

**Follow Up Notes from Nick Artim--Ilsley Report Info  
12.3.2021**

Hello Dana.

Here are a few more thoughts and clarifications on some of the items that I talked about yesterday. Much of this comes from years of identifying and presenting improvement programs for unique and iconic buildings, of which Ilsley would certainly classify. This is a protocol that we often use at the National Park Service, which happens to also be the administrators of the National Historic Register and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation. When we do complex building rehabilitations/modifications there will be several interested parties who can have impact on the project including the Superintendent (top person in the Park), Chief of maintenance, Chief Ranger, Historic Preservationist, Park Architect, Concessions Administrator, Chief Resource Officer and a host of others at Park, Regional and National levels. They all will bring different levels of understanding and expertise and so it is important that they have the same basic knowledge. I know that this is a sizable effort but what we learned during the Town office and other building projects is that the better that this head end work is done, the better the chance for success. Having Judith on the group is a benefit because she is experienced with the "buildability" issues that occur during construction and renovation projects. Please feel free to call me if you have further questions or if you want to get together and go over details. By the way, be sure to enjoy every second with Gussie at this and every holiday season.

Nick

**Suggested Outline**

1. Brief history of the library and project to date.
2. Brief summary of options - This is that first part that I discussed. It does not need to be too extensive or wordy and for this exercise it is probably best that it is not to prevent misinterpretation of what is being said and if necessary allow clarification when presented. It is a way to get the reviewers on a similar level of basic knowledge about the building and is intended to show that multiple options were looked at and the decision to renovate/expand emerged as the best. I have put in a few items but these are definitely not all encompassing or complete and these are items that the group should fill in.

**A. Option 1 – Do nothing**

Advantages

- Lowest initial cost
- No immediate operational disruptions
- *Add more items as appropriate*

Disadvantages

- Unknown risks of building system failures and emergency expenditures

- Describe the various current operational/mission challenges
- *Add more items as appropriate*

B. Option 2 – Rehabilitate/Renovate existing without additions

Advantages

- Modifies to building within existing shell to a more efficient function.
- Corrects several present deficiencies (what are they?)
- Probable lowest cost for upgrades
- Reduces risk of emergency failures
- Add more items as appropriate

Disadvantages

- Does not fully address space and use issues
- Restrictive for future programming -provide example
- Relocation of library operations to temporary during renovation – keeping the building functioning during an extensive rehabilitation is not realistic
- *Add more items as appropriate*

C. Option 3 – Rehabilitate Current Structure and Build Addition – Two phased approach.

Advantages

- Modifies to building within existing shell to a more efficient function.
- Corrects several present deficiencies (what are they?)
- Reduces risk of emergency failures
- Provides additional program space for foreseeable future.
- Potentially lower cost than building in two distinct phases
- Potentially eliminates the need for off site library operations since the new addition can be constructed and used while the historic building is renovated.
- Possible partnership with a complimentary agency, i.e. CCV.
- *Add more items as appropriate*

Disadvantages

- Unknown construction inflation factors – labor and materials, as well as the added cost for two construction set ups.
- Potential delays in program expansion
- Temporary closures while shifting library operations between phases.
- *Add more items as appropriate*

D. Option 4 – Rehabilitate Current Structure and Build Addition – Single phased approach.

Advantages

- Modifies to building within existing shell to a more efficient function.
- Corrects several present deficiencies (what are they?)
- Reduces risk of emergency failures
- Provides additional program space for foreseeable future.
- Reduces construction cost uncertainties, i.e. inflation. This may ultimately prove to be the lower cost of options 3 and 4.

- Potentially eliminates the need for off site library operations since the new addition can be constructed and used while the historic building is renovated.
- Possible partnership with a complimentary agency, i.e. CCV.
- *Add more items as appropriate*

#### Disadvantages

- High initial construction costs. A large financing package including bonds will be needed.
- This will take a large amount of public presentation to sell.
- Temporary closures while shifting library operations between phases.
- *Add more items as appropriate.*

#### E. Option 5 – Relocate Library

##### Advantages

- Allows a complete “purpose built facility”
- The library continues to function while the new facility is constructed and then transitions to the new. Potentially shortest down time.
- Provides additional program space for foreseeable future.
- Potentially lower cost than building in two distinct phases
- Possible partnership with a complimentary agency, i.e. CCV.
- *Add more items as appropriate*

##### Disadvantages

- The loss of an iconic public use building in the town core will be a very difficult and potentially fatal issue. During the town office project there were members of the public who were very loyal to the then present site and almost derailed the project. It could be a long and painful process.
- Land will need to be acquired.
- This may be the highest cost because of land acquisition
- Potential historic preservation issues that can cause an extended time schedule
- Temporary closures while shifting library operations to the new building.
- Loss of the “green aspects” of using an existing structure.
- *Add more items as appropriate*

### 3. Recommended Approach.

Based on the options the committee recommended renovation the present building and constructing an addition. The preference is to proceed as a single effort(option 4) but option 3 is a possibility depending on how financing can be accomplished. Now at this point the group should summarize the findings that GBH produced.

### 4. Recommended Committee Make Up

This should have representatives of key stakeholders. The persons selected should have appropriate skillsets for the effort and be unbiased. The complexity of the project means

that this is not a place, no matter how well intended, for amateurs. The different segments should have a primary member and alternate to fall in when the primary is unable to participate. This is critical since there will be times when decisions need to be made in an expedited manner to control costs.

Example member categories should include:

- Library administration (I suppose that this goes without saying)
- Someone versed in facilities maintenance, operations and construction – Judith Harris is an example of a person with these skill sets
- A representative of town government. A select board representative who could keep the rest of the board apprised of the situation. The board chair should be consulted to determine who has the best skills.
- The Town Manager
- A public member-at-large. Ideally this should be someone with experience in library operations and some design/construction experience.
- A finance expert. This will be a person to help with funding aspects including donations, grants and working with the Town Manager, Select Board on public financing/bonding needs.
- An independent design professional/architect who can be consulted when issues arise.