



p.o. box 5249 • edgartown, ma 02539 • [www.edgartownlibrary.org](http://www.edgartownlibrary.org)

Building Design Committee  
May 20, 2010  
10:00 am

A meeting of the Library Building Design Committee was held on the above date in the children's room of the Edgartown Free Public Library.

Members Present: C. Scott (chair), M. Donaroma, A. Tyra, C. Watt, L. Mercier, R. Knight, M. Fearey.

Public Attendees: F. Cheney (library director), Glenn Carpenter, Ned Southworth, John Lolley, Patricia Rose, and Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioner's (MBLC) Small Library Construction Consultant, Rosemary Waltos,

Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.

C. Scott briefed R. Waltos on the mission of this Building Design Committee. Committee members then asked R. Waltos questions.

What is the general attitude of the MBLC regarding applicants who were unable to take advantage of the 2004 grant award (Edgartown's situation)? R. Waltos replied that the MBLC considered each grant to be starting with a clean slate. The MBLC, however, will be likely to look for discussion regarding what is different about the new application as compared to the 2004 application.

The matching funding to qualify for the grant may be collected from both private and town resources.

It is ideal for the grant to have the design schematics approved by town vote, but it is not required until June 15, 2011.

If the town decides to renovate the old school, the value that qualifies for matching funding is up to \$800,000 of the appraised value of the land. The grant will need either 3 appraisals or the town appraisal for proof of value.

The MBLC will fund one building project--not both a branch and a main site. The impetus will be on the town to prove that it can provide the money to support the use of two sites if that is what is presented in the grant application.

The general rule is that there is one parking spot for every 400 square feet of building. The MBLC, however, will defer to the local planning board's decision if deemed reasonable. L. Mercier stated that the green area next to the old school could be developed to provide parking.

The MBLC will want to see planning for parking spots that are specifically designated for the library.

The library's building program must be completed before an architect is hired. The site location may be determined while finishing the building program.

The population estimates published by MISER that were used for the 2004 grant were overestimated. C. Watt described the census information that he put together for an earlier Committee meeting. The Committee will need to present a defensible explanation for how population estimates are determined for the new grant application.

Five library projects are finishing up and using their 2004 grant awards. Four more are beginning their projects and will use their 2004 awards. An additional four libraries are actively seeking funding and are optimistic about being able to meet the criteria to receive their 2004 awards.

Sixteen libraries are not accepting the MBLC grant awards. This money will be rolled into the next grant round with some held aside for other library construction related costs. Approximately sixty million will be available for this coming grant round, which will fund six to ten projects. R. Waltos estimates about 50 to 60 libraries will be competing in the upcoming grant round. The 2004 grant had 35 applicants. The eligible applicants will be listed in order of their scores and will be funded accordingly as money becomes available.

After the remaining 2004 grant money is spent, the MBLC will begin to lobby for another bond to fund the eligible projects. It took approximately three years before the state funded the 2004 grant round. The outlook for future state spending is not optimistic. No one knows how long it will take to pass another library construction bond bill.

According to the MBLC, a good library building design should incorporate adequate sizing for the community as well as the fundamental elements of a modern public library. While the MBLC grant requires that the applicant make a design to allow for 20 year growth, for practical purposes, the designers should look as far out as 100 years. It should have adequate parking and should be sited appropriately (in the heart of a community and visible).

Situating a library next to a school is good for the school population but will need to address additional issues: bigger children's area, vibrant teen area, more staff for children's services, increased traffic, greater concern for the safety and security of children as well as parents.

The entire design should meet the 150 lb/sq ft load standards to allow for greater flexibility as the collections ages. For instance, the current Edgartown Library building was not uniformly rated for 150 lb/sq ft and subsequently had a support issue with the placement of the back stacks.

The economic need percentage grant presented with the grant mailing that the Committee recently received is based on a community's economic need. It does not affect the likelihood of a grant being accepted but instead provides for additional funding to help the community after construction is completed. Edgartown does not have a high percentage compared to other state communities.

A "green" building will not necessarily be considered more favorably during the selection process. It does, however, allow an applicant to be eligible for an additional "green" grant from the MBLC. Criteria for a "green" building are based on LEEDS certification. Qualifications include recycling an old building, minimizing refuse during construction. The MBLC grant evaluators will look at the

“green” aspect of a design to ensure that the applicant has taken into account the cost for construction as well as for continued maintenance. The level of LEEDS certification is determined by a separate organization after construction is completed. The “green” grant is then awarded after the library receives its official LEEDS certification. While renovating an old building will help with LEEDS certification, it raises flags for the MBLC grant evaluators regarding issues of efficiency and operating expenses due to the need to conform to an old building (which is likely to be less efficient than a newly constructed building).

One of the MBLC evaluators will be an architect, who will visit each applicant’s site. That person will make recommendations based on his/her preliminary findings.

Notes for the Building Design Committee to bear in mind:

- ✓ Budget for asbestos removal.
- ✓ Aim to have the schematic drawings finished by the end of November.
- ✓ Schematic designs cost approximately \$60,000.
- ✓ Make the new library a durable, flexible facility. Media formats change over time.
- ✓ Do not expect the library to be full when opened. It should have plenty of empty shelves.
- ✓ It does not matter whether or not a library qualifies as a basic or excellent library according to the Wisconsin Library standards for the MBLC evaluators.
- ✓ The MBLC encourages libraries to consider multiple sites before settling on one.
- ✓ Plan on 45 square feet for each workstation.
- ✓ Consider the community gathering aspect of public libraries while designing.
- ✓ Eligible costs for matching MBLC grant monies do not include: paving, furnishings, technology (other than infrastructure), landscaping. Steel shelving does qualify but wood shelving does not.
- ✓ Using beams rather than columns makes for a more adaptable building design.
- ✓ Visit other libraries.

Private libraries have applied for MBLC grant monies.

R. Waltos was asked to provide the committee with a list of libraries that have flexible designs. She stated that new buildings as a rule are more flexible than renovated libraries. Duxbury is an example of a library that moved to an old school building for expansion. Duxbury did not increase the load capacity of the new children’s room, which has made it a less adaptable structure.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:15.

Respectfully submitted by,

Approved:

Felicia Cheney

---

Chris Scott, Chairman