
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION  

A RESOLUTION  
Requesting the City Manager to Transmit  
The Evanston Preservation Commission’s  
Recommendation and Report that the  
Evanston City Council Designate  
As an Evanston Landmark the  
Property Located at 2010 Dewey Avenue  

WHEREAS, on December 27, 2017 Dino Robinson, Jr. founder of  
Shorefront (the “Applicant”), located at 2214 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, submitted an  
application, nominating for landmark designation the property and building(s) at 2010  
Dewey Avenue; and  

WHEREAS, in accordance with City Code Section 2-8-5 of the  
Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended (the “City Code”), the Preservation  
Commission conducted a public hearing and review process; and  

WHEREAS, on January 9, 2018 the Preservation Commission notified  
Charles Johnson, Director of Facilities and Technology, Family Focus, Inc. at 310 S.  
Peoria St., Suite 301, Chicago, IL 60607 (the “Owner”) of the receipt of the application;  
and  

WHEREAS, on January 9, 2018 the Preservation Commission notified  
the property owner Family Focus, Inc. at 310 S. Peoria St., Suite 301, Chicago, IL  
60607 of the February 13, 2018 scheduled public hearing on the nomination; and  

WHEREAS, at its meeting of February 13, 2018 the Preservation  
Commission continued the hearing at the request of the Owner and with the consent of  
the Applicant to March 13, 2018, and on that date at the request of the Owner and with  
the consent of the Applicant the Commission continued the hearing to July 10, 2018.
WHEREAS, on July 10, 2018, the Commission, accepted testimony from the applicant, the property owner and the public, deliberated and evaluated the application, testimony heard at the public hearing, and other evidence and closed the public hearing also on July 10, 2018; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2018, the Commission approved its Report; recommending that the Evanston City Council (the “City Council”) designate the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS:

Section 1: The Commission determined that the application for landmark designation of the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue is in conformity with City Code Section 2-8-4, “Criteria for Designation.”

Section 2: The Commission recommends that the City Council approves the application for the landmark designation of the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue, as the Subject Property meets the criteria for designation as an Evanston Landmark under City Code Section 2-8-4(A) 2, and 6 and subsection 2-8-4 (B).

Section 3: The report of the Commission’s findings is approved, and attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. The Chair and/or the Preservation Coordinator may make corrections and modifications thereto without change in substance as they shall deem appropriate, consistent with this resolution.

Section 4: The City Manager is hereby requested to transmit the Commission’s Recommendation and Report to the Mayor and the City Council.
Section 5: Notice of the recommendation of the Commission, including a copy of the report, shall be transmitted to the City Council or its duly authorized Committee and sent by regular mail to the owner of record of a nominated landmark, and to the nominator within fifteen (15) business days following adoption of the resolution and report.

Adopted: September 11, 2018

Yeas: 9
Nays: 0

Diane Williams, Chair

Attest:

Mark Simon, Secretary

Date:
9-11-18
City of Evanston
Evanston Preservation Commission

Report to the City Council

Recommendation that the Property at 2010 Dewey Avenue
Be Designated as an Evanston Landmark

September 11, 2018

To the Honorable Mayor and the City Council of the City of Evanston:

COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION

The Preservation Commission recommends that the City Council designate the site and
building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue as an Evanston landmark. The nomination meets the
City Code, Section 2-8-4 Criteria for Designation (A) 2, (A) 6 and in accordance with
subsection (B) the building does retain sufficient integrity to convey its feeling and
association relative to (A) 2 and (A) 6 above.
BACKGROUND

On December 27, 2017 Morris "Dino" Robinson Jr. of Shcrefront (the "Applicant"), located at 2214 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, submitted an application, nominating for landmark designation the property at 2010 Dewey Avenue ("Subject Property"), owned by Family Focus. On January 9, 2018, the Commission notified Charles Johnson, Director of Facilities and Technology, Family Focus, Inc. at 310 S. Peoria St., Suite 301, Chicago, IL 60607 (the "Owner") of the receipt of the nomination, and the Commission notified the Owner of the public hearing scheduled on February 13, 2018.

In accordance to Section 2-8-5 of the Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended (the "City Code"), the Preservation Commission (the "Commission") conducted a public hearing on February 13, 2018. At the request of the Owner and with the consent of Applicant, and without a presentation or discussion, the hearing was continued to March 13, 2018. At this hearing, and with the consent of the Applicant, Family Focus requested 120 days to discuss the issue with the neighborhood and the community. The Commission continued the public hearing to July 10, 2018.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

At the hearing held on March 13 and July 10, 2018, Dino Robinson, Jr., the Applicant, presented the landmark nomination.

The original 1905 structure was designed by Ernest Woodyatt, an Evanston resident. A 1926 addition by architects Childs & Smith added more classrooms, a theater and gymnasium. The school stood until a fire gutted the structure in 1958. The 1961 addition by Ganster & Hennighausen replaced the original 1905 structure.

Mr. Robinson, Jr. said that as a community school, Foster School had produced hundreds of successful graduates who have made their place in local, national and global communities. To name a few: Junior Mance- Jazz musician inducted into hall of fame in 1997; Dorothy Bayen – her part in the Ethiopian/Italian war during the 1930s and 40s; Fred Hutcherson – Aviator who trained Tuskegee Airmen; William Logan – Evanston’s first Black Police Chief; Sanders Hicks – Evanston’s first Black Fire Chief (and Olympian speed skater Shani Davis’ first coach); Iva Caruthers – Work in faith based leadership and equity; Joseph Hill – Evanston First Black school superintendent; Tina Lifford – professional actress since 1970s and currently a main character on the TV drama “Queen Sugar.”

By the end of 1930, most Black residents resided in the Fifth Ward of Evanston and Foster School was centrally located in that ward. Although the majority of the students who attended Foster School before World War I were White, by 1928, 85% of the students were Black. By 1945, Foster had a 99% Black student body.

The historical setting of the Family Focus Building, formerly Foster School, illustrates the important cultural, social aspects, and events within the City of Evanston as it interacted with issues of racial equity. The building embodies historic and cultural...
themes reflecting Evanston’s early Black history. Shorefront, within its mission as a historical organization, has collected over 100 hours of oral histories of Black residents of Evanston. Within the interviews, not one interviewee failed to mention the important role of Foster School/Family Focus during its many uses.

INTEGRITY, LOCATION and SETTING
Mr. Robinson, Jr. noted the relationship between the property and its location is often important to understanding why the property was created or why something happened. The actual location of a historic property, complemented by its setting, is particularly important in recapturing the sense of historic events and persons.

In the late 19th century White working families, mainly Scandinavian immigrants, began settling in what is now the Fifth Ward. By 1900 a sufficient number of families had moved into the area that the School District saw the need for building a school there.

In the 1860s and 1870s when the Black population was small, Blacks lived in all parts of the original village of Evanston. After 1900, as Black migrants from the South increased Evanston’s population, discriminatory housing practices introduced by the White power structure of Evanston directed incoming Blacks to settle in the Fifth Ward. By 1930 many of the Fifth Ward White residents had left, making the population of the Fifth Ward predominantly Black.

From the time the Foster School/Family Focus building was constructed in 1903-05 until the present, the setting of Foster School—an elementary school building adjacent to single family houses on the south, west, and north—has changed little. Facing east, Foster School stands on the west side of Dewey Avenue; the main entrance looks over the large open expanse of Foster Field, which served as the playground for Foster School. Single family houses built in the early 20th century lie immediately to the west, south, and north of Foster School.

Foster School stands where it was built and is surrounded by buildings constructed in the period of significance. The integrity of the location and the setting of the Foster School/Family Focus building is excellent.

DESIGN
Mr. Robinson, Jr. said that beginning in the 1880s Evanston hired architects to design its school buildings. In doing so, Evanston was following a national pattern of building schools that would "define the strength and values of the community." (Bomier, Bruce, Renaissance of the American School Building, Anoka, MN: Environmental Resource Council, 2014). Several of the late 19th- and early 20th-century elementary school buildings in Evanston were placed in residential neighborhoods, often on lots intended for single-family houses. The scale and massing of those single-family houses influenced the scale and massing of the school buildings. In the case of Foster School, the patterned brickwork was the primary ornament on the 1903 building and is the primary ornament on the 1926 and 1931 sections of the building. This brickwork patterning is the most significant design element on those sections of the building.
The 1960 section of the building reflects major changes in school design that had occurred between 1931, when the second addition was made to Foster School, and 1960, when the Ganster & Hennighausen addition was completed. The influence of Modernism on architectural design led to the construction of school buildings with little or no exterior adornment. Significant advances in building construction and materials that included the introduction of fluorescent lighting and improvements in heating and cooling systems were further influences on the design of schools.

The design of all three sections of the Foster School/Family Focus building is as it was in the period of significance. The design integrity of the Foster School/Family Focus building is excellent.

MATERIALS
Mr. Robinson, Jr. said that the 1926 and 1931 additions very closely resemble the design of the 1903 building and used materials common in other Evanston school buildings constructed between 1900 and the 1930s. With the exception of the replacement of the wood-framed, double-hung windows with aluminum windows in the 1926 and 1931 additions, the other materials on those sections are original to the building.

In the 1960 addition, Ganster & Hennighausen used a red brick that is close in color to that of the brick in the earlier portions of the building. The second- and third-floor windows have limestone lintels. The aluminum windows are original to this portion of the building and are evidence of the evolution of the choice of building materials between the 1930s and the 1960s.

Except for the aluminum replacements in the 1926 and 1931 section, the materials are the original building materials and have very good integrity.

WORKMANSHIP
Mr. Robinson, Jr. noted that the two major periods of workmanship evident in the Foster School/Family Focus building represent two distinct views on how a school building should look. Until the 1930s, building ornamentation was a means of showing the importance of the structure. By mid-century the ornate decorations on buildings had given way to the clean lines of Modernism. The brick patterns in the 1926 and 1931 sections show masonry skills beyond simple bricklaying. On all sections the mortar was applied neatly, and the bricks sit in level rows.

The workmanship on all three sections of the Family Focus/Foster School building—1926, 1931, and 1961—are examples of highly competent construction work. The integrity of the workmanship is excellent.

At the end of his presentation, Dino Robinson, Jr. maintained that for the reasons stated above the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue meet criteria for Landmark designation 2-8-4 (A) 2, 6, 10 and possesses integrity under 2-8-4 (B).
FAMILY FOCUS PRESENTATION
At the July 10, 2018 hearing Bridget O'Keefe, attorney, and representing Family Focus Inc., the owner of the Weissbourd-Holmes Family Focus Center located at 2010 Dewey Avenue in Evanston, Illinois (the "Center."), stated that Family Focus is in opposition to the proposed landmark designation of the Center, because the Center does not comply with the designation criteria outlined in Subsection 2-8-4(B) "Integrity of Landmarks and Districts. Any area, structure, site or object that meets any one or more of the criteria in Subsection 2-8-4(A) shall also have sufficient integrity of location, design, materials and workmanship to make it worthy of preservation or restoration."

In addition, the National Register Bulletin 15(VIII) - How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Historic Property – says: “Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognize seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity.” These seven criteria have been used in the past by the Evanston Preservation Commission and provide further clarification on how the issue of integrity is interpreted and applied both nationally and by the City of Evanston.

Ms. O'Keefe stated the following arguments to state Family Focus' position:

DEFINITION OF HISTORIC INTEGRITY
The National Park Service which developed “standards and guidelines that guide preservation work at the national, tribal, state, and local levels, National Register Bulletin 15(VIII) - How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Historic Property – provides useful guidance: “Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognize seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity.” These seven criteria have been used in the past by the Evanston Preservation Commission and provide further clarification on how the issue of integrity is interpreted and applied both nationally and by the City of Evanston.

“Historic integrity is the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's prehistoric or historic period. Historic integrity is the composite of seven qualities:
• location
• design
• setting
• materials
• workmanship
• feeling
• association

Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. Not only must a property resemble its historic appearance, but it must also retain physical materials, design features, and aspects of construction dating from the period when it attained significance.”
EVOLUTION OF 2010 DEWEY

The building was constructed in 1903 (with additions being constructed in 1926 and 1931.) On October 30, 1958, a serious fire destroyed most of Foster School. In 1961, a modern addition was added to the portion of the historic building that survived the fire. Since 1989, all windows have been replaced. In 2010, a handicapped accessible entrance was added to the primary façade.

There were corresponding changes to the footprint of the building, which was expanded in both 1961 and 2010. The classroom spaces located on the basement, second and third floors have been demolished to accommodate the office and space needs for current non-profit tenants.

LACK OF HISTORIC INTEGRITY

It is important for a landmark building to be able to convey a sense of the history that it reflects throughout the period of significance and that it has been present throughout that history. The Center has evolved over time and no longer resembles the building originally constructed in the early 20th Century or the mid-century modern building constructed in 1961. The cumulative impact of these changes to the building - particularly since the closure of the school in 1979 - has compromised the historic character of the building and its architectural integrity. Thus, the Center does not meet the integrity criteria mandated by Subsection 2-8-4(B) of the Code.

DESIGN:
The design qualities of “integrity” that are not currently present at the Center.

East Elevation/Main Entry: There have been major changes to the design of the east elevation which has destroyed the historic integrity of its primary façade.

a. The original red brick entrance to the 1905 building was located at the center of the building and consisted of an elegant limestone portico with columns that flanked both sides. The building was expanded in 1926 and 1931. There was a consistent horizontal focus in roof height, evenly spaced window placement and architectural detailing.

b. After the fire in 1958, a significant portion of the building was demolished and replaced with a modern addition. The addition’s primary (east) façade consisted of a flat brick elevation with a non-descript main entry and three rows of windows located on the façade south of the main entrance. The emphasis of the building design continued to be horizontal evidenced by a consistent roof line and window bands.

c. In 2010, the primary elevation was further altered to provide ADA accessibility. The new design destroyed the horizontal focus of the building and interrupted the window pattern.
d. The primary façade has changed dramatically over the years. The altered roof line, interrupted window bands, new entry location and elevator tower destroyed the horizontal focus of the design and no longer convey consistent physical characteristics that existed during its historic period.

Windows: The windows are a primary design element on all facades. The windows throughout the building have been significantly altered since its time of historic significance.

a. The modern windows on the south side of the main entry are different in design and configuration than the original windows on the north side of the main entry.

b. Since 1989, all new windows have been installed in the building. In particular, the windows on the remaining original building were significantly altered by the removal of all mullions. The failure to replace the windows in the original structure with windows maintaining the historic profile and mullions damages the design aesthetic of that wing in particular.

Roof: The original roof appeared to be a hipped roof. After the fire, a flat roof was placed on the current Center. After the 2010 addition, the three-story elevator tower was added destroying the consistent height of the various building wings.

Entries: The historic main entries to the building have been radically altered.

a. The original entry located on site from 1905-1958 was traditional in appearance and constructed of high quality materials.

b. In 1961, after the fire, a non-descript entry was provided.

c. In 2010, a dramatic new handicapped accessible entry was provided on the primary façade.

d. In addition, the historic doors on the remaining original building have been replaced with non-historic materials.

Floor Plans: The interior floor plans have been significantly altered to respond to tenant needs. The classroom spaces located on the basement, second and third floors have been demolished to accommodate the office and space needs for non-profit tenants.

SETTING: The application for landmark designation states that the original building was in the shape of a rectangle. The site plan has been altered and the Center has a larger footprint. Its main entry projects to the east and a building addition projects into the west yard.

WORKMANSHIP: The original building contained high quality materials and design elements. A public referendum was required to fund the rebuilding of the school after
the fire. These budgetary constraints led to cost-efficiencies that impacted the level of workmanship that could be provided.

FEELING: The architectural style of the 1905 and 1961 buildings were very different. The “feeling” of the modern post-war school was disrupted by the 2010 addition due to the changed roof lines, interrupted window bands, and the tall elevator tower which damaged the horizontal focus and created a different appearance. Thus, the required “overall sense of past time and place” does not exist due to the very different design aesthetics of the historic building and the modern additions.

ASSOCIATION: The application for landmark designation extensively discusses the 1961 addition designed by Ganster and Hannighausen, referring to them as “prolific school architects in the North Shore.” The 2010 addition to the primary façade significantly impacted the Ganster and Hannighausen design.

INTEGRITY RATING SYSTEM
The following rating system has been used by the City of Evanston to categorize “integrity” in its landmark buildings: Excellent, good and poor.

“Poor” — a poor degree of integrity is exhibited if the building’s materials and details are missing or completely covered, or have unsympathetic, irreversible alterations and additions that greatly compromise the building’s character. Poor integrity may also be measured by missing original siding.

Applying the definition of “Poor” to the Center, it is obvious that the building’s integrity is poor, because:

a. The majority of the original building was destroyed.
b. The roof shape, entry location, and window type and configuration were significantly altered.
c. The horizontal nature of the primary façade of the 1961 addition was destroyed in 2010.
d. All of the windows have been replaced and the new windows located in the most historic portion of the building do not have a historic profile or mullions.
e. The site plan has been altered with the footprint of the building being enlarged.

The Center contains “unsympathetic, irreversible alterations and additions that greatly compromise the building’s character.” The cumulative impact of all these changes has severely compromised the historic integrity of the original historic structure and the 1960’s post-war school building.

TIMING OF PROPOSED LANDMARK DESIGNATION
Evanston first adopted its Historic Preservation Ordinance in 1978 in order to identify and preserve “areas, properties, structures, sites and objects having a special historical, community, architectural or aesthetic interest or value to the City and its citizens,” and to foster “civic pride” in Evanston’s unique architecture, landmarks and districts.
Over a period of approximately ten years, the Preservation Commission recommended and the City Council passed ordinances designating over 800 individual Evanston landmarks. As of 2015, there were 858 Evanston Landmark buildings. In the mid-1990s, an effort was made to create a Conservation District in the Fifth Ward based on the cultural and historical significance of the West Side ("PITCH"). However, for unknown reasons this process never moved forward. At that time, Foster School was one of several properties specifically identified as a site for historic consideration but no steps were taken to landmark the building.

Thus, the City of Evanston and its Preservation Commission have been aware of this building since the passage of the Historic Preservation Ordinance 40 years ago. It is only being revisited now following Family Focus’s decision to sell the building.

Landmark designation should be reserved for buildings that meet the designation criteria outlined in the Code and should not be used to prevent an owner from exercising its right to sell its property.

IMPACT ON FAMILY FOCUS MISSION
Family Focus is a non-profit organization and the Center is its only asset. Family Focus has provided extensive social services to Evanston residents since 1976 and it is committed to continuing to do so from a to-be-identified leased space within Evanston. It cannot, however, continue to operate from the Center.

Over the past five years, this building has operated at a deficit which has been met by drawing down Family Focus’ endowment causing adverse impact on the cost of operating the building and the financial resources of Family Focus. This does not even include the unmet capital needs that will be necessary in the years ahead. Family Focus cannot continue to fund an operating deficit and capital expenditures at the Center at the expense of its core mission – serving children and families in need.

Bridget O’Keefe concluded by saying that Family Focus does not consent to the proposed landmark designation of the Center and does not believe that it meets the criteria of Subsection 2-8-4(B) of the Code which is required to move forward.

Merri Ex, CEO and President of Family Focus concurred with Ms. O’Keefe’s presentation and spoke on the financial difficulties Family Focus is experiencing due to the lack of funding to maintain the building and the inability to market the building with a landmark designation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
The following members of the audience spoke in favor of the nomination:

Bennet Johnson, Lori Keenan, Steven Vick, Mary McWilliams, Ald. Robin Rue Simmons, M. Wetherspoon read letter from Janet Alexander Davis, Delores Holmes and Al Gibbs.
COMMISSION'S REPORT WITH FINDINGS OF FACT

2010 Dewey Avenue
Weissbourd-Holmes Family Focus Building / Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Experimental School / Foster School

Built: 1905 (original three-story building)

1926 and 1931 (North addition of Gymnasium, Theater and classrooms)

1961 (South end new construction replacing original 1905 structure)

Architects: Ernest Woodyatt (Woodyatt), 1905
Childs & Smith, 1926 and 1931
Ganster & Hennighausen, 1961

The City Code Section 2-8-5 (E) requires that the Commission's recommendation include a report with the following information:

1. **Explanation of the significance or lack of significance of the nominated landmark or district as it relates to the criteria for designation;**

On July 10, 2018, the Preservation Commission found that the nominated property and building(s) for Landmark designation at 2010 Dewey Avenue meets criteria for landmark designation of the City Code, Section 2-8-4 (A) "Criteria for Designation" 2 and 6 as follows:

(A) 2. **Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the historic, cultural, architectural, archaeological or related aspect of the development of the City of Evanston, State of Illinois, Midwest region, or the United States.**

2010 Dewey Avenue meets Criterion (A) 2 because its distinctive identification with, significant individuals, associated with the former Foster School's and the City of Evanston's cultural and political history. Consequently, its significance is defined by a period of time between 1905 and 1979, when and where those events took place. The property at 2010 Dewey Avenue along with its building(s) has a strong case for its period of significance from the earliest days of the existence of the former Foster School in 1905 up to 1979, when it stopped being used by the School District.

Throughout Foster School history many individuals who attended the school became prominent Black Evanston citizens that made their positive mark at the local, national and international level, including:

**Junior Mance:** Jazz pianist, released over 40 albums.


Iva Caruthers: General Secretary of Samuel DeWitt Proctor Conference, which engages progressive African-American faith leaders in social justice issues.

Joseph Hill: First African American Assistant Superintendent of school district 65 and later Superintendent.


Leon Robinson Jr.: Entrepreneur, Robinson Bus Company and later Robinson Enterprises with real estate holdings across the United States.

(A) 6. Its association with important cultural or social aspects or events in the history of the City of Evanston, the State of Illinois, the Midwest region, or the United States.

Foster School provided generations of young Black students education from a few in 1905 when the school opened, to 100% African American student body by 1945. Segregation of the Black community resulted in the majority of Black citizens residing in the City of Evanston’s Fifth Ward by 1930.

Other forms of segregation would not allow a Black teacher be employed in Evanston as a teacher until the 1950s. Foster School was where Black teachers could teach. Most of these teachers achieved successful careers, such as Joseph Hill became the first Black Superintendent of School District 65 in 1960. Eddie Lee Sutton established the Jean-Del Publishing Company in 1969 in order to publish her own educational materials. She later reactivated it under Sutton and Sutton Publisher, Inc. Lorraine H. Morton became Principal of Haven Middle School, later she was elected as an alderman and as Evanston’s first African American Mayor.

In 1966 Foster School became an experimental school or Laboratory School. White children from overcrowded schools were bussed to Foster School. In 1969 the lab school and Foster School became the Dr. Martin Luther King Laboratory School. In 1979 the school was relocated and the Foster building was closed, and subsequently sold to Family Focus in 1985.

The nomination states: “The historical setting of the Family Focus Building, formerly
Foster School, illustrates the important cultural, social aspects, and events within the City of Evanston as it interacted with issues of racial equity. The building is a representation of a specific historically and culturally related theme as a center focus on early Black history. It is an exemplification of a settlement significant to the cultural history and traditions (both positive and negative) of the City of Evanston, and a site worthy of preservation. Shorefront, within its mission as a historical organization, has collected over 100 hours of oral histories of Black residents of Evanston. Within the interviews, not one interviewee failed to mention the important role of Foster School/Family Focus during its many uses.”

**ABBREVIATED TIMELINE RELATED TO 2010 DEWEY AVENUE**

1905 Foster School opens  
1924 60% “Colored” student body at Foster School  
1926 Addition of an auditorium and gymnasium at a cost of $150,000. A library branch was added in a converted brick garage at the rear of the school  
1928 85% “Colored” student body at Foster School  
1945 99% “Colored” student body at Foster School  
1954 Brown v. Board of Education: Supreme Court overturns legal school segregation at all levels  
1961 The new “fire resistant”, $602,000 south wing of Foster School is dedicated  
1964 Representatives of Foster School PTA and other groups protest “De Facto Segregation”. “[It] is a sociological and psychological impediment to personalities of youngsters attending the school”. “Eliminate Foster as a segregated elementary school.”  
1969 Foster School renamed to Dr. Martin Luther King Laboratory School  
1969 The Supreme Court ruled that racial segregation in schools had to end at once  
1976 Family Focus organized  
1979 District 65 voted 5 to 2, to move King Lab to the former Skiles School. Foster School closes despite a class action lawsuit to re-open and retain the Lab School at the Foster School building  
1986 District 65 considers selling the Foster School building to an “interested buyer”  
1999 June 19, Foster School building renamed to the Weissbourd-Holmes Family Focus Center  
2001 Evanston’s 60% Attendance guideline for racial integration fulfilled  
2005 Foster School building reaches 100 years old  
2017 Family Focus announces intent to sell the Evanston property located at 2010 Dewey Avenue

2. **Explanation of the integrity or lack of integrity of a nominated landmark or district:**

(B) **Integrity of Landmarks and Districts.** Any district, site, building, structure, or object that meets any one or more of the criteria in Subsection 2-8-4(A) shall also possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials workmanship, feeling, and association to convey its historic significance.
The architectural changes that happened during the period between 1905 and 1979 are all significant and are all part of the property’s history. The fact that the 1905 building burned to the ground in the 1958 and was replaced in 1961, does not disqualify the property and building(s) from possessing sufficient integrity of feeling and association with the events that occurred from 1905 to 1979 (the period of significance). The historic events and the people who attended Foster School and their subsequent contributions to society, all are part of the historic property as it evolved.

3. Identification of critical features of the nominated landmark or areas, properties, sites and objects in a nominated district to provide guidance for review of alteration, construction, demolition or relocation;

Despite the 1958 catastrophic fire that burned down the 1905 Foster School building and subsequent additions in 1926 and 1931, and the modern addition in 1961, and the alterations from 1989 to 2010, the building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue retains sufficient integrity to convey its feeling and association relative to criteria 2-8-4 (A) 2 and 6,

The photos below taken in September, 2018 are the record for future alteration, construction, demolition, or relocation under Evanston’s ordinance. Also acknowledging that since the building is not being designated for architectural significance that the Preservation Commission in the future would look favorably on a broader interpretation of design standards for modification of the building.
4. Proposed design guidelines, if any, for review of alteration, construction, demolition or relocation;

If designated as Evanston landmark, the building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue would be subject to review for exterior work requiring a permit and when visible from the public way under the City Code Section 2-8-9 Standards for Review of Alteration, Construction, Relocation and Demolition. Also acknowledging that since the building(s) is not being recommended for its architectural significance, the Commission in the future would look favorably on a broader interpretation of design standards for modification of the building.

Modifications necessary for adaptive reuse of the property shall not be discouraged. Such modifications shall include, but not be limited to the subdivision of north parking lot for residential development, additions to the roof and building, and modifications to windows. Changes to interior of the building are not within the purview of the Preservation Commission.

If landmarked, and the Commission reviews a future application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Commission will conduct its review based upon the building and site's form and appearance during its period of significance 1905-1979. The Commission will consider whether the work that is being proposed is compatible with the building as it had evolved up to 1979.
5. A map showing the location of the nominated landmark

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION
The Preservation Commission recommends to City Council the landmark designation of the property and building(s) at 2010 Dewey Avenue with reference to criteria 2-8-4 (A) 2 “Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the historic, cultural, architectural, archaeological or related aspect of the development of the City, State, Midwest region or the United States” and 2-4-8 (A) 6 “Its association with important cultural, social, political, or economic aspects or events in the history of the City, the State, the Midwest region or the United States,” defining a period of significance dating from 1905 to 1979.

The Commission acknowledges that the building is being designated for its historic and cultural significance to the City of Evanston, not for architectural significance. Consequently, this designation will require a broader interpretation of the Ordinance’s standards for review in the future, recognizing the distinction between architectural and
historic and cultural significance. The Commission concludes that the building and site does retain sufficient integrity per criterion 2-8-4 (B) Integrity of Landmarks and Districts. "Any district, site, building, structure, or object that meets any one or more of the criteria in Subsection 2-8-4(A) shall also possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials workmanship, feeling, and association to convey its historic significance," to convey its feeling and association relative to 2-4-8 (A) 2 and 6.

LINKS TO:

2010 Dewey Avenue Landmark Nomination

Dino Robinson, Jr. Presentation

Family Focus Presentation
MEETING MINUTES (EXCERPT)
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, February 13, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present:  Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Julie Hacker, Ken Itle, Jamie Morris, Tim Schmitt, Mark Simon, and Diane Williams,

Members Absent:  Sally Riessen Hunt, Suzi Reinhold, and Karl Vogel

Staff Present:  Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator
Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Presiding Member:  Dian Williams, Chair

CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order at 7:06 pm with a quorum present

PUBLIC HEARING

A. 2010 Dewey Av. (Family Focus) – Nomination for Evanston landmark designation
[City staff recommends continuing the public hearing to March 13, 2018].

Commissioner Itle made a motion to open the public hearing for 2010 Dewey Av. seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays. (Commissioner Schmitt arrived after the vote was taken).

Chair Williams said that City staff has recommended to continue the hearing to March 13, 2018 at the request of Family Focus and that the applicant had agreed to the request.

Caterina Varvaro, Senior Vice President for Family Focus, owner of 2010 Dewey Av. said she was representing Family Focus.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to continue the public hearing for the nomination for landmark designation of 2010 Dewey Av. until the meeting of March 13, 2018, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed. Vote: 8 ayes, 0 nays.
Respectfully Submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz  
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
MEETING MINUTES (EXCERPT)
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, March 13, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Elliott Dudnik, Julie Hacker, Ken Itle, Jamie Morris, Suzi Reinhold, Tim Schmitt, Mark Simon, Karl Vogel and Diane Williams,

Members Absent: Sally Riessen Hunt and Robert Bady

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator
Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 pm with a quorum present

PUBLIC HEARING

A. 2010 Dewey Av. (Family Focus) – Nomination for Evanston landmark designation [continued from February 13, 2018].

Commissioner Schmitt made a motion to open the public hearing for 2010 Dewey Av. Nomination for landmark designation, seconded by Commissioner Dudnik. The motion passed unanimously. Vote: 9 ayes, 0 nays.

Morris (Dino) Robinson Jr., nominator, highlighted in his presentation the following:

The nomination meets standards 2, 6 and 10 of the Preservation Ordinance, Section 2-4-8:

2. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the historic, cultural, architectural, archaeological or related aspect of the development of the City of Evanston, State of Illinois, Midwest region, or the United States;
6. Its association with important cultural or social aspects or events in the history of the City of Evanston, the State of Illinois, the Midwest region, or the United States; and

10. Its exemplification of a pattern of neighborhood development or settlement significant to the cultural history or traditions of the City of Evanston, whose components may lack individual distinction.

Mr. Robinson noted that the structure at 2010 Dewey St. embodies a sense of community that has stood over a century in Evanston. It serves a particular segment of the Evanston community as a school, as symbol of social change and currently a place for social services. As a former Foster School, it has educated generations of Evanston residents who have made significant local, national and global contributions to society.

It later evolved to the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Experimental School, serving as a model for innovative teaching, and social changes during the 1960s, specifically desegregating schools in Evanston. As Family Focus, a social service center, the structure pioneered programming that has had a lasting effect in the community it serves.

The original 1905 structure was designed by Ernest Woodyatt, an Evanston resident, that stood until a fire gutted the structure in 1958. A 1926 addition by architects Childs & Smith added more classrooms, a theater and gymnasium. The 1961 addition replaced the original 1905 structure after it suffered a catastrophic fire.

In considering the designation, the nomination references the 1996 study supported by the Evanston Community Development Block Grant (Is this federal CDBG funds? If so, should read 'a Community Development Block Grant through the City of Evanston.' to create a **West Evanston Conservation District** (Reid Mackin, 1996). The study resulted in formation of the work group known as Preserving Integrity Through Culture and History (PITCH).

The work of PITCH encompassed four long-term goals:
• To establish a maintain a West Evanston Conservation District (WECID)...
• To amend the Evanston Historic Preservation Ordinance to allow...?projects affecting the WECID
• To encourage increased involvement in historic preservation issues...?by residents of the WECID
• To raise visibility of the cultural, historic, and architectural resources, sites and structures of the WECID

The history of Evanston mirrors the history of the nation. It did practice, early on in its history, the system of Jim Crow, where Foster School became the de facto segregated school in Evanston. Many interesting students attended Foster School. Some of these individuals are:

**Junior Mance:** Jazz pianist, released over 40 albums.


Sanders Hicks: First African American Fire Chief. Founder of the Evanston Speed Skating Club. First coach for Olympic medalist in speed skating, Shani Davis.

Iva Caruthers: General Secretary of Samuel DeWitt Proctor Conference, which engages progressive African-American faith leaders in social justice issues.

Joseph Hill: First African American Assistant Superintendent of school district 65 and later Superintendent.


Leon Robinson Jr.: Entrepreneur, Robinson Bus Company and later Robinson Enterprises with real estate holdings across the United States.

In closing Dino Robinson, Jr. said the building was the base for community development and the base for home and engagement in the community. It operated as a school, and as it grew, became an experimental school, introduced busing from other schools, and launched the ‘in school lunch program’. As the home of Family Focus it engages in their innovative programming and social services. Is by this and with the spirit of the PITCH work for developing the West End Preservation District, and honoring this historical aspect of what the historical structure at 2010 Dewey Avenue has encompassed and meat to the community. This building is one of the last symbols of the strength and bonds of the 5th Ward community and the African American community specifically.

Public Comment:
Kristian Harris, Mary McWilliams, Al Gibbs, former Ald. Delores Holmes spoke in support of the nomination.

Owner’s Remarks:
Bridget O’Keefe, attorney for Family Focus, the property owner, said Family Focus leases seven sites to provide their services. The only asset Family Focus owns? is the building at 2010 Dewey Av. They invested over $2 million dollars in its upkeep, and every year FF or the building or both? runs a deficit in terms of its operation. At this point, Family Focus does not support the designation. However, they would like to request more time to discuss this issue with the neighborhood and the community and ask for 120 days extension to do so.
Dino Robinson did not object to the extension request, after learning from the Commission that the property is protected until a final decision is made on the nomination.

Commissioner Dudnik made a motion to continue the public hearing on the nomination of 2010 Dewey Av. until July 10, 2018, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed. Vote: 9 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
MEETING MINUTES EXCERPT
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, July 10, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Julie Hacker, Sally Riessen Hunt, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Mark Simon, Karl Vogel and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Jamie Morris, and Tim Schmitt,

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator
Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 7:09 pm with a quorum present.

OLD BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC HEARING

- 2010 Dewey Av. (Family Focus) – Nomination for Evanston landmark designation
  (Continued from March 13, 2018).

Morris “Dino” Robinson, Jr. of Shorefront presented the nomination for landmark designation on the basis of four designation criteria, as defined in the preservation ordinance: Sections 2-8-4 (A) 2, (A) 6, (A) 10, and 2-8-4 (B).

Ernest Woodyatt designed Foster School, now the Family Focus Center, in 1903—a two-story, red brick school building, with an English basement and a hipped roof. In 1926 and 1931, the firm of Childs & Smith designed additions to Foster School, reflecting key elements of the Woodyatt design. A fire destroyed much of the original 1903 building in 1958. The 1961 (post-fire) Ganster & Hennighausen addition was a marked contrast to the Childs & Smith additions, and subsequent alterations occurred to the building in 2010.
Mr. Robinson said the structure at 2010 Dewey Avenue embodies a sense of community that has stood for over a century in Evanston. The structure has served Evanston's west side community as a school, a symbol of social change, and currently, a place for social services.

At 2010 Dewey, or the former Foster School, generations of neighborhood residents were educated. Many have made significant local, national and global contributions to society. 2010 Dewey later became the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Experimental School, serving as a model for innovative teaching and as a response to desegregation efforts nationally and locally. Mr. Robinson also referred to a 1996 study, supported by an Evanston Community Development Block Grant, to create a West Evanston Conservation District, and the formation of the work group, Preserving Integrity Through Culture and History (PITCH). This work group sought to develop a West Evanston conservation district and increase neighborhood engagement with historic preservation, local history and culture.

Mr. Robinson then cited the criteria for landmark designation for 2010 Dewey Avenue as follows:

CRITERION (A) 2.: Many notable people were educated at Foster School prior to the school's closing in 1979. Their work contributed to the history and culture of Evanston, and nationally and internationally. Examples include: Junior Mance; Dorothy Hadley Bayen; Fred Hutcherson; William Logan; Alice Tregay; Sanders Hicks; Iva Caruthers; Joseph Hill; and Tina Lifford. (Their many accomplishments are detailed in the application for landmark designation.)

CRITERIA (A) 6 and (A) 10: Foster School was originally constructed in 1903. Between 1905 and 1967, multiple generations of Black students were educated there. By the 1930s, it was the dominant school for Evanston's Black students, reflecting the local impact of 'Jim Crow' and segregation. After protests from the Black community in the 1940s, Black teachers were hired to teach in Foster School. These teachers included Grace Boyd, Willa Brown, Mary Lou Sullivan, Wendell Lanton, Dorothy Brown, Patsy Sloan, Jean Hunter, Alice Robinson, Vera Brownlee, Eddie Lee Sutton, Carolyn White Hunter, and Lorraine Morton, later elected Alderman of the Fifth Ward and Evanston's first African American Mayor.

SECTION (B) INTEGRITY OF LANDMARKS AND DISTRICTS: According to the National Park Service (NPS), "Integrity is evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic or prehistoric period. The National Register of Historic Places has established criteria that specify the qualities of
historic integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association." The Evanston Preservation Ordinance requires that a local landmark meet four of those qualities: location, design, materials, and workmanship. Mr. Robinson then described how 2010 Dewey meets these four (4) qualities:

Integrity of Location: Location is important in relating the property's location and setting to the historic events and the story of the people associated with that historic property. Evanston's schools had and have a commanding presence in their neighborhoods. Foster School is no different. Because of that presence, both the location and the setting are important.

Integrity of Design: As defined by NPS, design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. Foster School's designs and additions reflect changes in 20th century school design. The use of traditional red brick and window styles are continued throughout each addition. In later new additions utilize aluminum and brick.

Integrity of Materials: The NPS definition states that "Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property." Except for the aluminum window replacements in the 1926 and 1931 additions, the materials are the original building materials and have very good integrity. The 1960's additions to 2010 Dewey were constructed with red brick, the second and limestone lintels above the second- and third-floor windows. The aluminum windows are original to this portion of the building and are evidence of the evolution of the choice of building materials between the 1930s and the 1960s.

Integrity of Workmanship: Specific to Foster School, workmanship illustrates the aesthetic principles of 20th century school design. The two major periods of workmanship evident in the Foster School/Family Focus building represent two distinct views on how a school building should look. The workmanship on all three sections of the building—1926, 1931, and 1961—are examples of highly competent construction and workmanship.

Representatives of the property owner then presented their arguments in opposition to the nomination of 2010 Dewey Avenue for landmark designation. These representatives included: Bridget O'Keefe, attorney, Marie Ax, Executive Director and Julie Hamos, Vice Chair of the Board of directors of property owner, Family Focus,
Ms. O'Keefe emphasized that Family Focus respects and shares the community's passion towards this building. However, Family Focus' position is that the 2010 Dewey Avenue building is ineligible for designation because it does not meet the integrity standard Section 2-8-4 (B) of the Ordinance. Ms. O'Keefe also cited the National Register criteria regarding integrity and its seven (7) aspects or qualities: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, and Association. She asserted that 2010 Dewey does not meet all seven qualities."

The original building was constructed in 1903 with subsequent additions in 1926 and 1931. On October 30, 1958 a fire destroyed most of Foster School, and in 1961, a modern addition was added to the portion of the historic building that survived the fire. Family Focus took ownership of the property in 1983. In the late 1990s Family Focus replaced all windows in the building. A handicapped accessible entrance was added to the primary façade in 2010, which included a 3-story elevator. This new entrance represented a major change to the primary elevation. There were also corresponding changes to the footprint of the building, which it was expanded in 1961 and again in 2010.

2010 Dewey has evolved over time, and no longer resembles the building it was originally constructed in early 20th Century, nor the mid-century modern building that was constructed in 1961. The cumulative impact of these recent changes, particularly since the closure of the school in 1979, has compromised the historic character of the building and its architectural integrity. Thus, the Foster School building does not meet the integrity criteria mandated by Subsection 2-8-4(B) of the Code.

Based on the rating system used by the City of Evanston to categorize “integrity” in its landmark buildings, the 2010 Dewey Avenue building is rated as “Poor.” A “poor” degree of integrity is exhibited if the building’s materials and details are missing or completely covered, or have unsympathetic, irreversible alterations and additions that greatly compromise the building’s character. The cumulative impact of the above changes has severely compromised the historic integrity of the original historic structure and the 1960’s post-war school building.

Ms. O'Keefe also noted the “PITCH” effort of the mid-1990s. At that time, Foster School was one of several properties specifically identified as a site for historic consideration but no steps were taken to landmark the building. The City of Evanston and its Preservation Commission have also been aware of this building since the passage of the Historic Preservation Ordinance in 1978, or 40 years ago. There have been numerous opportunities for the City and Preservation Commission to determine that this building was appropriate to landmark.
There is a significant burden that must be met to approve a landmark designation of 2010 Dewey given the adverse impact on the financial viability of Family Focus. The cost of operating the building is having a negative impact, and Family Focus cannot continue to fund the building at the expense of its core mission – serving children and families in need.

Ms. O'Keefe stated that Family Focus neither consents to the proposed landmark designation of 2010 Dewey nor believes that it meets the criterion 2-8-4(B) which is required for designation. Merri Ex, CEO and President of Family Focus then spoke about Family Focus' financial difficulties due to the lack of funding to maintain the building and their inability to market the building with a landmark designation.

The following members of the audience spoke in support of the nomination: Bennet Johnson, Lori Keenan, Steven Vick, Mary McWilliams, Ald. Robin Rue Simmons, M. Wetherspoon read a letter from Janet Alexander Davis, Delores Holmes, and Al Gibbs.

After audience comment, Commissioner Hacker asked if the property is landmarked, how the Commission would review changes to the building, such as windows or roof, and how to evaluate those kinds of changes.

Commissioner Dudnik said that 'Preservation' is being used here as if the Commission is speaking of the word 'demolition' and alternative scenarios. Chair Williams said that criteria 2-8-4 (A) 2, (A) 6, (A) 10, and 2-8-4 (B) "Integrity" are the issues the Commission is considering, and whether or not this nomination meets those criteria. That is the basis for the Commission's decision.

Commissioner Dudnik then noted that 2010 Dewey Avenue would only have to meet one or more of the section (A) criteria. He had a problem with (A) 10, the neighborhood development and (B) was partially met. Commissioner Simon said it is clear that the nomination has to meet both—at least one criterion of (A) and criterion (B).

Chair Williams said that Commissioner Hacker's question refers for future reviews of the physical aspects of the building and identifying the character defining features of this property. Commissioner Itle observed that this nomination is not about architectural design but cultural and political history. Therefore, a period of significance must be identified which is probably from original construction to 1979 when the school closed. To Commissioner Hacker’s point, reviewing whether some renovation or application is appropriate or not would be based on 2010 Dewey’s appearance in 1979.
Commissioner Simon stated that the section (A) criteria being presented are not just about the people that were there, but also about a strong feeling and association with the building. Criterion (B) is harder, because it does say that it must have sufficient integrity of design, materials, feeling and association. Realistically, 2010 has some of those and not others. The Commission can recommend approval based upon the historical, cultural, feeling and association. In the future, it would not be approving projects based on the architectural features and can be flexible in reviewing plans to modify the exterior or the windows. All of this says that a future owner would have to come back for exterior alteration of the building, and nothing else whatsoever.

Chair Williams noted that the National Register references about integrity gets to the question—does the site retain its identity? The basis of the identity question is if someone from the period of significance returns to the site, they would recognize this place. This assures flexibility over the landmark’s story and the building.

Commissioner Dudnik said the way (B) is written says...a feeling and association to convey its historic significance; it does not say...a feeling and association to convey its “architectural significance.” Commissioner Riessen Hunt said just because it does not resemble the original does not mean it does not mean that it lacks integrity. A case could be made for the stabilization if the community and the beginning of the entire community. Commissioner Bady said he appreciated both sides and learning about the history of 2010 Dewey Avenue. Also he appreciated the people who came in support of the nomination. He had no doubt that the historical and cultural relevance is there.

In summary, Commissioners agreed that criterion (A) 10 was written primarily for districts and inapplicable here. Commissioner Hacker asked if that would mean that there would be more latitude on exterior alterations. Commissioner Simon said the critical features are historical. It would neither preclude exterior alterations nor discourage exterior alterations. Scott Mangum noted that the Commission has 70 days after the closing of the public hearing to approve its report on the nomination and send it via a resolution to City Council.

Commissioner Ltle then moved to direct City staff to prepare a report recommending designation of 2010 Dewey Avenue (the former Foster School) as a City of Evanston landmark, with reference to criteria (A) 2 and (A) 6, and defining a period of significance dating from 1905 to 1979: acknowledging that the building is not being designated for architectural significance and that future Commission decisions should look favorably on a broader interpretation of design standards for modification to the building; and criterion (B) that the building retains sufficient integrity to convey its feeling and
association specific to those two criteria. Commissioner Dudnik seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 8-0.

Commissioner Itle then moved to close the public hearing for 2010 Dewey Avenue, seconded by Commissioner Riessen Hunt. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hacker made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:30 pm on July 10, 2018, seconded by Commissioner Bady. The motion passed 9-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
MEETING MINUTES EXCERPT
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, September 11, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Julie Hacker, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Jamie Morris, Mark Simon, and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Tim Schmitt, Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Sally Riessen Hunt, and Karl Vogel

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM 7:05 pm

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 2010 Dewey Av. (Family Focus) – Nomination for Evanston landmark designation (Continued from July 10, 2018). Consideration of approval of report and resolution asking the City Manager to transmit the Commission’s recommendation to designate 2010 Dewey Avenue as an Evanston Landmark.

At the invitation of Chair Williams, Bridget O'Keefe, attorney for the property owner presented:
- There has been less interest in purchase of property since landmark consideration.
- The property is being designated for history, not architectural reasons.
- Seeking flexibility in design guideline language.
- Agree with period of significance.
- Propose additional language: only exterior changes to be reviewed, exempt surrounding land for purposes of possibility to develop residential use on property to north.
- Detailed proposed language excluding interior review, designate east elevation as primary, allow for new additions on roof or secondary elevations if compatible, allow for flexibility for window replacements.
- Concerned with vagueness of report language.
- East façade primary because is most visible and as entrance.
- Do not see potential of developing land to the east.
At the invitation of Chair Williams, Dino Robinson Jr., applicant stated:
- Also interested in flexibility within building and zoning compliance and to allow for additions that would fit in.
- Believes that development of the lot north of building acceptable to community.
- Does not see potential for development on lot to the east of the building.

Chair Williams expressed concern with proposed language regarding exceptions to Preservation Ordinance provisions, such as excluding the site from Commission review.

Ms. O'Keefe clarified that they are asking for flexibility due to nonprofit status of owner.

Commissioner Simon noted that he was only interested in providing additional flexibility for development of the land to the north.

Commissioner Itle stated that he was also open to future subdivision for development to the north.

Commissioners Simon and Hacker discussed adding general language about what the Commission might consider, but cautioned against being too specific as that could limit creative reuse.

Ms. O'Keefe added that the additional language would useful for real estate broker and developers to know limits and opportunities.

Staff and the Commission clarified that subdivisions of landmarks are required to come before the Commission, unless the landmark designation excludes the land. Commissioners were not comfortable excluding land, but instead favored adding language to the report that would not discourage a future subdivision.

In response to concerns about the report listing the critical features, the Commission agreed to remove the bulleted list of features, from item number 3 in the report, while retaining the photos.

In response to concerns about the design guidelines, the Commission suggested additional language to item number 4 in the report:

Modifications necessary for adaptive reuse of the property shall not be discouraged. Such modifications shall include, but not be limited to the subdivision of north parking lot for residential development, additions to the roof and building, and modifications to windows. Changes to interior of the building are not within the purview of the Preservation Commission.

Commissioner Simon made a motion recommending approval of the report as modified by the Commission, and resolution for the City Manager to transmit the Commission's recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Itle. The motion passed 6 ayes, 0 nays.
AN ORDINANCE

Granting Evanston Landmark Status to the Building and Lot of Record at 2010 Dewey Avenue

WHEREAS, the City has enacted a Historic Preservation Ordinance ("Ordinance"), Title 2, Chapter 8 of the Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended; and

WHEREAS, Section 2-8-5 of the Ordinance sets forth the process whereby the Preservation Commission ("Commission") shall nominate and consider applications for landmark designation and designate landmarks and historic districts; and

WHEREAS, the building at 2010 Dewey Avenue (the "Subject Property") was constructed in 1905 as Foster School (later known as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Experimental School and the Weissbourd-Holmes Family Focus Building), and operated as a school during its period of significance between 1905 and 1979, where many individuals who attended and/or worked at the school became prominent Black Evanston citizens that made their positive mark at the local, national and international level, including: Junior Mance, Dorothy (Hadley) Bayen, Fred Hutcherson, William Logan, Sanders Hicks, Iva Caruthers, Joseph Hill, Tina Lifford, Leon Robinson Jr., and Lorraine H. Morton; and

WHEREAS, the Subject Property operated as a public school during an era of de facto and de jure racial segregation and thereby illustrates important
cultural and social aspects and events in the history of the City of Evanston as it interacted with racial equity; and

WHEREAS, the Subject Property has experienced architectural changes, but it maintains integrity of feeling and association with the events that occurred during its period of significance from 1905 to 1979; and

WHEREAS, Morris Robinson, Jr. (the "Applicant"), of Shorefront with offices at 2214 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Illinois, submitted an application on December 27, 2017, and a modified application on June 28, 2018, for the designation of the building on the Subject Property as an Evanston Landmark; and

WHEREAS, the Commission conducted public hearings, pursuant to proper notice, on February 13, 2018, March 13, 2018, July 10, 2018, and September 11, 2018, to consider the application pursuant to Section 285 of the Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, due notice of said hearings was given in accordance with the requirements of the Evanston Preservation Commission Ordinance and all persons desiring to be heard were given opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Commission, after having heard and reviewed the nomination testimony, receiving other evidence and making a written record, found that the aforesaid lot of record and building on the Subject Property, with the original 1905 building designed by Ernest Woodyatt and with additions by architects Childs & Smith (1926) and Ganster & Hennighausen (1961), met the
criteria in City Code Sections 2-8-4(A)(2), 2-8-4(A)(6), and 2-8-4 (B) of the Ordinance for designation as an Evanston Landmark; and

WHEREAS, at its July 10, 2018 meeting, the Commission voted to recommend that the City Council grant Evanston Landmark designation to said building on the Subject Property; and

WHEREAS, at its September 11, 2018 meeting, the Commission adopted a Resolution "Requesting the City Manager to Transmit the Evanston Preservation Commission’s Report and Recommendation that the City Council Designate the Building at 2010 Dewey Avenue as an Evanston Landmark" to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Development Committee of the City Council considered and adopted the record and recommendation of the Preservation Commission at its October 8, 2018 meeting and recommended that the City Council designate the building on the Subject Property, as an Evanston Landmark; and

WHEREAS, the City Council considered and adopted the respective records and recommendations of the Preservation Commission and the Planning and Development Committee at its October 8, 2018 and October 22, 2018 meetings, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS:

SECTION 1: The above recitals are found as fact and made a part hereof.
SECTION 2: Pursuant to City Code Section 2-8-5(G) of the Ordinance, the City Council hereby designates the building at 2010 Dewey Avenue as an Evanston Landmark.

SECTION 3: If any provision of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or applications thereof.

SECTION 4: All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5: This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication in the manner provided by law.

Introduced: October 8, 2018
Approved: Nov 12, 2018

Adopted: October 22, 2018

Stephen H. Hagerty, Mayor

Attest: Devon Reid, City Clerk

Approved as to form: Michelle L. Masoncup, Corporation Counsel
August 13, 2018

Foster Center Our Place
Ms. Rose Johnson
Center Director
2010 Dewey Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Re: Condition Assessment Report
    at 2010 Dewey Avenue, Evanston, IL.

Dear Ms. Johnson

Pursuant to the proposal dated May 1, 2018 and as revised on July 16, 2018, enclosed please find US-BES’ condition assessment of the referenced property.

PROJECT APPROACH

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide Foster Center Our Place (FCOP) documentation of the current condition of the components of the school, as well as to provide general recommendations for repairs that may be necessary. Cursory observation of mechanical, electrical plumbing, and heating system that were accessible are included in this document. Therefore, for this evaluation, we will limit our Scope of Work to include visible areas, that is, exterior common elements and components of the exterior walls and roofs and interior common areas.

Given the scope included in this proposal, and our desire to have the most qualified professionals with specific expertise perform this evaluation, a licensed architect(s) from US-BES performed the work with the assistance of a senior project estimator, Mr. Brent Mounts.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Based on the observations made during US-BES’ on-site visit and review of limited documents, the building conditions are found to be as follows:

Interior Conditions: The hallways, classrooms, restrooms, offices and auxiliary spaces were observed to be fair to poor condition.
Exterior Condition:
Façades: The brick masonry and limestone walls were observed to be in good condition. The exception was the chimney at the west elevation. This was observed to have large vertical cracks (see photo 50 and 51). Immediate repair to the chimney’s walls is highly recommended.
Roofs: The roof surfaces vary between good to poor condition. A small roof toward the east was observed to be in good condition, while others to the north and south were in fair to poor.
Windows: The windows were observed to be in good to fair condition. The windows in the mechanical room appeared to be original and observed to be in poor condition.

INTRODUCTION

Scope

On April 26th, 2018 Frank V. Gonzalez, AIA, ALA, GGP, of U.S. Building Efficiency Solutions, Inc. (US-BES) conducted the first of many visual surveys of the interior and exterior of the referenced building. At this meeting we met Ms. Colette Allen, Mr. Paul Mark Wallace and Mr. Jackie Robson.
Additional Site visits:

- June 28th, 2018 – Inspected the basement, mechanical, electrical rooms, gymnasium, hallways, and staircases.
- July 9th, 2018 – Inspected the exterior facades.
- July 2nd, 2018 – Inspected interior rooms in the evening while most of students were not present. This allowed us to freely enter classrooms that were not accessible during day.

US-BES was provided with the following documents for review:
(Note: Documents provided for review were transmitted in electronic format after our site visit.)

- Facility Assessment, Family Focus, date 11/15/2016 prepared by IFF.
- Construction drawings from 1959. Note many of the pages from the set of drawings are missing and we reviewed pages that were available.

Building Description

The 3-story school structure with penthouse are a combination of two buildings. Toward the north exists the 1905 building and on the south a more recent wing was built after the 1958 fire destroyed a large portion of the original building. The buildings do not have an installed fire sprinkler system. According to IFF’s report the gross square footage of the building is approximately 51,000. The buildings are of a combination poured-in-place concrete and steel reinforcement at the 1905 section. The 1959 portion is a steel framed building. The slabs are of metal decking with poured concrete. The walls are of brick masonry and limestone. The interior walls are both plaster and drywall. The flooring has vinyl tiles, concrete, carpeting, wooden strip flooring and in some areas, it appeared to have asbestos floor tiles.
OBSERVATIONS - Interiors and Exterior:

**Interior Walls:** in the 1905 building, the walls are of plaster and painted. The plaster walls were observed with hairline cracks and the paint was observed with cracks throughout. In the 1959 addition the walls are of drywall and painted. Some deterioration was observed near window corners. This is possibly due to moisture petition (see photos 1 – 14).

**Floors:** US-BES observed vinyl tile flooring and carpeting. Asbestos flooring tile also appeared in serval locations. Damaged floor tile was observed throughout (see photo 33 and 34)

**Ceilings:** The ceiling are of acoustical drop tiles, drywall, and plaster. US-BES observed tiles missing at the gymnasiums ceiling (see photo 27).

**Doors:** There are several types of doors in the buildings. They range from glass and wood, metal, and solid and non-solid wood. US-BES observed that not all doors at the corridors had their fire rating stamp, to be displayed on side. Other doors appeared to have been tempered with a non-fire rated surface. The hardware varied and it was reported that a master key does not exist. This creates a challenge for the staff when immediate access is necessary. Several doors would not close properly or door handles were not operable (see photos 36 – 40).

**Restrooms:** Both the men’s and women’s restrooms were observed with damages. The tile walls were observed to be outdated and the metal partition dividers with damages. The water flow in the sink appeared to be slow and possibly clogged due to interior corrosion in the pipes (see photos 19 – 24).

**Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning (HVAC)**

The building’s heating system source is from two large boilers in the basement level. Pipes throughout the buildings feed heating radiators of different size and designs (see photo 7).

The cooling system is by window air conditioners which can be insufficient to cool a large classroom space, and therefore inefficient. The system should be calibrated and checked regularly for efficiency.

**Plumbing System**

US-BES tested a few of the restroom faucets and observed the waterflow was slow and from some, there was no waterflow. It appears that the pipes are clogged with corrosion. The Building Maintenance contact did inform US-BES that the building pipes lack proper water pressure.
US-BES observed a 100-gallon commercial water heating tank in the basement. It is fueled with gas, with an electrical starter (see photo 56). Regular maintenance and inspections are recommended.

**Electrical Power**

US-BES observed an 800-amp servicing electrical system in the basement. US-BES recommends routine inspection and maintenance for the equipment.

**Exterior**

**Facades:** The brick masonry and limestone walls were observed to be in good condition. The lintels on the 1905 building are of decorative limestone at the 2nd floor. The 1st and 2nd floor lintels are of steel. The corners of the brick walls have a coin design. A limestone band is located along the 2nd floor (see photos 45 – 48).

The chimney at the west elevation was observed to have large vertical cracks (see photos 50 and 51). The immediate repair to the chimney’s walls is highly recommended.

**Roofs:** The roofs vary in condition from good to poor. The majority of the bituminous built-up roofs have cracks, bubbling, and allilgating surfaces (see photos 52 and 54).

**Windows:** The building’s windows are aluminum double hung with a white finished color. The basement windows are single glass and appeared to be dated from when the building was originally constructed.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Interior Walls, Floors, and Ceilings:** The walls that were observed to be damaged should be repaired. Other surfaces were observed to have cracked paint. The floors were observed with damages. The flooring that appear to be of asbestos should be tested for the product. Ceilings were observed to be damaged and missing. US-BES recommends developing a compressive repair program. The repair program could be broken into phases for ease of budgeting the work.

**Restrooms:** The restrooms were observed to be in fair to poor condition. Remodeling of each restroom is recommended.

**Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning (HVAC)**

The building’s heating system is vintage, and a more economical system is recommended. The cooling by window air condition is financially expensive and the design of central is recommended.

**Plumbing System**
The interior water system pipes should be upgraded as various water leaks were observed.

**Electrical Power**
The electrical system in the building is outdated. US-BES recommends redesigning the system to current code. There are various sustainable electrical system that work off of renewable sources such as wind and solar power. Current mechanical system use less energy than those from serval years ago. Implementing a design to conserve energy is highly recommended.

**Exterior**
**Facades:** The brick masonry and limestone require tuckpointing. Inspecting the walls closely such by a scaffold is recommended. The most affordable system for inspecting facades at close range is by repelling. US-BES recommends hiring a professional to inspect the walls.

The chimney at the west elevation was observed to have large vertical cracks (see photos 50 and 51). The immediate repair to the chimney’s walls is highly recommended.

**Roofs:** The roofs vary in condition from good to poor. US-BES recommends a repair phasing program, addressing most damaged areas first.

**Windows:** The building’s windows were observed to be in good condition. Minor repairs are recommended such as sealing the perimeter of the frames and the glass to frames.

If you have question, please call me anytime.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Frank V. Gonzalez, AIA, ALA, GGP
Principal
Licenses:
Illinois – 001.018624
New York – 029327-1
Florida –AR92977

**Photographs Below**
1. View of the reception area at the 1st floor.

2. View of the office, room 208.

3. View of the office, room 207.

4. View of the additional office is

5. View of the classroom 012.

6. View of the STEM room.
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7. View of the heating radiators and window air conditioner.

8. View of the room 203.

9. View of the walls and floor in room 203.

10. View of the air conditioner, CMU wall and windows, room 203.

11. View of the windows, flooring, and ceiling in room 201.

12. View of the ceiling lights in room 201.
13. View of the flooring, walls, and ceiling, room 106 (Library).

14. View of the walls along the sitting area, room 106 (Library).

15. View of the room in 105.

16. View of the windows, air conditioner, flooring, ceiling lighting, room 103.

17. View of the entrance to classroom 209. The glass is not fire rated. Typical condition throughout the facility.

18. View of the women restroom, room 009.
19. View of the men’s restroom, near room 009.

20. View of the women’s restroom, basement. The tiles and metal portion wall dividers are outdated. The partitions were observed with damages.

21. View of the ADA women’s stall.

22. View of the ADA women’s regular stall.

23. View of the men’s washroom sinks, basement level.

24. View of the men’s urinals, basement level.
25. View of the men’s ADA stall, basement level.

26. View of the gymnasium.

27. View of the ceiling in the gymnasium. Ceiling tiles are missing throughout.

28. View of the old lockers, across the gymnasium.

29. View of the hallway in the basement.

30. View of the staircase leading to the 1st floor.
31. View of the hallway at the 2nd floor.

32. Another view 2nd floor hallway.

33. View of the hallway at the 3rd floor. Floor tiles were observed to be missing and damaged.

34. View of the damaged and missing floor tiles, 3rd floor. This is a tripping hazard and should be repaired immediately.

35. View of a different area in the 3rd floor hallway.

36. View of the doors at the Community Playhouse.
37. View of the door at room 207.

38. View of the door, room 208.

39. View of doors, near the gymnasium.

40. View of doors across the gymnasium.

41. View of doors, room 001

42. View of the entrance doors
43. View of the exist doors, 1st floor, east section.

44. View of a solid core door leading to a restroom.

45. View of the front entrance to the school, east elevation.

46. View of the east elevation, near Foster Street.

47. View of the new and original facades of the school.

48. View of the south and a portion of the east facades.
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US-BES
U.S. Building Efficiency Solutions, Inc.
49. View of the south façade, along Foster Street

50. View of the cracked chimney wall, west elevation

51. Closeup of the large crack. The damaged chimney was recently repaired.

52. View of the roof over the 1905 original building.

53. View of the ceramic tile roof shingles.

54. View of built-up roofing membrane.
55. View of the boilers

56. View of the hot water tank

57. View of the damaged ceiling. It appears to be from prior water leak

58. View items stored in boiler room. The area should free of such items.

59. View of liquids, shovels, plastic bags, and other miscellanies items. Boiler room should free of possible flammable items.

60. View of more miscellane items cluttering boiler room.
FAMILY FOCUS
Facility Assessment
2010 Dewey Street, Evanston, Illinois

Prepared by IFF
July 28, 2021

Introduction

On June 15, 2021, IFF visited and assessed Family Focus’ building located at 2010 Dewey Ave in Evanston, IL. This report is an update of the findings from an assessment conducted in 2016, which reflects current needs and renders an opinion on the physical condition with an eye towards improvements for potential long-term tenants. There is an expressed need to assess the existing building to guide Family Focus where to invest in improvements. Addressing the improvements through this lens will have a significant impact on the current building operations and will require a robust design and construction process. Key priorities for the building include:

- Stabilizing the building systems and envelope.
- Providing attractive facilities and amenities for the community and local organizations, particularly an early childhood education center.

The IFF assessment will highlight opportunities and challenges in adding to the existing use of this building and is intended to help guide Family Focus in their decision making process. The information within this report will also help with the development of a funding strategy that addresses needs beyond routine maintenance. In addition to seeking capital improvement grants and private fundraising, Family Focus is considering a capital campaign.

This is an update to the 2016 assessment and describes the current physical condition of the buildings and grounds and includes: identification of deficiencies with the site, building enclosure, building systems; preliminary analysis of building code and accessibility compliance issues; prioritization of items to be addressed. The building deficiencies observed have been prioritized into four groups:

- **Priority 1: Short Term** - includes items that impact life safety, impair core proposed functions, or are causing damage to the facility.
- **Priority 2: Intermediate** - includes items or building systems that are near the end of their service life and will need to be replaced in near future. Repair or replacement of items in this category are not critical at this time but will need to be addressed in 2 to 5 years. This category can also include code violations that do not pose an immediate hazard.
- **Priority 3: Long Term** - includes items that will need to be addressed in the long term beyond 5 years or are regular maintenance items.
- **Priority 4: Quality Improvements** includes non-critical upgrades to improve the quality of the building environment.
Individual renovation tasks are included based on several factors including the physical condition of a building element, building code requirements, and items required by the zoning ordinance. IFF has recommended several renovations needed to address these shortcomings and to address the recommended modifications to enhance the building operations. The extent of the renovations needed is subject to the interpretation of the local building code and zoning ordinances. IFF recommends that Family Focus engages with a licensed architect and contractor in a conceptual design phase to identify additional work scope that may be required which would have a significant impact on the projected renovation costs. The conceptual design estimate would then inform a full project budget.

This Facility Assessment represents the best of IFF’s knowledge regarding conditions at the site based upon visual observations and is intended to provide an outline of work required. A more detailed assessment that would include selective demolition of key areas is required to create a detailed scope of work and budget.

Opinions expressed regarding the facility’s conformance to any and all building codes, accessibility rules and regulations, or other standards are preliminary only. IFF recommends that Family Focus enlist the services of appropriately licensed professionals for final determination of code-related issues.

Facility History
The Family Focus building assessed is approximately 51,000 square feet and the oldest part of the building dates to 1905. This portion of the building consists of masonry exterior walls, concrete columns and structural concrete floors. A building addition was constructed in 1961, which has structural steel columns and beams, and concrete metal decking floors. A three story elevator tower was added in 2010 and repairs to severe chimney damage was addressed in 2018. In this same year, one of the boilers for the addition was replaced.

Facility Overview
There are four different levels of flat roofs and the topmost roof is partially cladded with clay tile at the building perimeter. The interior framing consists of metal stud of plaster/drywall wall assemblies. The floor finish ranges from vinyl tile, sealed concrete, ceramic tile floors, carpet and wood flooring in the gymnasium. There is a fire alarm system, including visual alarms, but no sprinkler system, except for the theater. The building is ADA accessible, except for most of the restrooms.

Currently, the building has 12 tenants throughout the building and is below its capacity. At the basement level, there is a large community room, a youth media space, food pantry storage, a commercial kitchen and a gymnasium. The basement also contains the boiler room, mechanical room and electrical room. The main level houses the Teen Baby Nursery, administration offices, a small meeting room and tenant spaces. The second floor has a black box theater, library and a large conference room and tenant spaces . The third floor also has the fan room and the elevator room, in addition to tenant spaces. Many rooms, especially classrooms originally designed for young children, maintain their original size and amenities, such as small toilet rooms and sinks. Most rooms have been subdivided to create smaller offices or spaces. On site, there is a small community garden, an outdoor play area and a surface parking lot. The trash dumpsters are located at the parking lot adjacent to the alley but there is no enclosure for them.
The building is underutilized and Family Focus sees an opportunity to reconfigure and activate spaces to attract desirable tenants that are complementary to their services, to create a vibrant community hub.

**Summary of Findings**

This Summary of Findings offers an overview of the observations made during the walkthrough of the facility. A more detailed list of improvements is provided in the following narrative and budget.

**Site**

**Sidewalks and Parking**

Concrete sidewalks are in good condition. At the southern portion of the building, in front of the teen and baby program rooms, there is a pebbled sidewalk in good condition. An open parking lot is accessed via an alley at the west side of the building and has 60 spaces (including two handicap parking spaces). The lot extends to north of the building. The size is adequate for the building type and use. However, the asphalt surface will need repairs due to potholes and cracking. There is adequate site lighting on the building and parking lot. General maintenance (bulb replacement or fixture repair) will be needed.

**Landscaping**

The trees, shrub and lawn are in good condition and appear to be regularly maintained. At the north side of the building is a community garden that appears to be regularly tended.

**Exterior Building**

**Foundation and Lintels**

The foundation is in good condition and does not show any cracking nor differential settling. IFF was only able to closely inspect windows at the basement level and first floor. The lintels appear intact but show signs of rust.

**Roof**

Modified bituminous roofing was observed on site, except at the perimeter of the original 1900s building, which is composed of clay tile roof in good condition. It is also comprised of a modified bituminous roof with a silver coating and it appears to be in good condition with evidence of some ponding in a few locations.

The roofing above the second floor of the 1960s addition was replaced within the past three years and is in good condition, as is the roofing above the elevator penthouse. Although no leaks have been reported, the roofing above the first floor annex and above the third floor appear to be worn, cracking and show evidence of ponding in some locations. At the teen and baby annex, which is only one floor, the roof membrane laps over the fascia without any flashing or protective metal coping.

**Exterior Walls and Windows**

Staff has reported leaking at the ceiling in rooms 109, 110, 209 and 210, located along the east side of the 1960s building. At the time of the visit, contractors who have examined the condition have varying opinions regarding the cause: masonry in need of tuckpointing or failed window flashing. A visual inspection shows that both are deficient at these locations and in need of repair. Worn sealant was seen at the flashing and this installation may
have prevented water weeping from behind the masonry to the outside face of the building. Significant erosion of the mortar at this location may have allowed water to more easily penetrate the masonry wall.

Masonry is in fair condition but needs tuckpointing repairs in several locations: at the roof side of the third floor “pop up”, at the east façade of the building (mentioned above) and at the west façade of the building (both addition and original building). Where the masonry and mortar are in good to fair condition, cleaning will be needed.

In the 1960s portion of the building, sealant repair is highly recommended due to signs of noticeable cracking in several locations. Glazing and window frames are in good condition and consist of fixed pane or awning in this portion of the building. In the original portion of the building, the window frames appear to be in good condition, although minor repairs and sealant repairs should be part of a maintenance program.

Exterior Doors
The doors remain in fair condition and will need minor repairs. At the east side of the building, at the northern portion of the original, the concrete stairs require concrete patching at the base of one railing and complete failure at the other railing. This will require replacement and concrete stair repair. Above the same doors is a worn awning with a major tear. This will require its removal. Replacement is not necessary but may be desired to mark it as featured entrance to the theater located on the second floor.

Interior Building

Basement Level
Staff reported floor damage in the gymnasium that occurred 3 years ago. Steam from the heating system pipes migrated under the floor and caused severe buckling of the wood flooring. With assistance from the City of Evanston, a new wooden floor was installed. However, the floor tile planks at transition between the wood floor and the VCT at the corridor. There is evidence of Vinyl Composition Tile (VCT) cracking and missing floor planks in select locations.

The ceiling tiles in the gymnasium require replacement due to a hot water leak in the theater, which is located directly above. The leak was repaired but the affected ceiling tiles have not been replaced.

First, Second and Third Levels
Corridor flooring is in overall good condition due to regular maintenance but in need of replacement due to cracking in several areas. Although it is in good condition, tile replacement is mismatched due to availability of cost-effective tile at the time of replacement. This is the same situation within the office areas (AKA former classrooms) with tile. According to staff, 6 rooms have carpet flooring and the average age is 6 years. There are plans to replace this flooring with new carpet, although the timeline was not definitively defined at the time of the visit.

Several rooms have been subdivided with drywall and framing over time to accommodate specific functions no longer in service therefore many layouts should be reconfigured for more general uses suitable for a variety of
tenants. Reconfiguration may trigger a larger renovation that will require conformance to current building codes.

In many instances, partial height walls have been installed but a few rooms have partition walls extending up to the ceiling finish. If there is a concern for acoustic privacy, new partitions will need to extend above the ceiling finish, either to the floor deck or with acoustic insulation over the top of the partition above the ceiling.

Within the 1960s addition, many classrooms on the first and second floor can easily be repurposed into an Early Childhood Education center. Leading practice recommends 2000 Square Feet for this classroom type and should contain a toilet and sink, which the existing condition in these spaces.

The majority of the ceiling finishes are acoustic ceiling tile and require tile replacement, if not ceiling grid system replacement. There is evidence of water damage or pronounced bowing of tile in several locations, which may be the result from leaks or pipe condensation.

Interior doors are in fair to good condition with only minor repairs needed. If significant renovation is undertaken, door hardware will need to be replaced with lever type, knurled handles throughout the building. For tenant spaces, office function type locks are recommended.

**Kitchenettes**
Within the building, there are two kitchenette areas: one in the Teen and Baby wing and one adjacent to the second floor conference room. The cabinetry is in functioning condition but may require an upgrade in the foreseeable future.

**Bathrooms**
The ceramic wall tile finishes in the bathrooms extend to the full height are in fair to good condition, except where it meets the floor. Floor tile finishes are in fair physical condition but require deep cleaning of the grout for better maintenance. Partitions, toilets, floor finishes and accessories will need upgrading to attract new tenants. At areas adjacent to urinals, tile replacement is recommended. Comments related to plumbing and HVAC to be addressed in the Building Systems section.

**Theater**
Seat replacement or re-installation is one of the greatest needs of the theater. At the time of the visit, several rows were cordoned off to prevent use. The floor finish is comprised of VCT and carpet in fair condition but will need replacement if the intent is to rent the space for a new tenant. The ceiling is painted structural concrete with some damage to the concrete. This could be cosmetic in nature or the result of a slow leak or water seepage. Although there is not an internal roof drain above that location, there is evidence of water ponding. If Family Focus chooses to utilize the theater before a full renovation, seat rows can be removed for spare parts and used to repair the remaining seats as required. Comments related to HVAC, Life Safety and Accessibility will be addressed in the Building Systems section.

**Building Systems**
Utilities
The building is served by all major utilities, including gas, electricity, city water and city sewer.

Electrical
An 800 amp electrical service was observed in the 1905 original portion of the building maintenance room and will require upsizing for future renovation to accommodate the desired building capacity. According to the previous report, it was speculated that this may be undersized. However, there is no report of any service disruption, therefore it is sufficient for the building’s current operations. There are several electrical panels located throughout the building in good condition.

Ceiling mounted or acoustic ceiling tile integrated florescent light fixtures are installed throughout the building, especially in the classrooms. The typical light fixture bulb type is a T-8 and requires periodic replacement. In bathrooms, many light fixture housing was missing or damaged.

Phone/Data/Security
A security system and cameras were installed since the time of the previous site visit. Data for the main office area was adequate. As an upgrade, the owner may consider adding Wi-Fi in conference areas or direct connections at any future print centers for the tenants.

Plumbing
Most minor repairs, such as leaky faucets and drain traps are easily remedied and should be a part of a regular maintenance program. The most significant plumbing issues is the water pressure, especially at the third floor bathrooms. Sink faucets had very low pressure, no hot water and only one toilet in the Men’s room functioned properly. It was also noted and expressed that many in sink classrooms are not functioning or have very low pressure.

Hot Water
A 100 gallon high efficiency commercial water heater was observed at the time of the visit and is fueled by natural gas. The heater was installed in 2015 and in good condition. This water heater type needs routine maintenance every six months for several components per manufacturer’s recommendations.

Heating, Cooling and Ventilation

Controls
Simple thermostats were observed at the time of visit. Staff remarked that many thermostats were not functioning. Better quality replacements will be beneficial for increased efficiency, functionality and durability.

Heating
The primary heating source for the 1960s building addition are two large boilers which feed the radiators and one is a recent replacement. Staff remarked that there two large boilers that alternate in operation during the winter. The condenser pump was recently repaired. The heating system is adequate for the building, albeit uncoordinated, which can result in noticeable inconsistency. In room 103, ceiling mounted electric heaters are installed due to a non-functioning radiant heating in this room. The ceiling at the heater do not show any sign heat damage on the tiles.
Cooling

The primary building cooling is addressed using unit air conditioners, both window mounted and floor mounted with window mounted ducts, serving each individual room. Several units were in operation at the time of visit and functioned as intended. This system addresses cooling adequately and can be tenant controlled, however this results in less energy efficiency for the building owner. The theater is cooled with a roof top unit and requires yearly routine maintenance.

Ventilation

The 1960s addition utilizes a fan powered exhaust system and was not functioning at the time of the site visit. This is a critical repair to be addressed at the building owner's earliest convenience. The impact is most noticeable in the bathrooms.

Accessibility

An elevator servicing all three floors was installed in approximately 2007 and is in good working condition.

The primary theater entrance is not ADA and it is remedied with a lift at a separate entrance from the building corridor.

The building appears to meet the minimum required number of exits.

Significant renovations may require upgrades such as accessible door hardware, code required door clearance, door swings, required countertop heights, sinks and accessible toilet stalls. This includes under sink pipe insulation where it is exposed.

Life Safety

The building is served by a fire alarm, throughout the building, including visual strobes in the corridors. Existing devices found in the classrooms appear outdated. If any new room reconfiguration requires their re-location, this could cause a problem with Fire Alarm Control Panel (FACP) communication. Installation of new devices compatible with the FACP will likely be needed and can be addressed during renovation or in at least Year 3 or beyond upgrades. The Fire Alarm Control Panel is located in the basement, adjacent to the mechanical room and an annunciator in the main entrance lobby.

Except in the theater, the building but has no fire sprinkler system. Significant building renovations may require a sprinkler throughout and its extent is governed by the Evanston fire code.

Exit signs and emergency lighting were observed at the time of the visit and are appropriate for the building type and layout. If the layout is changed, additional signage or relocation may be required. There were a sufficient number of fire extinguishers and smoke detectors observed.

At the first and second floor corridor in the 1960's addition, there is a partially glazed wall separation. If extensive renovations were to occur, these wall partitions may be required to become fire rated walls that will
conceal or remove the glazing. Alternatively, installing a full sprinkler system within the building may also sufficiently address concern about a safe means of egress. This is dependent upon Evanston’s Fire Code.

Hazardous Materials

Throughout the 1960s addition of the building, there are select locations with what appears to be the original floor tile. During this era of construction, the mastic used to adhere the 9x9 tile contained asbestos. Where a tile is removed and evidence of an oily, black residue indicates asbestos containing mastic. Testing will be needed to confirm this. Full remediation will require additional safety measures to protect the installers from inhaling any airborne substances resulting from the act of removal. Alternatively, full encapsulation can contain the asbestos. If this approach is taken, careful consideration at floor transitions is recommended. If there is too much height between the materials, a threshold or transition strip will be needed to comply with accessibility standards.

General Facility Recommendations

Overall, the building is in good conditions but not without recommendations for improvements and building stability. This assessment also addresses improvements that will change its operations based upon a business model defined by Family Focus and any of its potential partners. These improvements can be categorized into two categories, which may overlap in some cases:

- Building improvements to maintain or improve the physical condition.
- Improvements driven by occupant driven enhancement.

The following is a list of recommended general building improvements, quality improvements and deferred maintenance concerns. Items in frequently used areas will be prioritized in this report. Enhancement driven improvements will be under quality improvement items and may reference or inform items classified under physical condition.

IMMEDIATE: Items requiring immediate action

Immediate maintenance items present a risk to the building integrity in the near term and may include threats to the building envelope, building systems, indoor air quality or life safety.

- Restroom ADA Renovations, full finish replacement, plumbing and lighting upgrades. Selecting water efficient fixtures is recommended
- Leaking at the east facing windows in rooms 109, 110, 209 and 210. Repairs to the flashing and sealant to be addressed. If leaking still occurs, then masonry repair to be examined and addressed accordingly.
- Replacement of worn carpet in classrooms or installation of resilient surface or VCT floor tiles. The lifespan of carpet is shorter than tile and needs timely replacement, especially as it impacts the indoor air quality. If replacement with carpet is the most expedient and cost-effective solution, consider a carpet tile floor system.
- Replace damaged railing at the theater entrance located on the east façade at the northern end of the building.
• Repair non-functioning existing sinks located in the rooms.
• Low Voltage/IT upgrades for more data capacity.
• Replace ceiling tiles in the gymnasium

INTERMEDIATE: Items to be addressed in years two to five
Items in this category represent conditions that, if left unaddressed, could significantly deteriorate.
• Reconfiguration of tenant spaces to accommodate the type of tenants identified in the business plan. Consider a kitchenette, wellness/prayer room, mother’s room or private call booth as part of the building amenities package.
• Installation of fire sprinkler system throughout the building may be required if there is significant renovation attached to room reconfiguration
• Air conditioner upgrade to a centralized model with tenant control within their space. Consider installing an energy efficient system appropriate for retrofitting into older buildings.
• Parking lot top lift to be removed and re-striped.
• Main electrical service upgrade.
• Repair heating in rooms where ceiling mounted electric heaters are installed.
• Roof membrane replacement above the third floor and the first floor.
• Floor finish repairs where its integrity will be impacted.
• Repairs to or installation of a water booster pump to address water pressure at the restrooms. This is recommended if the full restroom renovations do not adequately address the issue.

LONG TERM: Items to be addressed in year five and beyond.
Items in this category would eventually bring the facility to full compliance and address all maintenance and replacement needs.

General Improvements Related to the Building Envelope, Systems and Operations
• Boiler replacement in the next 15 years. Although the building functions well with more than one heating system, consider consolidation.
• Roof replacement in the next 15-20 years, if properly maintained.
• Theater renovation.
• Replace play area equipment and play surfacing.
• Finish replacement with attractive high quality and high durability materials in tenant, public and shared spaces.
• Lighting upgrade in areas that have not been renovated as part of the room reconfiguration scope. Selecting energy efficient fixtures that provide the appropriate lighting levels and color rendition for the intended activity is recommended.
• Floor tile replacement.

QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS
Quality improvement items enhance the building environment, increase the building’s value and would contribute directly to the effectiveness of the facility to serve its purpose. This category is for improvements that are of a lesser priority and do not concern life safety nor building integrity issues. This category is appropriate when the owner has the funding to make upgrades for enhanced amenities catered towards desired tenants.
This also assumes that there are community partners, a solidified business plan and funding will not be in place in the near term.

**Non-critical Building Quality Improvements**

- Paint throughout.
- Door hardware repairs and replacement as needed.
- Deep cleaning of floor tile throughout the building
- Wood floor cleaning and refinishing in the Gymnasium
- Power washing of stained masonry and limestone coping on exterior walls.
- Ceiling grid and ceiling tile replacement.

**DEFERRED MAINTENANCE CONCERNS**

Deferred maintenance issues are deficiencies that result from postponed maintenance or repairs that have been put off until a later time and that require repair or replacement to an existing condition.

- Installation of metal roof coping until roof replacement at the third and first floor. No roof leaks were reported at these locations. A professional roofing contractor should be consulted and hired to install roof coping and typical transition details.
- Window flashing and sealant replacement, particularly at the 1960s addition wing. A contractor should be consulted and hired to install a transition detail of the wall to the top of the windows.
- All rooftop units, boilers, radiators, air conditioners and ventilation need maintenance and servicing. Upon repairs, a maintenance plan and schedule should be created and implemented to avoid future damage.
- Family Focus should outsource repairs to electrical, mechanical, plumbing and fire protection systems.
- Inspect sealants at joints where the building a paved surface meets and around exterior doors and windows annually. Where deterioration occurs, additional sealant should be applied.
- Regularly maintain, at least once every six months, the building’s roof, roof drains, scupper and flashing to prevent water seepage into the building.
- Inspect and schedule cleaning of the grease trap annually, or as needed.
- Inspect clay tiles and coping at the parapet annually to ensure that they are watertight.
- Annually review the masonry walls for deterioration and tuck point as needed.
- Inspect lintels above doors and windows annually.
- Inspect clean-outs, roof drains, scuppers and downspouts annually and after heavy rainfall.
- Inspect roof top units (RTUs), furnaces, condensers, fire alarm, fire pump and fire extinguishers annually.
- Hire a pest control contractor to inspect for rodent and insect problems annually.
- Inspect and maintain the elevator annually.
- All warranty work must be done in accordance with manufacturer/installer specifications in order to preserve warranty benefits.
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