

Old Library Accessibility Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
November 2, 2016

Members Present: Wendy Cote-Magan, Mark Mikitarian, Ken Swanton, Lucy Wallace  
Guests Present: Joan Eliyesil, *Harvard Press*

The meeting was called to order at 7 PM.

Administrative: Minutes of October 17, 2016 were approved.

Update on Cost Estimates: Mark reported on his and Wendy's meeting on October 31<sup>st</sup> with Steve Kirby and distributed copies of the revised estimated construction costs for Options 2 and 3, with add alternatives (Add Alts) for each. Option 2 has been revised to reflect less reuse of existing material and adjustment to amount of landing being removed. Add Alt #1 for Option 2 is to repair the original front door/now window to be same size as adjoining window. Option 3 was revised to reflect the shorter ramp, less railing and masonry, as well as the longer path to the ramp. The Add Alt #1 for Option 3 would be the removal of the side door and restoration of windows on south side to be the same size.

Mark had run estimates showing the cost of each option with and without the Add Alts. Option 2 without Add Alt #1 would be \$299,870; with Add Alt would be \$327,270. Option 3 without Add Alt #1 would be \$376,000; with Add Alt #1 would be \$407,000.

The difference in cost between the two options is due primarily to the amount of granite and masonry called for in Option 3 (being the front and more visible entrance), while more concrete could be used on the landing in Option 2. Option 3 also includes removal of the side entry steps and landing. Lucy asked if that if the side entrance could be blocked and noted as not a public entrance, could that work be postponed to a future time?

Schematics and Refined Estimates: Steve has recommended that we retain the services of an architect to do schematic plans and get them estimated for the two options to further refine the costs. Ken suggested we also ask for code compliant issues that would be triggered by this work. Lucy had spoken with Marie Sobalvarro regarding meeting the requirements of the state's procurement laws. If the estimated cost for design services is less than \$10,000 we must contact (by phone is allowed) at least 3 firms and, using a script, explain the task and ask the same questions. Steve has given us several firms that we could approach. Wendy felt we would not get a firm to do this work for less than \$10,000, and suggested we would do better to go with a single option.

Discussion ensued regarding the recommended option we would make to the Selectmen, which was our charge. We have looked at providing access on all four sides of the building and have rough estimates for 3. Option 1 would clearly be below the \$100,000 threshold and, therefore, not trigger additional code compliance. Options 2 and 3, being over that threshold will. The pros and cons of what to recommend in our report to the Selectmen were considered. Lucy moved and Mark seconded the following motion: "We recommend Option 3, as shown on Rev 3 drawing dated 10/6/16, and that the town get schematic plans and a cost estimate for this work. In addition, the cost estimate should delineate the cost of removal of the side entrance and indicate the interior code compliance issues triggered by this work." Motion passed 3-1 (Magan, Mikitarian, Wallace – Aye; Swanton – Nay).

Report to Selectmen: Given the aggressive timeline of the RFP, our report to the Selectmen should be presented at their next meeting (11/15). In order to meet the deadline for inclusion in the Selectmen's packet, the report needs to be sent to Julie by noon on 11/10. Points to be covered in the report include:

- We looked at each side of the building (there are existing doorways on each side)
- We obtained high level estimates for 3 options: existing back door, side entrance and restoring front entrance
- Recommendation: Option 3
  - Would provide true public access for all
  - Respects the historical integrity of the building
  - Reconnects the building to the Common and town center
  - Restores original entrance to the building

Mark will draft the report and send it to members for review and revision.

Meeting with CPIC: We are scheduled to meet with CPIC at 9 AM on Monday, 11/7. Mark had expected to receive their questions ahead of this meeting so we could discuss our answers, but had not. If Mark does receive their questions, he will forward them to the OLAC for suggested answers. Ken and Wendy will not be available to attend the CPIC meeting; Mark and Lucy will.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 PM. A date for the next meeting was not set.