1 Ilsley 100 Project Team 2 Minutes of Meeting 3 July 14, 2022 4 5 Voting members: Joe McVeigh - Ilsley Library Board (Present) 6 7 Amy Mincher - Ilsley Library Board (Present) 8 Dan Brown - Middlebury Selectboard (Present) 9 Farhad Khan - Middlebury Selectboard (Present) Jim Gish - Public Member (Present) 10 Barbara Doyle-Wilch - Public Member (Absent) 11 12 Ken Perine - Public Member (Present) 13 14

15

# Non-voting Members:

Dana Hart - Ilslev Library Director (Present)

Judith Harris – Consultant/Town Liaison from Harris & Harris Consulting (Present)

16 17 18

The meeting began at 10:00 a.m. in the Ilsley Public Library community room.

19 20 21

### Approval of Minutes

22 23

The minutes of the June 30, 2022 meeting were approved with the correction of the spelling of architect John McCloud to John McLeod.

24 25 26

### Design Example

27 28

29

30

31 32

33 34

Hart shared with the Team the Fayetteville, Arkansas library project that is much larger than the Ilsley project and she went over the various areas within this expansion project that are the same areas they've discussed for the Ilsley project, but on a much grander scale. Hart said that you could enter the library on two levels from a parking garage. Gish asked if a parking garage had ever been mentioned in conjunction with the Ilsley expansion. Perine said a parking garage had been discussed a few years ago at the time of the EDI development, but based on the parking requirements at that time, the spaces in the garage would be taken up entirely by the uses in the structure built above it, so no additional public spaces would be created.

35 36 37

#### Communications Update

38 39

Gish had no updates since he'd been away, but after the end of this meeting he'd have more information on where they are in getting the project out to the public.

McVeigh said a written report was submitted to the Selectboard at their June 28th meeting and that was well received, and there was also a very nice article in the Addison Independent that summarized the report submitted to the Selectboard.

44 45 46

47 48

49

50 51

McVeigh said at the last Trustees meeting it was pointed out that on August 4th there is a downtown block party when Main Street is blocked off in front of the library. He said Ruth Hardy had suggested asking people at this event what their hopes and dreams would be for the library. Perine suggested videotaping the responses and to get the opinions from different age groups so you have a variety of testimonials that you can use for a future presentation to potential donors. He said probably some type of release to use these videos would need to be signed by

the people interviewed. Gish said it would be helpful to know what event is planned for in front of the Library to be sure it isn't something especially noisy. Brown suggested they reach out to BMP Director Karen Duguay and Market Director Nan Carpenter to reserve a space. Hart will look into all the details of this possibility.

# Funding Update

Hart said Ruth Hardy has agreed to be an alternate member of the Project Team to attend the meetings the week Perine is unavailable, and she brings to the Team a great deal of experience with government funding. Hart also said she has a meeting set up with Fred Kenney of Addison County Economic Development Corporation regarding any funding that might be available.

McVeigh asked about ARPA funds and Hart said the Vermont Department of Libraries is getting \$16 million for capital improvement projects for Vermont public libraries to be dispersed through a competitive grant application process that will probably begin in early 2023 and the funds must be expended by December of 2026, so the timing is perfect for us and the fact we already have the project in the works will be helpful.

McVeigh said thanks to Ruth Hardy's initiative, there is currently a legislature working group looking into all aspects of public libraries in the state for about a year, and Hart has been very active providing information to this group.

Perine mentioned there are other groups that are going to begin capital fund raising in the near future so we might want to coordinate these efforts. Hart said their fund-raising consultant said if these efforts begin in the next few months it's not as big a concern as it would be if they would be starting the campaigns in another year. She said Ilsley's first annual campaign would be this fall, and that would be a good way to introduce the library to people and to any future capital campaign. Perine said these pledges are sometimes done by budgeting out several years, so it might limit their ability to donate. The bond vote was discussed and the possibility of other large school and town bond votes that might be happening over the next few years. Hart said it was important to keep reminding the community how long the library has been waiting and has been deprioritized for many years for other large projects.

They also discussed the difference between Ilsley Library that is owned by the Town and the Friends of Ilsley Library that is a separate 501(c)(3) and how their funds are separate from the Library yet they give money to the Library, and how this would need to be cleared up and explained at the time of the capital campaign. Hart was confident theses details could be ironed out.

# Preliminary Program Study

Hart said she understood from the discussion at the last meeting, that the Team wanted to vote on the Preliminary Programming Study as it is right now, and as it changes in the future adjustments will be made, but for the purpose of working with the matrix they need to approve what we've agreed to so far. Harris said the only thing missing now is the adjacency diagram which will be necessary for the design team and Harris, Hart, and Doyle-Wilch will begin work on that Monday 7.18, and then the Team needs to take this study report back to the Selectboard with an update and ask for their feedback and figure out how to take this to the public for feedback.

The Team reviewed the documents and data they were being asked to approve and discussed how the adjacency plan is completed.

Perine moved to approve the preliminary program study as outlined in the 30-page document. Khan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent (Doyle-Wilch). **MOTION PASSED.** 

Gish said this is a great start and provides a clear direction, and Mincher said it is all based on real, thought-out data.

### Matrix Discussion

McVeigh said the idea is to "test drive" the matrix today using the 2017 gbA Architects plans and described how they would be reviewing this based on the five options.

 Harris described Option A that would be renovating and repairing the existing building in the same footprint with no addition. McVeigh said the advantage to looking at Option A is so they can say to people they could put a lot of money into this building, but this is all you get. Harris said doing "nothing" still has a significant price tag without getting anything additionally.

Harris said Option B is to expand and renovate within the current site boundaries, based on the 2017 gbA plans. She said Option C is saying you would renovate and repair the existing and move some of the services to a different location. She said Option D is tricky, because it considers exploring an adjacent property, such as the EDI site, but this would require a partnership. She said the other possibility is a property line adjustment if there isn't enough expansion space on this site. That could be accomplished by taking the upper levels of the building over the parking lot with parking underneath. There was discussion as to whether Option E and Option D were the same, but Perine said Option D is almost the same as E, only that D would be building on land already owned by the Town whereas with Option E they would need to purchase a piece of land somewhere else. There was further discussion on the distinction between the options, and possible adjustments to make the options clearer.

The Team then tried out the matrix and there was debate on the importance of some of the criteria and how high a score each Team member would give for each criterion. They found that some of the criteria meant different things to different people, such as "compatible neighborhood quality". The Funding Viability category also caused some questions about what the proper criterion in this category should include.

Hart pointed out that when they apply this matrix to the future project, they have to remember that the option that gets the highest score will not necessarily be the plan they end up with, because cost is also going to be a factor in the decision.

#### Next Steps

McVeigh asked if they should be looking to hire a cost estimator. Harris said that discussion will take longer than the time they had left in the meeting, and she also thinks they'll need an appraisal of the existing building, because if it came down to the option of needing to sell this current building they will need the value. She said when they get into trying to put reality around options C, D or E of the matrix, they're going to need more expertise than any of the Team members have, so it might mean they would need input from a property developer.

153	<u>Adjournment</u>
154	
155	The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.
156	
157	Respectfully submitted,
158	Beth Dow