

LIBRARY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2014

Attendees:

Jan Rosenbaum (Jan), chair
Ames Curtis (AC)
Warren Erickson (WE)
Judy Lindahl (JL)
Carole Gartley (CG)
Pat Messler (PM)
Peter Hall (PH)
David Jackson (DJ)

Ex-officio attendees:

Bill Chapman (BC), Select Board
Ann Filley (Ann), Library Director
Kathleen Meil (KM), Library Committee, acting chair
Charlton Ames (CA), Select Board (ex-officio)

Absent:

Staci Coomer (SC)

Also in attendance:

Cate Monroe, Library Committee member
Mike Sabatini, Rockport Properties representative
Rick Bates (Rick), Town Manager
Vanessa Bienvenue

NOTE on notations:

The name or initials following the attendee list are the shorthand notation as to how attendees are identified in the following minutes though I have tried to spell out the name of the person the first time he/she is mentioned.

NOTE on follow-up assignments:

Where appropriate, I have highlighted assignments or volunteer commitments in **red**.

Call to Order:

Meeting opened at 4:04 by Jan Rosenbaum (Jan), chair. Jan announced that Staci Coomer would not be joining us, but otherwise all committee members were in attendance. Introductions of Peter Hall (PH) and David Jackson (DJ) were made.

The working agreement was reviewed and one added: "State on objective as much as possible."

May 12, 2014

New Ponderables:

1. The Steering Committee has been charged with evaluating the economic impact of the library.
 - a. **Jan asked everyone to research “libraries as economic drivers”.**
 - b. **Additionally, he requested the committee report on our thoughts regarding the IMPACT the library would have given the different possible sites – think about it and e-mail Jan with your thoughts regarding both topics.**

Jan asked we look for any previous economic studies relating to libraries and, if any found, e-mail the web addresses to all.

2. How can we demonstrate or document the needs of the next library, especially to non-users of the library facility. Jan pointed out that the Steering Committee will need to prepare to make presentation(s) to the public.
3. How should the Steering Committee organize the economics section? This question goes as much to the Library Committee as to the Steering Committee.
4. A new ponderable: What does the Steering Committee need to know regarding any assignments from the Library Committee post June 16 joint meeting?

Old Business:

1. Weighting of Matrix Factors: (See the handout provided by Ames Curtis (AC), Carole Gartley (CG) and Warren Erickson (WE). Also the handout put together by Rick Bates (RB).)

WE pointed out any sites that get dropped must still have defensible arguments developed.

Jan requested that everyone should spend the next 2 weeks adding to the pros and cons. The AC and RB documents should be a starting point. As best possible, any added items should be considered for all the sites; not to work to build a case for or against a specific site.

Peter Hall (PH) asked what the reasons that are driving the search for a new library building? The handouts didn't list any that that could be interpreted as driving the need.

Kathleen Meil (KM) pointed out that the driving forces have been documented and that the weighing of the sites take into consideration how well each individual site can accommodate the needs.

PH pointed out that some of the “needs” drive some of the criteria more than others, e.g., the inclusion of a “community center” would impact some sites more than others because of the possible need for additional parking but if it were dropped (or handled via a different mechanism) a site that had been discounted could now rise to the top.

Dave Jackson (DJ) suggested we all take another look at the criteria to see if one or more was directed to make some sites look better or worse; how does each criteria play out given site specifics.

Jan reminded all of how the square footages (sf) were developed and how the exercise using the suggestions from a website (regarding how to calculate sf needs) resulted in a building of between 9,000 sf and 14,000 sf came about with his specific thought process resulted in the handout showing 11,580 sf (see Library Space Allocation Worksheet, draft 5/11/2014). But, regardless of what the current or proposed plan, we must look at the expansion possibilities in 10 years, regardless of whether we end up

LIBRARY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2014

with a 9,000 sf building or a 14,000 sf building. The point being that the Steering Committee (and subsequently, the Library Committee) must be able to justify the sf decision.

On review of the sf handout, it was acknowledged that it seemed to be considering just the Rockport Properties site adjacent to Mary Lea Park (referred to from here out as the MLP site).

A discussion regarding the space allocation worksheet resulted in a tacit agreement that different configurations would result in different space requirements. For example, multi-story buildings would require 2 stairwells and an elevator regardless of the number of additional floors but would require 2 restrooms for each floor.

This then lead to a discussion on whether or not certain sites had been dropped from further discussions at the last meeting. But, because the last meeting hadn't been well attended that it would be appropriate to hold formal, documented votes on each site with reasons given in the motion to drop.

Some felt we had "jumped" over a step or two by eliminating some of the sites. Others pointed out that the Steering Committee had valid reasons for dropping some of the sites because to continue to evaluate would be meaningless. In the end, it was agreed, for posterity sake, to take formal votes on motions that would be as fully documented as the scribe could do. "Let the minutes reflect..."

Before taking the actual votes, it was agreed to remove references to the Bok Trust.

Motion: remove the CMCA site from further consideration:

Motion by DJ, 2nd by Pat Messler (PM) for the following reasons:

Pros:	Satisfies those who want a downtown site	Cons:	Acquisition Costs Building Renovation Costs Issues with parking/accessibility Safety issues at intersection Limited future expansion Multi-story operational costs Lose of potential tax revenue
-------	--	-------	--

Vote to remove was unanimous

Motion: remove the Memorial Park site from further consideration:

Motion by AC, 2nd by WE for the following reasons:

Pros:	Satisfies those who want a downtown site Preserves current location No acquisition cost	Cons:	Issues with the Veterans Memorials vis-à-vis veterans Depletes "The Green" Limited future expansion Issues with parking/accessibility Safety issues at intersection Multi-story operational costs May require blasting
-------	---	-------	--

Vote to remove was unanimous

LIBRARY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2014

Motion: remove the RES site from further consideration:

No motion offered; site retained for future consideration. However, for completeness sake, the following pros and cons are entered into the record for posterity sake.

- | | | | |
|-------|--|-------|--|
| Pros: | No acquisition cost | Cons: | Some wetlands |
| | Ease of future expansion | | Will require side walk along West Street to be rebuilt |
| | Lower operational costs | | |
| | Meets parking/accessibility needs | | |
| | Safe ingress/egress from West Street | | |
| | Near major roads (routes 1 and 90) | | |
| | Potential for green space/children's play area | | |
| | Potential "Gateway" to Rockport Village | | |
| | Possible location for Rockport Information "kiosk" and Chamber of Commerce (COC) | | |
| | Ease of access from all 5 Rockport villages | | |
| | Some citizens passionate about it | | |

Motion: remove the Route 1 sites from further consideration:

Motion by CG, 2nd by PM for the following reasons:

(Motion agreed to by all to include both the old Fuller Chevrolet and Hoboken Gardens sites plus other commercial sites along Route 1/Commercial Street.)

- | | | | |
|-------|--|-------|---|
| Pros: | Ease of future expansion | Cons: | Acquisition costs |
| | One story construction | | Safety issue with ingress/egress onto Route 1 |
| | Lower operational costs | | Loss of property tax revenue |
| | Meets parking and accessibility needs | | |
| | Near major roads (routes 1 and 90) | | |
| | Potential for green space | | |
| | Possible location for Rockport Information "kiosk" and Chamber of Commerce (COC) | | |
| | Ease of access from all 5 Rockport villages | | |

Vote to remove was unanimous

Motion: remove the CHRHS site from further consideration:

Motion by PM, 2nd by CG

- | | | | |
|-------|---|-------|--|
| Pros: | No acquisition cost | Cons: | Shared with Five-town CSD |
| | Meets parking and accessibility needs | | School security issues and regulations |
| | Near major roads (routes 1 and 90) | | Not available |
| | Ease of access from all 5 Rockport villages | | |
| | May mean lower construction costs | | |

Vote to remove was unanimous

Motion: remove the Rockport Properties (MLP) site from further consideration:

No motion offered; site retained for future consideration. However, a brief discussion was had about the other Rockport Properties owned site between Shepard Block and Barbara Jackson/Union Hall buildings. Following the brief discussion, it was agreed that the 2nd site was never seriously considered

LIBRARY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2014

due to it being a smaller site and less advantageously positioned. For completeness sake, the following pros and cons are entered into the record for posterity sake.

- | | | | |
|-------|--|-------|--|
| Pros: | Potential for expansion | Cons: | Acquisition cost or issues related to ownership or lease |
| | Satisfies those who want a downtown site | | Multi-story operational costs |
| | Adjoins MLP for green space | | Shared parking may be a problem |
| | Ease of access to ROH for shared programming | | Elevator to parking level may present a safety issue |
| | Preserves public view of harbor | | Egress from Sandy's Way to "lower" Main St. and, thence, to Central or Main sts. |
| | | | Potential loss of property tax revenue |

Motion: remove the current library site from further consideration:

Motion by WE, 2nd by DJ

A brief discussion was held regarding what was meant by the "current library site." Did it include the retention of the current building or was the only option to tear it down and rebuild. The discussion ended with an agreement that the motion only related to the "tear down/rebuild" option as the "retain as is" was not feasible and the issues with the current building was what was driving this effort.

- | | | | |
|-------|--|-------|-----------------------------------|
| Pros: | No acquisition cost | Cons: | Limited future expansion |
| | Preserves current location | | Issues with parking/accessibility |
| | Satisfies those who want a downtown site | | Does not meet operational needs |
| | | | Safety issues at intersection |
| | | | Cost of demolition |
| | | | Multi-story operational costs |
| | | | Will require blasting |

Vote to remove was unanimous

Motion: remove the combined site (current site plus Memorial Park site) from further consideration:

PH asked if this meant closing Limerock Street and what was involved in doing so.

PM gave a brief history of the issue from the 1940's when Mary Louise Curtis Bok donated the park and current site and offered to build a "Carnegie Library" if Limerock was closed. The voters turned down the idea of closing Limerock, but Mrs. Bok still donated the land.

One of the options was to re-route Limerock "through" Memorial Park

Another option would be to convert the current library site into a parking area

Another option was to build a sky-bridge (or tunnel, mentioned sarcastically).

WE pointed out that we aren't even clear what this "site" would evolve.

In the end, no motion was offered so the site is retained for future consideration. However, for completeness sake, the following pros and cons are entered into the record for posterity sake.

- | | | | |
|-------|--|-------|---|
| Pros: | Satisfies those who want a downtown site | Cons: | Issues with the Veterans Memorials vis-à-vis veterans |
|-------|--|-------|---|

LIBRARY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2014

Preserves current location
No acquisition cost

Depletes "The Green"
Requires closing or re-routing of Limerock St.
Issues with parking/accessibility
Safety issues at intersection
May require blasting
May (will?) require razing of current building;
possible cost of demolition

Continued discussion:

Three sites remain: RES, MLP and Combined Site.

AC asked why we are keeping the Combined Site?

Jan and WE said that the Combined Site does need more thought (looking at it, it has the same or additional problems as the Current and the Memorial Park sites but no additional benefits).

WE reminded the committee about Judy Lindahl's (JL) statement from the previous meeting (that the town has not taken a vote regarding the library; we need to stop fearing the reaction; we should present the ideas and stop worrying about the "what if they ask why we didn't consider..." question).

KM: its agreed that we need more information about what the Combined Site entails.

A discussion then ensued related to The Matrix and whether or not we have either moved beyond it (or outlived the need for it) or if we need to revise the numbers/weights based on our further explorations. This lead to the idea that some of the criteria were extraneous or unnecessary or open to wide interpretation (e.g., Iconic). Areas under question are: iconic, population density, resolution of the Bok deed restrictions, and Environmental/Property Remediation.

Jan asked AC, CG and WE to work with RB to wrap The Matrix up (tidy it up).

CG suggested that we should all be involved in determining the weightings while AC suggested we do it at the next meeting (in deference to the advancing hour). In the

Jan then gave everyone the assignment of e-mailing him suggested weights and which items to remove.

JL that it would be better to provide short statements (blurbs) about each site as it relates to specific criteria. This would be about content, not numbers.

Finally, AC recommended that **KM and CG rework The Matrix**. All were in favor of this action. The following caveats were added: (DJ) terms need better definition; (PH) remove the extraneous criteria.

As to criteria weighting, we have (from the last page of the AC, CG, WE list):

- Downtown vs. Village Location
- Acquisition vs. Construction Costs
- Parking, Accessibility, Safety
- Impact on Veterans Memorials
- Operational Cost
- Ongoing Maintenance Cost

At roughly 5:50, RB, CA and BC had to leave for a Select Board meeting.

LIBRARY STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2014

Next meeting:

Tuesday, May 27 at 4 p.m.

Adjournment: