

Trustees of the M.N. Spear Memorial Library
November 8 2021, 7:30pm, on Zoom
Minutes

- Members present: Michele Regan-Ladd, Kate Cell, Tim Logan, Savannah Ouellette, Brad Foster
- Mary Anne Antonellis: Library Director
- Guests: Penny Kim, Mike Vinskey, Molly Moss, Meryl Mandell, Leslie Luchonok, Rita Farrell, Gail Fleischeker

Mary Anne made an announcement that the meeting is being held via Zoom due to the pandemic.

- Welcome guests
- November 3 meeting minutes approved unanimously.
- Comparison of 2021 Building Program with Schematic from 2009.
 - This is an inaccurate comparison (comparing apples to oranges) because the document is comparing two dissimilar sets of data; it's comparing the actual from the 2009 schematic with the calculation from the 2021 Building Program which includes the 30% which doesn't make sense. Instead we should be comparing the Building Program from 2009 with the Building Program from 2021.
- Straw poll conducted to get a sense of where Trustees are at in their thinking about which site we should recommend.
- Suggestion: We should make a provisional recommendation because we won't have a cost comparison between the two sites. Example- Comparison of expanding access to behind town hall versus an above ground septic.
- The town hall site has major drawbacks: 1) according to a civil engineering report from the last process, a large amount of fill would have to be trucked in to level the site which would be cost prohibitive; 2) poor traffic visibility at town hall. There are a lot of differing opinions in town about the traffic at the top of the hill. There are no sidewalks nor options to add sidewalks down the roadways next to town hall.
- Note- there's already a lot of library traffic at town hall due to programming at town hall. It's unlikely people would be walking down that driveway; people would park at the library so there wouldn't need to be a sidewalk.
- Meryl Mandell : The road at the top of the hill has already been lowered, but there are still sight distance problems. Pulling out of the town hall driveway, visibility in both direction is poor which is a huge drawback of this site. There would also be an interface, congestion between regular town hall traffic and library traffic. There's very little room to expand the driveways. If the police have to get in and out quickly, traffic congestion would pose a safety issue.
- What is the assessed value of each of the parcels because the value of the land matters in the grant proposal? The MBLC has said that the assessed value that's relevant is only what land the library will be sited on and neither parcel has a large assessed value and will be comparable enough to each other so it's not an important factor.

- 0-32 is 430 ft. of frontage and the town hall is less. Both sides will have some challenges- wetlands, need to maintain space for a road to the back of lot 032, raise septic on lot 0-32., moving the broadband shed at town hall, the slope at the town hall, etc. The space to build a library behind town hall is only 250 feet wide, while there are lots of ways to site a library on 0-32 around wetlands.
- Benefits of the town hall- Concentration of civic services and connection to community garden.
- 0-32- concern is that the environmental issue has to be fixed by somebody.
- Update- there's no right of access from Pelham Hill Rd. into lot 0-32.
- We must choose a site by December 3, and additional site work must start by Wednesday.
 - If we choose Town Hall, a geotechnical survey and a boundary and topography survey needs to be done
 - If we choose 0-32, a boundary and topography survey may need to be done
- Will there be a significant difference between the cost of building on the site behind town hall versus lot 0-32? A raised septic will raise cost, but the cost of dealing with the slope is likely to be much higher. From the civil engineer's report from 2010: "To allow for parking for the library, the building would have to be several hundred feet off the road which would put it in the greatest slant of the downward slope, which would require a large amount of fill be brought in to level the site. Cost would be prohibitive."
- Penny Kim: Years ago, the MBLC preferred that the library be visible from the roadway. We're going to have a wonderful jewel and it should be visible from the road.
- Meryl Mandell: We haven't had a new building in town that we could be really proud of since the elementary school was built. To have a very beautiful municipal building along a major roadway through town is not a minor thing. If we put the building behind town hall we're losing a wonderful opportunity to showcase our town and show pride in our town. Accessibility too- when people see the building, they'll be more likely to go there. It will be a beautiful building with gorgeous gardens that she will be involved with creating. Maybe there could be additional community gardens at the library too.
- There is a history of site locations being changed for libraries. It's possible, but it would need to be an emergency circumstance. We can't go in saying we're going to use one site, but know we're likely to change our minds.
- We have a responsibility to build a library that the town can support and afford, so the civil engineering report saying that the site behind town hall is cost prohibitive may be pretty definitive.
- Mary Anne- both sites are completely viable. She can envision the library on either site. There's plenty of space to site a library on either site and it would be wonderful in either location. The soil at lot 0-32 where the library would be sited is perfectly clear- both the recent testing and the testing from 10 years ago showed the site is clean. It's only that one test way back on the parcel, far from where a library would be sited in the location of the old Air Force tower where we are seeing any issues.

- Are there any aspects of the parcels that might affect operational costs, such as solar? Conway School of Landscape Design thought 0-32 had lots of solar exposure. Perhaps the town hall site because a slightly larger cost due to plowing because it's farther away from the road.
- There may be misinformation out there about the chemicals found at lot 0-32. We need to be very clear about where and how much there is and what chemical we're talking about. Gasoline can migrate only up to about 400 feet. It would not reach the potential library site. The testing from 2009 and today prove the location where the library would be sited is completely safe.
- Mike Vinskey: Is there any possibility that the contamination on 0-32 could negatively affect the building, vapors seeping into ventilation rendering the building inhabitable? Answer: No, this is not possible. At either location the building would be built on a slab with no ventilation from under the building. Also, gasoline does not migrate more than 400 feet and the potential site is very far away from the location of the one soil test that found gasoline; it's acres away. There would be no impact to the library from this one test.
- Solar will cover solar that's on the building so the building will be south facing.
- The town hall site brings up traffic issues, and pedestrian crossing safety issues. That area is not safe.
- Unanimous Recommendation to the Select Board: lot 0-32. Roll call vote:
 - Michele Regan-Ladd- Yes
 - Kate Cell- Yes
 - Tim Logan- Yes
 - Brad Foster- Yes
 - Savannah Ouellette- Yes

Documents discussed at the meeting:

- Draft comparison of 2021 Building Program with Schematic from 2010
- Schematic design from the 2009 grant application
- Civil Engineering Report and Conway School of Landscape design report from 2009
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Parcels O-47 and ZO-43, Cooleyville Rd.
- Summary of Groundwater Analytical Results Parcel O-47, Cooleyville Road
- Lot O-47 monitoring well laboratory report
- Limited Subsurface Assessment 66 Leverett Road, Parcel O-32

Next meeting: Tuesday, November 16, 7:30pm.

Respectfully submitted by Melanie DeSilva, Secretary, Library Board of Trustees (notes prepared from zoom meeting recording)