



**ILSLEY 100 PROJECT TEAM
REPORT FOR MIDDLEBURY SELECTBOARD – FEBRUARY 14, 2023**

Executive Summary

SITE SELECTION/DESIGN DIRECTION

After carefully considering the pros and cons, including cost estimates and public input, the Ilsley 100 Project Team recommends proceeding with Option B, to renovate and expand the library on its current site. The preliminary order of magnitude estimate for this option is \$14.8 million. This number includes soft costs that the Owner might incur, including professional fees. It does not include the costs of temporary rental of space during construction, or moving costs.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The Project Team has made extensive efforts to engage the public in the decision-making process. A separate document titled Public Correspondence Re Ilsley 100 Project's Public Community Engagement Meetings summarizes public comment received at a series of in-person and online meetings in January. Public sentiment ran highly in favor of Option B.

FUNDING

The Project Team has identified eight grants for which the project is eligible and competitive, totaling \$1,095,000. Ilsley is also expected to be competitive for a portion of \$26 million in combined ARPA funding and Congressionally Directed Spending to be distributed by the Vermont Department of Libraries. Working with a fundraising consultant, the Project Team plans to conduct a feasibility study in the fall for a private fund-raising campaign. The Project Team anticipates working closely with the Selectboard and town administration to gauge the impact and feasibility of a proposed municipal bond to complete funding of the project.

NEXT STEPS

The next phase of the pre-design portion of the project is to issue a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to ascertain which professional design firms may have an interest in the project and to evaluate their qualifications. (See the draft RFQ attached separately.) After reviewing the qualifications of various firms, the Project Team envisions a design competition among the 3-4 firms/teams winnowed from the RFQ process. Firms would receive a stipend and a two-month period to develop an initial conceptual design. The Project Team has funds budgeted for FY 23, which will cover the cost of the stipend. The next steps for the funding portion of the project are beginning work on grant applications, and renewal of the contract with our fund-raising consultant, Christine Graham, to proceed with a feasibility study in the fall. The Project Team has included the cost of the feasibility study in the capital funding request for FY 24.

REQUESTS OF THE SELECTBOARD

The Project Team requests that the Selectboard:

- A) Endorse its recommendation to proceed with Option B: to renovate and expand Ilsley Public Library in the current location.
- B) Approve the Project Team's proposal to proceed with the suggested RFQ and subsequent process.
- C) Approve the revised contract with fundraising consulting firm CPG Enterprises, Inc.

Detailed Report

EXPENDED: SITE SELECTION/DESIGN DIRECTION

After carefully considering the pros and cons, including cost estimates and public input, the Ilsley 100 Project Team recommends proceeding with Option B, to renovate and expand the library on its current site. The preliminary order of magnitude estimate for this option is \$14.8 million. Reminder: this number includes all soft costs that the Owner might incur, including professional fees. It does not include any temporary rental of space during construction, or moving costs.

The Project Team previously worked to identify and explore four different options to address the library's facility needs. In order to review and evaluate these options, the Project Team carefully detailed the scope of each option in a narrative description; generated and debated a thorough list of pros and cons for each option; sought cost estimates; and invited community input.

The Project Team hired Henry Erickson, of Erickson Consulting LLC, to provide estimates for each option. Erickson was supplied with the narrative descriptions, required square footage for expansions/new build options, and architectural drawings of the current library building. Erickson provided order of magnitude estimates; these are estimates of a project's level of effort and cost to complete. *Order of magnitude estimates take place early in a project life cycle and guide strategy and planning choices. They are not a budget or a final project cost. However, they are very helpful when considering the potential costs of the options relative to each other.*

After careful review of the pros and cons of each option, and their cost estimates, the Project Team narrowed the options to two, eliminating the possibilities of renovating but not expanding and of renovating and adding an annex. After further discussion, debate, and consideration of community input, the Project Team voted unanimously at its January 26th meeting to recommend Option B (Renovate & Expand)

Some of the arguments in favor of Option B were . . .

- Option B allows for enough additional square footage to achieve the vision for a new library building, at a lower cost than Option D.
- The path to completion is more straightforward and less complex than Option D. The Project Team hopes this means the project will move forward expediently.
- Option B allows the community to retain the beloved historic library building. During the public outreach efforts, there was considerable agreement that most members of the public do not want to abandon the currently library building.

Some of the arguments opposed to Option D were . . .

- The uncertainty of the project and the longer anticipated timeline to completion. With the currently library building facing an array of critical needs, there is an urgency to move forward, and it was felt that Option D would not be able to meet that urgency.
- The difficulty and potential expense of repurposing the current library building. In addition to the community concern about losing a beloved historic structure, it was difficult for the Project

Team to gauge the feasibility and costs associated with finding an adaptive reuse for the current library building.

- The high cost of the parking garage. While it was understood that building on the lower parking lot would require replacement and addition of parking spaces, the anticipated cost was considerably more expensive than expected.
- Community concerns about the impact of a large, mixed-use building on the character of downtown Middlebury. During the public outreach efforts, many expressed concern that a multi-story building and large parking garage would detract from the small-town feel in the downtown area.

Action Item: The Project Team requests that the Selectboard approve its recommendation of Option. B.

DESIGN NEXT STEPS

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

The Project Team will issue a request for qualifications, seeking professional firms or teams including architectural, engineering, construction management, and estimating and/or project management to provide conceptual design services. Of the firms that respond to the RFQ and meet the qualification criteria, the Project Team will then select 3-4 firms to be included in the subsequent request for conceptual design/project vision. Anticipated timeline: February-March.

REQUEST FOR CONCEPTUAL DESIGN/PROJECT VISION

3-4 firms will be invited to submit illustrations of a conceptual design/project vision, along with probable construction cost estimates. Participating firms will receive a stipend of \$5,000. The Project Team, Town Selectboard, and Administration will explore and vet these competing conceptual designs, with opportunities for community participation at public forums. Anticipated timeline: May-June.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The firms/teams submitting the Conceptual Design Proposals deemed most desirable will then be asked to provide details regarding their proposed team composition, contract format, and fee structure to develop their conceptual design through 100% Schematic Design Phase as well as for all remaining phases of proposed work through Construction Administration. Anticipated timeline: July-August.

Action Item: The Project Team requests Selectboard approval to proceed with the RFQ / RFP process as outlined in [name of RFQ document.]

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Throughout the process, the Project Team has used several methods to keep the community informed and to elicit feedback. These efforts have included the following:

- Regular updates in the monthly library newsletter
- Warnings of bi-weekly public meetings of the Project Team
- Publication of Project Team meeting agendas and minutes on the library's website
- Blog postings from Jim Gish, updating the community
- An op-ed series in the *Addison Independent* by Library Director Dana Hart with a variety of perspectives on "The Library of the Future."
- Postings on Front Porch Forum announcing public feedback meetings and inviting input from those unable to attend
- Regular progress updates in the *Addison Independent*
- A report on the renovation project for the college community in the *Middlebury Campus*
- Social media posts on Facebook and Instagram encouraging meeting participation and feedback
- Social media posts on Facebook and Instagram updating the community on the condition of the library and the process and progress of the Project Team.
- Publication of reports to the Selectboard on the library's website
- Public and key constituencies feedback meetings

Following up on the series of public meetings held in November and December, the Project Team held two public feedback meetings, one in person in the library's Community Meeting Room on January 17th, and one remote only on January 20th. The Project Team also again met separately with two of its key user bases: the parents of young children at the Middlebury Elementary School Association, and retirees at the Eastview community. At these meetings the Project Team shared the narrative descriptions of the four options under consideration; their pros and cons; and the order of magnitude estimates. The Project Team then explained that the four options had been narrowed to two (B and D), and solicited feedback from the community on the remaining options.

Many valuable comments were received from the public. Several community members who were unable to attend the meetings sent feedback via email to Library Director Dana Hart. A summary of the community feedback received is attached in a separate document. A video recording of the January 20th public meeting along with the accompanying slide presentation is posted on the library's website as is a recording and slide presentation from the November meetings.

<https://www.ilsleypubliclibrary.org/about-us/ilsley-100-project-team/>

FUNDING SOURCES AND TIMELINE

The library renovation and expansion will be funded through a mix of grant funding, private donations, and municipal bonding.

GRANT FUNDING

Library Director Dana Hart has identified eight grants for which the project is eligible and competitive, totaling \$1,095,000 (Appendix 2). It is important to note that these grants are all for improving or preserving existing buildings, and would not be applicable had Option D been selected.

There is also ninth grant for which the project is eligible: the Department of Libraries will disperse \$16 million dollars in ARPA funding and \$10 million in congressionally directed spending funding for library capital improvements in the spring of 2023. The Dept. of Libraries has not announced the amount of funding each library will be eligible to apply for yet, but they have shared that this will be a one-time grant program. It will be awarded in the summer of 2023, and funds must be expended by 2026. This grant could significantly increase the amount of grant funding the library renovation and expansion project received if the project is able to proceed expediently.

PRIVATE DONATIONS

The Project Team plans to launch a capital campaign to fundraise for the library renovation and expansion. Working with consultant Christine Graham, the Project Team is planning to conduct a feasibility study in the fall. By November, the Project Team hopes to know what fundraising goal is viable for this project. The quiet phase of the capital campaign could start as early as the end of 2023/beginning of 2024.

In order to conduct the feasibility study, there must be at least a conceptual design in place. The Project Team has factored this into the project timeline, and hopes to have conceptual designs by early fall. This will allow the feasibility study to move forward.

MUNICIPAL BOND

Once the Feasibility Study has been conducted, a Professional Design Team is selected and Schematic Design is complete including costs estimates, the Project Team will have both sides of the equation: the amount of funding that can likely be secured through grants and capital campaign as well as the project's overall cost. The difference between the funding secured and the estimated cost will be the initial target for a bond. The Project Team anticipates working closely with the Selectboard and town administration to gauge the impact and feasibility of any proposed bond.

While municipal bonding will be necessary to bring this project to fruition, the Project Team is dedicated to securing as much funding as possible through grants and donations, and will continue to explore creative options to reduce the burden on the tax payers.

FUNDING NEXT STEPS

Capital campaigns are linear processes with well-defined stages, and there are two aspects of determining a campaign's feasibility: assessing organizational readiness (through an organizational audit), and assessing a community's potential capacity for giving (through a feasibility study). Over the past year, the library has worked with Christine Graham to conduct an organizational audit, reviewing and preparing the information, systems, and staff that will be required for a successful campaign.

Feasibility studies are conducted by fundraising professionals, and assess external factors such as public opinion about the proposed campaign and goals; likelihood of financial support from the community; size of potential gifts from key prospects; and recommendations for improving the campaign. In 2017, the Town of Middlebury retained Christine Graham of CGP Enterprises to conduct a fundraising feasibility study for the library's proposed renovation/expansion project. While the 2017 plans did not go forward, Graham is still committed to working with the library on this project. Given the amount of time that has elapsed, an updated contract, which proposes a feasibility study in the fall of 2024. Funding for this study has been included in the library's capital funding request for FY 24.

Action Item: The Project Team requests that the Selectboard approve the agreement with CPG Enterprises, Inc. to conduct a fundraising feasibility study at a cost not to exceed \$30,700.

Appendix 1: Description of recommended design direction

OPTION

RENOVATE & EXPAND

B



IPL 100

NARRATIVE

Option B entails renovating and repairing the original 1924 building while adding square footage in one or more locations for a total of 24,256 square feet. Portions of the 1977 and 1988 additions would be selectively demolished to make room for the expansion. This would be bound by the current property footprint or a slight expansion of those boundaries to increase public gathering and green space.

PROS

- Preserves the historic and beloved 1924 building
- Provides sufficient space for the proposed program. The community would benefit from new and expanded spaces.
- Relatively straightforward path to completion with fewer complexities than Option D.

CONS

- Existing structure limits flexibility
- The property footprint would be filled, leaving limited options for future growth
- Requires relocation during construction
- Reduces existing green space and available space for outdoor programming

COST ESTIMATE\$14.8M

See explanation of costs on next page

EXPLANATION OF COSTS

This is a rough order of magnitude estimate, provided by Henry Erickson of Erickson Consulting LLC.

Order of magnitude estimates take place early in a project life cycle and guide strategy and planning choices. They are not a budget or a final project cost.

The estimate includes base construction costs (labor, material, etc.); fees and general conditions for the prime contractor, bonds and insurance for the contractor, contingency (to cover unexpected but necessary work) and escalation to cover the potential for inflation (over a one-year period.); owner costs at 10%; and professional fees at 10%.

Rental and moving costs for a temporary library location are not included. This expense could increase the owner costs. Should the final plan call for expansion beyond the current property line to the north, the cost of real estate acquisition is not included.

Appendix 2: Tentative Funding Sources

ILSLEY PUBLIC LIBRARY		
IPL 100 PROJECT TEAM Funding Sources		
Funding Source	Amount Eligible/Estimated/ Requested	Status of Funding (eg: application submitted, funding awarded, funding received)
Government Funds		
Congressional Directed Spending		Made contact with Sen. Sanders office and shared intent to request congressionally directed funding in 2023. Met with Beth Awhaitey, Outreach Representative for Sen. Sanders.
Municipal Bond		Working with selectboard and town manager to explore bond options.
Grant Funds		
Libraries Capital Project Fund (Vermont Department of Libraries, Agency of Administration)		Preliminary conversations with granting agency.
Walter Cerf (Community Foundation)	\$25,000	Preliminary conversations with granting agency.
Historic Preservation (Agency of Commerce and Community Development)	\$20,000	Preliminary conversations with granting agency.
Libraries Transform Communities	\$20,000	Preliminary conversations with granting agency.
VCDP Accessibility Modification (Agency of Commerce and Community Development)	\$100,000	Preliminary conversations with granting agency.
Community Facilities (USDA)	\$50,000	Preliminary conversations with granting agency.
Cultural Facilities (Vermont Arts Council)	\$30,000	Preliminary conversations with granting agency.
State Economic & Infrastructure Development Investment Program (Northern Border Regional Commission)	\$350,000	Preliminary conversations with granting agency. Letter of Interest being drafted.
Municipal Energy Resilience (Buildings and General Services)	\$500,000	Preliminary conversations with granting agency. Responded to initial survey to indicate intent to apply.
Private Fundraising		
Capital Campaign		Fundraising consultant retained; organazational audit complete; feasibility study tentatively scheduled.
Total Anticipated Funding		\$1,095,000

Appendix 3: Tentative Funding Schedule

ILSLEY PUBLIC LIBRARY												
Grant Funding Schedule												
2022 2023 2024												
	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APR	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT
VTLib Libraries Capital Project Fund												
Walker Cerf (Community Found.)						X						
Historic Preservation												
Libraries Transform Communities												
VCDP Accessibility Modification												
Community Facilities (USDA)												
Cultural Facilities												
NBRC (SEID)												
Municipal Energy Resilience												
Government Funding Schedule												
2022 2023 2024												
	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APR	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT
Congressional Directed Spending												
Municipal Bond												
Capital Campaign Schedule												
2022 2023 2024												
	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APR	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT
Organizational Audit/Preparation												
Feasibility Study												
Plan Campaign												
Quiet Phase (Leadership Gifts)												
Public Phase (Major Gifts)												
Public Phase (Community Campaign)												