



## **RICE LIBRARY BUILDING COMMITTEE**

**August 14, 2019**

**6PM**

**TOWN HALL**

**AGENDA**



1. Review and Approve Minutes
  - a. May 7, 2019
  - b. May 22, 2019
  - c. June 5, 2019
  - d. June 19, 2019
2. Design Status and Update (Scott Simons Architects) - None
3. Prepare for November Vote
4. Next Meeting

### Materials:

- Draft Minutes
- Bond Referendum

# MEETING NOTES

## Rice Library Building Committee Meeting

May 7, 2019 7:00 PM Kittery Community Center

Notes by: Tim Brochu **5/19/2019 DRAFT NOTES**

### Attendees:

PRESENT	Ryan Kanteres	Scott Simons Architects
PRESENT	Seth Wilschutz	Scott Simons Architects
PRESENT	Jim Anderson	Committee Chair
PRESENT	Kendra Amaral	Town Manager
ABSENT	Lee Perkins	Library Director
PRESENT	Charles Denault	Town Councilor
PRESENT	Jeffrey Pelletier	Town Councilor
PRESENT	Brenda Fox-Howard	Finance Director
ABSENT	George Dow	Committee Member
PRESENT	Jennifer Brewer	Committee Member
PRESENT	Tim Brochu	Committee Member
PRESENT	Margaret Meyers	Committee Member
PRESENT	Doug Greene	Committee Member
PRESENT	David Batchelder	Committee Member
PRESENT	Katie Lyons	Rice Library Circulation Supervisor

## Historic Preservation Report

SSA presented a summary of the 100-page draft Historic Preservation Plan they have received from Scattergood Design. Ryan noted that it's unusual for a building of this age and use to have as many of its historical features intact and in as good condition as they are in.

- **Character-Defining Features** – Significant views, materials, and architectural features
- **Preservation Philosophy** – The following preservation treatments are recommended for certain areas of the building:
  - **Preservation** - The act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Preservation areas can be modified to restore them to their historical condition.
  - **Rehabilitation** - “the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values.”
  - **Adaptation** – Areas that are less historically significant, and may be modified without compromising historical significance
- **Preservation treatments:**
  - The Toilet Room in the Reading Room is not historically significant.
  - The round desk in the Reading Room should be maintained but could be replaced in kind
- **Existing conditions and repair** - 11 categories of components that may require repair were discussed:
  - Site
  - Roofing and Drainage
  - Masonry - 5% of mortar to be repainted (not including chimneys)

- Metals – Exterior iron handrails
- Windows - Windows are unique, require repair work
- Doors & transoms - Some revarnishing
- Flooring - Marble floor in the entrance is original, other flooring is not
- Walls and Ceilings - Some plaster repair (cracks)
- Finish Woodworking - Some revarnishing
- Fireplace Surrounds - In good condition
- Lighting – Some are not historical and could potentially be removed
- **Status of recommendations** – Jim asked to clarify if recommendations in the report are a mandate. Ryan noted that there is not a regulatory requirement, but following the recommendations would allow the building to maintain its status on the historic register.
- **Design Implementation** – Seth noted that the final report will describe how the proposed design will implement the preservation recommendations.

### 4/24 Community Meeting

Public feedback from the 4/24 Community Meeting was discussed. SSA has shared public comments with the Committee and noted that they continue to receive emailed comments.

- **Summary of breakout group discussions:**
  - Seth's group:
    - Support for socialization spaces
    - Strong interest in sustainable priorities
    - Interest in a contemporary / modern addition (with some exceptions)
    - General preference for the North scheme
  - Ryan's group:
    - Conversation about parking
    - Slight preference for southern scheme
    - Most said either scheme could work
    - Impression that North has more indoor/outdoor connections
    - Southern scheme has a more direct connection to the Foreside
    - Be considerate of abutters
  - Sara / Scott's group:
    - Focus on technology
    - Defined space for senior citizens
    - Indoor/outdoor connections
    - Questioned the need for community meeting spaces since these are available at the Community Center - Greta (library staff) said that the Library has enough programs to utilize this space, and said that the Community Center has a full schedule and events there require additional staff to set up and facilitate.
  - (See SSA's presentation slide for additional topics discussed at the Community Meeting)
- **Public Participation:**
  - People seemed pleased about the timing of this forum appreciated getting an understanding of where the project is at.
  - Jen noted that some responses may have been based on people wrapping their heads around it.
  - David noted that it took a while for participants to get their heads around the concept of massing.
  - Doug noted that the basis for design and how it's evolved was well detailed and answered people's questions.

- Jen observed that the group was largely older citizens, so the committee should continue to keep other demographics in mind.
- Katie noted that a lot of the participants were regular users of the Library.
- Kendra noted that there were lot of new faces, not just the usual group of involved citizens
- **Parking:**
  - Parking was a big topic of discussion at the Community Meeting.
  - What is the redevelopment of this site going to do to parking in the Foreside? What can realistically be accomplished?
- **Playspace:**
  - Doug suggested planning space on the site for an interactive playspace (maybe in the future). He referenced the Hoyt Sullivan playground in Somerville MA as an example that incorporates natural elements - <http://www.earthscapeplay.com/project/hoyt-sullivan-park-tower-playground/>

## Design Scheme Selection

SSA presented revised designs for both the North and South Schemes. Ryan noted that SSA's goal is to have a well-resolved Schematic Design for display at the Kittery Block Party. The Committee discussed attempting to select either the South or the North Scheme in the next meeting. (Some program notes discussed below may apply to both schemes)

- **North Scheme**
  - Community Room is downstairs
  - Meeting spaces - Each space should handle 20 - combine 3 spaces to seat more people
  - Storytime for 30 people, bigger groups downstairs
  - Southeast Meeting Room – Ryan asked what the Committee thought about this space.
    - Jen suggested an angled exterior wall to better orient it to views of the Foreside
    - Tim noted that a south facing meeting / reading space is good, and it could allow space for expansion of bookshelves if needed in the future.
  - Cafe / coffee service:
    - Peggy noted that there could be a Keurig, with washable cups
    - Tim noted that there was opposition in the Community Meeting to providing a Cafe with coffee and food service, but we may want to consider a packaged snack counter / Keurig similar to the Kittery Community Center
    - David suggested providing a sink
    - Jim noted that the Portsmouth Library has a small snack space which might be appropriate
  - Ryan noted that the landscape could become the anchor to the Foreside in the North Scheme, as opposed to the building in the South Scheme.
  - Charles suggested adding a dormer to the roof of the addition to reflect the roof massing of the Rice Building. Ryan noted that they are hesitant to copy elements, but will study the scale and look of the roof and use of materials.
- **South Scheme**
  - The Ground Floor is similar to the North Scheme
  - Tightened floor plan to north, more proportional to existing building. Some space moved behind the building.
  - Storytime:
    - Katie noted that there are often 50-60 people in storytime (30 kids + caregivers)
    - Peggy suggested comparing proposed Storytime space to the Taylor Building.

- Kendra noted that the interior spaces in the South Scheme feel disconnected from the Rice Building spaces.
- Reference Desk:
  - Katie noted that they would not use it as reference desk
  - The existing Rice entrance may not be a major point for people to access, but people will keep using that entrance
  - Ryan suggested flipping the reference space to other side of the stair. This frees up the tower space, facing south and the Foreside, for public use
  - Seth noted that there is little usable wall space in on the other side of the stairs.
- Kendra asked if the fanned stacks need to remain for historical significance. Ryan noted that this is still under investigation.
- Book drop off – A parking pull-off on Wentworth Street is proposed.
- **North / South Scheme Pros & Cons**
  - SSA summarized pros and cons of the North and South Schemes (see slide)
  - Jim noted that he prefers the South Scheme for its connection to the Foreside, but noted that some people in the Community Meeting who wanted the library to "anchor" the Foreside preferred the North Scheme.
  - Tim noted that the South Scheme orients the entrance to the Foreside, while the North Scheme entrance may not be as visible from the Foreside. The South Scheme fills in a gap in the patterning of buildings from the Foreside up Wentworth Street. The North scheme presents the Rice Building as a jewel on the hill, which some people preferred in the Community Meeting. The South Scheme glass entry with visibility of the Rice façade may address concerns about the addition concealing the original building.
  - Ryan noted that the North Scheme interior flow works better (per Kendra's comments). SSA will study the South Scheme to improve the internal flow.
  - David noted that in the North Scheme you see more of the face of the existing Rice Building. In the South Scheme the scale of the addition is working well. In the South Scheme there is General Collection space in the Basement, but the North Scheme does not have this and could be closed off when not in use.
  - Ryan noted that there is not a significant site cost difference between one scheme or the other.
  - Doug noted that the North Scheme has a lot of advantages in terms of interior flow and indoor/outdoor connections to the site

## Design and Materials

- **Material selections**
  - Ryan noted that SSA is anticipating using mid-price materials. We can't afford much brick or stone.
  - Jeff noted that we should consider whether we want the Foreside to shift towards more modern design, or preserve traditional styles
  - Jim asked if there would be glass at the intersection with the existing building or a solid material. Ryan noted that it could be curtainwall framing at the brick, or there could be a metal return like in the North Scheme
  - Jen noted that arches are prominent on the Rice Building and could be part of the design.
  - Doug asked if the roof of the addition could be open to interior spaces. Ryan noted that there will be some mechanical equipment but it may be possible at some portions of the roof.

## Project Budget

SSA presented a preliminary project budget, which can apply to either the North or South Schemes.

- **Project Costs:**
  - The Construction Cost is currently budgeted at \$3,996,250 including a 10% design contingency.
    - Seth noted that 11,000 SF at \$275/SF for the new addition is achievable.
    - Ryan noted that they would prefer it to be 10,500 SF at \$285/SF +/-.
  - Soft costs (furnishings, fees, services, administrative costs) are budgeted at \$1,030,400.
    - Ryan noted that the original FF&E (furniture, fixtures, and equipment) budget was low. SSA has budgeted an allowance of \$315,000 for FF&E.
    - Ryan noted that the Clerk of the Works fee was high in the original budget. SS&A reduced this to \$50,000. Jim noted that the original budget was based on a full time Owner's Rep / Clerk, and that this had been part of negotiation to reduce SSA's Construction Administration fees.
  - An Owner's Contingency of \$225,250 is included.
  - Total project cost is budgeted at \$5,251,900
  - The budget notes that 5% cost inflation per year should be anticipated (add \$325,000 to the project budget for a 2021 construction start = \$5,576,900 project cost with inflation)
    - Kendra noted that \$5 million is all we can afford
- **Operational Costs:**
  - Jeff asked which option would cost more to operate?
  - Ryan noted that SSA will review operational costs for each option with Lee

## Next Steps

- **5/8** – SSA to upload the draft historical preservation report
- **5/20** – SSA to provide a draft of presentation material for the 5/22 meeting
- **5/22 Building Committee Meeting** - Decide on a preferred scheme
- **5/24** – “Drop dead” date for selection of a preferred scheme
- **6/5 Building Committee Meeting** – Review draft presentation materials for the Block Party
- **6/15 Kittery Block Party** – Kendra noted that it will be very busy and difficult to make a presentation. The goal should be to show people images to get them excited about the project.
- **June / July Second Community Meeting** – to be scheduled for after the Block Party
- **July Town Council Meeting** – Presentation to Town Council

**Next Meeting: 6:00 PM Wednesday 5/22/19 at Kittery Town Hall Council Chambers**

## Meeting Minutes: Meeting No. 08 – 5<sup>th</sup> Schematic Design

---

Date: May 22, 2019  
Project: Rice Public Library Renovation and Expansion  
Location: Kittery, Maine  
To: Kendra Amaral + Library Planning Committee  
Prepared by: Scott Simons Scott Simons Architects  
Ryan Kanteres Scott Simons Architects  
Chris Berry Scott Simons Architects  
Attending: James Anderson, Tim Brochu, Jennifer Brewer, Peg Meyers, George Dow, Lee Perkins, Douglas Green,  
Charles Denault, David Batchelder, Scott Simons, Ryan Kanteres, Matt Maiello, Sarah Hourihane  
Not Present Kendra Amaral, Jeff Pelletier  
Meeting title: Building Committee Meeting No. 8

### 1. Review of Outstanding Old Business

2. **Poll Building Committee Members** Straw poll results: 7 South – 2 North (4 including absentee)  
Review of positions from board members  
Charles- Preferred the North scheme because it leaves Existing building more dominant  
Douglas- Preferred the North scheme citing better connection to site, better layout, and the formal shape of early iterations  
Lee- Preferred the South scheme citing better sight lines, less excavation, and better solar access  
George- Likes the South scheme because of its relationship to site and surrounding neighborhood, its efficient layout, and view to the foreside  
Jen- South Scheme seemed more functional, but is on the fence and likes both  
Tim- Likes that the South Scheme engages with the foreside. Creates a 'plea' to go and preserves god visibility to existing building. Likes North Scheme as well, but thinks South is more successful  
Jim- South Scheme may avoid approx. \$75-100K in ledge removal and preserves the never fully realized Olmstead brothers garden design. Fundamentally prefers how the South Scheme relates to the foreside  
David- Likes the flow of the North Scheme but prefers the visibility of the entry in the South Scheme  
Kendra- Not present- Likes the North Schemes circulation and connection to the existing  
Jeff- Not present- Likes how the North Scheme engages with the existing better

### 3. Identify Single Scheme

#### A. Review progress of North and South Schemes

- A. Code issues regarding open stairs were reviewed for both schemes
  - B. The balcony in the upper level reading room was discussed in both projects
2. North scheme and South Scheme developments were presented
- A. Lee comment positively on the public use of the torrent room spaces, discussed access and control of the local history room on the lower floor. Additionally Lee thought included

audio books in e-commons will work and she ask us to consider sittting people on the east side of the curved desk, and graphics on glass fronted meeting rooms.

- B. David reacted positively to South Scheme layout
- C. General concern was mentioned about location of copier
- D. Jen, and general, effort should be taken to identify study carols and tutoring rooms
- E. Tim ask SSA to represent the view to the foreside

B. Compare merits of North and South Schemes

- 1. North Scheme Pros
  - A. Preserve the prominence of the existing building south façade
  - B. Less underpinning required
  - C. More connected out door space
  - D. More equal parking
  - E. Simpler flow between new and old
  - F. Opportunity for courtyard garden space
  - G. Better shaded west windows
- 2. South Scheme Pros
  - A. Strong gesture to the Foreside
  - B. View from building
  - C. More contiguous new floor plate
  - D. Active spaces more visible to downtown
  - E. Good roof top solar collection opportunity
  - F. Less excavation (risk of ledge)
  - G. More new south windows
- 3. North Scheme Cons
  - A. More excavation (risk of ledge)
  - B. Requires handicap ramps (cost)
  - C. Less visibility form Foreside
  - D. Requires modification of the Mezzanine
- 4. South Scheme Cons
  - A. More underpinning required (at Elevator and west wall)
  - B. Collection on lower level (staffing)
  - C. More total earthwork
  - D. Requires removal of Mezzanine
  - E. Less encapsulation of north wall

C. Final decision

- 1. Final Vote            6 South Scheme – 2 North Scheme

4. Next Steps and New Business

- 5. Next meetings time            June 5, 2019  
Block Party                        June 15, 2019



## Meeting Minutes: Meeting No. 09 – 6<sup>th</sup> Schematic Design

---

Date: June 05, 2019  
Project: Rice Public Library Renovation and Expansion  
Location: Kittery, Maine  
To: Kendra Amaral + Library Planning Committee  
Prepared by: Scott Simons Scott Simons Architects  
Ryan Kanteres Scott Simons Architects

Meeting title: Building Committee Meeting No. 9

### 1. Review of Outstanding Old Business

- A. SSA provide and update on the schedule
- B. SSA presented improved version of the south scheme site plan, balancing parking and maintaining the garden space

### 2. Update on Plan Revisions

- A. Plans were reviewed level by level
  1. Notable changes included the elimination of the monumental stair a consolidation of core elements
  2. There was general consensus that the organization of the levels, entries, and major program elements where working well

### 3. Exterior Design Development

- A. Building massing and exterior materials
  1. Hipped roof was confirmed
  2. SSA agreed to continue to study exterior materials. SSA was encouraged to create more of a design moment addressing the foreshore on the south west corner ahead of the next meeting
- B. Site development
  1. Preservation of the garden space was identified as strong positive
- C. Discuss presentation images
  1. After a view of some sample images it was agreed that a simple rendering of the south scheme and the current site plan would be appropriate material for SSA to bring to the block party

### 4. Block Party and Public Meeting Logistics

- A. Day of schedule, printing and support materials were reviewed
- B. SSA agreed to develop, and bring printed, comment cards

### 5. Next Steps and New Business

- A. SSA presented preliminary budget numbers
  1. Continued efforts to right size the building where recommended
  2. SSA also recommend an additional pricing effort be conducted, as this preliminary effort was taken form an early version of the North Scheme

6. Next meeting time            June 19, 2019

## Meeting Minutes: Meeting No. 10 – 7<sup>th</sup> Schematic Design

---

Date: June 19, 2019  
Project: Rice Public Library Renovation and Expansion  
Location: Kittery, Maine  
To: Kendra Amaral + Library Planning Committee  
Prepared by: Scott Simons                      Scott Simons Architects  
                  Ryan Kanteres                     Scott Simons Architects

Meeting title: Building Committee Meeting No. 10

### 1. Review of Outstanding Old Business

- A. SSA provide and debriefing from the Block Party – shared quotes from the overwhelmingly positive comments we received back

### 2. Update on Plan Revisions

- A. Plans were reviewed level by level
  - 1. SSA noted relocated breakroom and was asked to removed old kitchen
  - 2. SSA was asked to add a study/parenting room to the third floor

### 3. Exterior Design Development

- A. Building massing and exterior materials
  - 1. The general reaction to the further development of the angled gesture towards the foreside was positive, though some concern about the resulting ‘boxy’ proportion was raised
    - A. SSA will work to develop a more vertical proportion of materials and windows
  - 2. Conversation focused largely on materials. SSA present options with a ‘red’ brick masonry and a ‘grey’ brick masonry
    - A. The committee was split and could see merit in emphasizing the original brick by using field colors in the new building that were similar to the limestone trim of the existing, as well as the alternative of using the less contrasting ‘red’ brick.
    - B. SSA was also looking for feedback on the infill materials and found that there was more support for higher contrast materials in the ‘grey’ brick options.
      - A. A palette of copper, stone, and corten steel look materials was presented.
      - B. There was slight preference for a copper look infill panel in a ‘red’ brick
  - 3. A roof option with dormers was positively received
    - A. Opportunity to bring light into the children’s story time area was particularly desirable
- B. Site development
  - 1. The garden, book drop, and a seating near exterior stairs were all discussed
- C. Presentation images
  - 1. After continued discussion it was agreed that the SSA would bring a rendering of the grey clad south scheme to the community meeting. This would allow further development of this option and allow opportunity for public feedback

**MEETING MINUTES NO 10 Rice Public Library (06.19.19)**

**4. Community Meeting Logistics**

A. SSA and LA will both be attending the community meeting. SSA will formulate the digital presentation

**5. Next Steps and New Business**

A. SSA is working to finalization of the SD phase work

1. Clarity on exterior material direction is very desirable, but not critical for completion of work in this phase. SSA will further refine these selections and will continue to study both a 'grey or contrasting' masonry and 'red of blending' masonry options

**6. Next meeting time                      Community Meeting on June 26, 2019**

## BOND REFERENDUM

### RICE PUBLIC LIBRARY EXPANSION, RENOVATIONS AND IMPROVEMENT

1 “Shall the Town of Kittery council be authorized to issue bonds in a total amount not to exceed  
2 \$5,000,000 for the purpose of funding costs to expand, renovate, and improve the Rice Public  
3 Library?”

4 Yes

5 No

#### 6 **Background**

7 The Town of Kittery is seeking to expand, renovate, and improve the Rice Public Library. The  
8 project will result in a 21<sup>st</sup> century library that is consolidated into a single building, accessible to all  
9 visitors/ADA accessible; with space for collections, children, young adult, and adult programs,  
10 flexible community meeting and program space, technology to meet the evolving needs for  
11 information access, and adequate parking.

12 The construction and associated soft costs for implementation of the project are estimated to be  
13 \$5,000,000. Grants and private donations may be used to augment the project budget for  
14 enhanced building features, landscaping, furniture, fixtures, equipment and technology.

15 The Library is a department of the Town of Kittery, and all assets of the Library including the Rice  
16 Building and the Taylor Building are owned by the Town.

17 The debt will be general obligation bonds, funded through annual tax revenue. The estimated cost  
18 of interest, at 3%, is \$1,574,583, and the estimated total cost of principal and interest at maturity is  
19 \$6,574,583.

20 The total amount of bonds outstanding and unpaid is \$23,927,920. The Town’s capital  
21 improvement program (“CIP”) policy bonding limit, 2.5% of Total Valuation, is \$42,997,500. If the  
22 proposed bonds are approved, the Town will be at 67.3% of its total CIP policy bonding limit. The  
23 Town does not have authorized, unissued bonds.

24 The validity of the bond and of the voters' ratification of the bond may not be affected by any errors  
25 in the estimate made pursuant to Town Charter 6.07 paragraph (2). If the actual amount of the total  
26 debt service for the bond varies from the estimate, the ratification by the voters is nevertheless  
27 conclusive and the validity of the bond is not affected by reason of the variance.