

1 IIsley 100 Project Team  
2 Minutes of Meeting  
3 October 26, 2023  
4

5 Voting members:

6 Joe McVeigh - IIsley Library Board (Present)  
7 Amy Mincher - IIsley Library Board (Present)  
8 Dan Brown - Middlebury Selectboard (Present)  
9 Farhad Khan - Middlebury Selectboard (Present)  
10 Jim Gish - Public Member (Present)  
11 Barbara Doyle-Wilch - Public Member (Present)  
12 Ken Perine - Public Member (Absent)  
13 Ruth Hardy – Alternate Public Member (Present)  
14

15 Non-voting Members:

16 Dana Hart - IIsley Library Director (Present)  
17 Judith Harris – Consultant/Town Liaison from Harris & Harris Consulting (Present)  
18 Beth Dow – Town Liaison (Present)  
19

20 Also present: Natasha Sen (Library Trustee) and Victoria DeWind  
21

22 Design Team Present:

23 Chris Huston – ReArch  
24 Steve Roy – Wiemann Lamphere  
25 Michael Minadeo – Wiemann Lamphere  
26 Kelley DesRoches – Wiemann Lamphere  
27 Dennis Humphries – Library consultant to Wiemann Lamphere  
28

29 The meeting was called to order by Chair McVeigh at 10:00 a.m. in the Town Offices Conference Room,  
30 and there were no changes to the agenda or the minutes of October 12, 2023.  
31

32 McVeigh gave a brief review of the past few weeks and the finalization of the contract with ReArch and  
33 Wiemann Lamphere and said the Design Team would be giving a brief presentation of where they are in  
34 the design and some of the issues that have come up, and then there would be discussion and time for  
35 questions.  
36

37 Roy went over their development of the two-story concept and their overall goals. He said they've  
38 gathered additional information from the engineering teams and while they've received a lot of  
39 information, they are now having discussions with the stakeholders with the goal of bringing the IIsley  
40 100 Project Team up to date.  
41

42 Roy presented their idea for relocating the parking spaces that would be lost by expanding the footprint  
43 of the building into the current parking lot. The idea is to shift the parking lot to the east by removing a  
44 couple of trees and building a retaining wall, and this option would replace all but two of the parking  
45 spaces lost by the expansion. Huston said they are now in the information gathering phase and  
46 exploring options that had been brought up earlier, such as ways to replace the lost parking.  
47

48 Roy said Historic Preservation does not want any changes to the existing main stairway, and they want  
49 the new entrance to be moved back behind the front line of the 1924 building to keep the focus on the  
50 historic library. Huston said they had thought that a porch on the front of the 1924 building would take  
51 away any confusion of having two front entrances, but Historic Preservation was against that idea. There  
52 was some discussion about the decision that the stairs had to be maintained, and options that might  
53 make it clear that they are not the main entrance to the library. Also discussed was the importance of  
54 maintaining a positive relationship with Historic Preservation as we do have grants with them, and they  
55 do influence the decision of potential grants from other organizations.

56

57 Roy showed an optional floor plan to address the location of utilities and the need to remove some  
58 features of the original design to be able to fit in the programming needs, and the rearrangement of  
59 some of the areas within the library. He said one thing that might be considered would be approaching  
60 the owners of the 71-73 Main Street property to see if it could be acquired.

61

62 Humphrey remarked on the preservation aspect of the library and said of all the historic library  
63 restorations he's worked on, only one had their front stairs removed, and he also spoke about the  
64 importance of maintaining an historic landmark, so it aligns with the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.  
65 Various options were discussed for making it clear that the stairway isn't the main entrance to the  
66 library, and the importance of making the new ground level Main Street entrance obvious so there is no  
67 confusion.

68

69 The energy efficiency options were discussed and how sustainability would be a strong selling point to  
70 the public, and Hardy voiced her concern about using the basement due to the potential for flooding.

71

72 McVeigh asked for the Team's reaction to the replacement parking option. Khan asked the cost of the  
73 parking option, and Huston said they had not yet developed a cost. Doyle-Wilch said she wasn't sure if  
74 the redesign of the back entrance to the library was a result of the parking option, but she had liked the  
75 original design that integrated the space more with the Town Offices. Roy said they preferred the  
76 original design for the back entrance as well, but the change was to recapture some building square  
77 footage. The consensus was that the back entrance needed to be modified to bring back the welcoming  
78 back entrance and the connection to the Town Offices. The Team also agreed on the parking option and  
79 didn't feel the loss of two spaces overall was that much of an impact.

80

81 Hardy said she remained skeptical of the two-story design, since we'd be losing some square footage by  
82 bringing the front entrance back, and she feels a third story would allow for more design flexibility and  
83 the additional space needed for programming. Brown wondered about the cost difference between a  
84 two- and three-story building. Huston said there would be additional costs with adding a third story, but  
85 also savings in other ways, and they couldn't really say what the cost difference would be without doing  
86 a detailed analysis. Huston also said one cost consideration with additional floors is the need for  
87 additional library staff, and Humphries agreed. Hardy felt three floors would provide more space for  
88 certain group areas and disagreed with the need for additional staffing. Hart said she hadn't done the  
89 cost analysis on the additional staffing needs, but it would be significant with benefits, and there are  
90 other operational considerations with an additional floor, so there are benefits and drawbacks, such as  
91 the safety consideration.

92

93

94 Library Trustee Sen said while she would hate to see the rooftop garden go away, perhaps that space  
95 would be better served as additional building square footage. McVeigh said one of the programming  
96 requirements was the need for outdoor programming space, and the rooftop garden was a response to  
97 that requirement. Also discussed were the possible uses for the original 1924 portion of the library.  
98

99 Victoria DeWind wondered about the replacement parking option and how it would impact the future  
100 EDI project, and she was not in favor of losing two parking spaces. She also wanted to see the original  
101 library building continue to be used as a library and liked the idea of removing the rooftop garden to add  
102 utilize the Town Hall plaza and green space in front of new entrance. She suggested that solid wall with  
103 windows instead of the large expanse of glass walls would provide more options to meet library needs  
104 and reduce square footage needed in addition to the problem of light pollution from glass walls.  
105

106 The Design Team left the meeting to break prior to the next stakeholder meeting around 11:30 a.m.  
107

108 The Project Team discussed future public meetings with specific groups and when to have a larger public  
109 meeting. Hart said there were some groups that she thought it would be helpful to have the Design  
110 Team present, and other smaller groups she felt just the Project Team could meet with, but the first step  
111 was identifying the groups. The need to reach out to people that weren't necessarily library supporters  
112 was discussed, and how important it was to discuss the project with them in hopes of turning a possible  
113 "no" into a "yes". These meetings can be held in November and December, but Hart said some of the  
114 meetings with some organizations can continue into the spring before the bond vote, because even  
115 though the schematic design may be complete, there are always changes being made. McVeigh said  
116 now might be the time to also meet with some Town groups, such as the Energy Committee and the  
117 Infrastructure Committee.  
118

119 The next meeting of the Ilesley 100 Project Team will be at 8:00 a.m. on Thursday, November 9, 2023,  
120 prior to the Selectboard meeting on November 14<sup>th</sup>.  
121

122 The meeting adjourned at 11:51 a.m.  
123

124 Respectfully submitted,  
125 Beth Dow