

Shutesbury Library Building Committee Meeting Minutes

6 December 2022

Present

SLBC Members: Mary Anne Antonellis, Stephen Dallmus, Brad Foster, Dale Houle, Penny Jaques, Molly Moss, Elaine Puleo

Absent: Quackenbush

Guests: Neil Joyce (CMS), Roger Hoyt (CMS), Lauren Stara (MBLC), Michael Vinskey

Puleo opened meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Public Comment None

Dallmus suggested that we allow public comment until 7:10 at the beginning of each meeting. The committee agreed.

Review minutes from previous

Minutes from the November 15, 2022 meeting were reviewed.

Antonellis made a motion to approve the minutes as amended with minor corrections. Foster seconded.

Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Foster-aye, Houle-aye, Jaques-aye, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye

Minutes from the December 1, 2022 Designer Subcommittee meeting were reviewed.

Antonellis made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Houle seconded.

Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Foster-aye, Houle-aye

Update on architects selected for interviewing

Antonellis summarized the Designer Subcommittee's decision at their December 1 meeting: six architects submitted requirements. Of those, three are recommended for interviews: Johnson Roberts, Oudens Ello and LLB. A second Subcommittee meeting was not needed.

Dallmus moved to approve Johnson Roberts, Oudens Ello and LLB for interviews. Houle seconded.

Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Foster-aye, Houle-aye, Jaques-aye, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye.

Interviews are scheduled for Monday, December 12 and will be a hybrid format with the LBC, MLBC reps, CMS and architect candidates present. Joyce has emailed the three candidates and has spoken with Johnson Roberts and Oudens Ello but not LLB. Antonellis randomly drew names to select order of presentation for the three firms:

Ouduns Ello 4:00 p.m.

LLB 5:15 p.m.

Johnson Roberts 6:30 p.m.

Finalize plans for the designer interview process

The committee confirmed that candidates have 20 minutes for a presentation followed by 30 minutes for questions. There will be 10 minutes between candidates. Joyce read the email he sent to candidates (see attached).

As there is a limit of 12 people in Town Hall's large meeting room, the SLBC, MLBC reps and TMS reps plus the candidates will be attend in person. Others must participate via ZOOM. Attendees will be asked to wear masks.

The Committee reviewed Joyce's sample interview questions (final list is attached).

- Q1 Leave as is
- Q2 Recommended eliminating this Q as the 3 firms being interviewed have all designed libraries that have been constructed. The LBC agreed.
- New Q 2 Forces applicant to look at things critically. Leave as is.
- New Q 3 Very important (cost control). Leave as is.
- New Q 4 Foster suggested removing first sentence, Houle and Moss disagreed. Leave as is
- New Q 5 Important. Leave as is.
- New Q 6 Leave as is
- New Q 7 Leave as is
- New Q 8 Antonellis asked what are BIM and Revit? Joyce explained that they are 3D drawing tools and that Revit is industry standard.
- New Q 9 After the committee discussed rewording this question about issues on Lot O-32, site, it was decided to leave as is
- New Q 10 Foster suggested modifying this Q to say "How does your firm conduct follow ups for quality control and solicit customer satisfaction feedback?" LBC agreed.

Antonellis reminded the committee that for the OPM interviews, Quackenbush asked all questions to provide for continuity. She will ask him to do this again. Dallmus asked whether we would provide the list of questions to the designers ahead of time, particularly the questions about timeline and cost control? Joyce and Stara both stated that it's typical to NOT provide the Q's ahead of time. The committee decided to not provide questions ahead of time.

Updates on Lot O-32

WETLAND BOUNDARY SURVEY: The Conservation Commission is requiring a survey of wetland flagging once they agree to the locations of each flag. While flag locations have been mapped via GPS, the accuracy can be affected particularly when a tree canopy is present. Antonellis asked the LBC to fund the survey as it is part of the construction process.

Puleo moved to allow Antonellis to hire a surveyor using construction funds. Dallmus seconded. Roll call vote: Mary Anne Antonellis-aye, Stephen Dallmus-aye, Brad Foster-aye, Dave Houle-aye, Penny Jaques-aye, Molly Moss-aye, Elaine Puleo-aye

Joyce suggested that rather than bringing every expenditure to the committee that Antonellis and one person from the committee be designated to make decisions. Stara suggested checking the contract to see if it designates a person to make expenditures.

Puleo made a motion: if no one is designated, that it be Antonellis and Quackenbush. If Antonellis is designated, that Quackenbush be added as the second person. Foster seconded. Roll call vote: Mary Anne Antonellis-aye, Stephen Dallmus-aye, Brad Foster-aye, Dave Houle-aye, Penny Jaques-aye, Molly Moss-aye, Elaine Puleo-aye

CHANGES TO WETLAND BOUNDARIES: April Doroski, Fuss and O'Neill's wetland scientist and Emily Stockman, the Conservation Commission's peer reviewer, returned to Lot O-32 for a follow up site visit. After further review, Doroski and Stockman agreed to adjust the original IVW boundary

(along access road to the radio tower site) from one larger IVW to a series of 4 smaller IVWs. The original IVW was greater than 1000 sf. The four new IVWs are all smaller than 1000 sf and therefore are not jurisdictional. Stockman agreed with new boundary on east side of site. This BVW boundary has shifted 15' into the east edge of Lot O-32. On west side at the front of the property, the boundary of the wet meadow is reverting to the original wetland delineation. These revised boundaries will be discussed at the continued public hearing at 8:00pm during the December 8 Conservation Commission meeting.

Planning for public forum in February

We will discuss this at our January meeting.

Liaison reports

The Friends received \$31,385 during Giving Tuesday!

Schedule next meeting

We will cancel the December 13 as we are meeting on the 12th. The next meeting will be December 27.

Dallmus moved to adjourn. Foster seconded.

Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Foster-aye Houle-aye, Jaques-aye, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye,

Meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Attachment:

Designer Selection – Interview Q&A for December 12, 2022 Interviews

Firm Interviewed _____

1. Please provide an overview of your approach to completing the design. include the following:
 - a. Who are the key individuals that will be involved from your firm to complete the design?
 - b. What is the expected level of involvement of the subconsultants during the preliminary stages of design?
 - c. What are the expectations that you have of the Town and related Departments during the design phase?
 - d. How will the personnel and/or expectations change during construction?
2. Please provide an example of “lessons learned” from a past success, as well as from a past failure that have been encountered on your projects.
3. Please provide examples of your cost control practices and provide examples of how you monitor and maintain project cost and budgets throughout the duration of a project.
4. Engaging the public and maintaining public confidence in this project will be critical to its overall success. Can you please cite specific examples of your past practices and strategies that have resulted in successful public engagement, as well as examples of what has not worked well for communities.
5. Please cite specific examples of your firm’s ability to design and oversee construction of cost effective, environmentally responsible municipal buildings. Please include an overview of any credentialed buildings (LEED or otherwise) your firm has completed.
6. Clear and effective communication is a vital element of any successful project. Please describe how you propose to effectively communicate with the various parties during completion of the study? How will this change as the project progresses beyond the study phase?
 - a. Designer to Subconsultants
 - b. Designer to OPM
 - c. Designer to Owner / Building Committee?
7. The anticipated project timeline for the completion of design is the fall of 2023, followed by full construction documents and bidding in the winter of 2023 with construction to follow. Do you anticipate any difficulty in attaining this schedule? Is there an opportunity to expedite the design and bid the project earlier?
8. Please confirm your firm’s ability to provide building modeling services for this project, including BIM / Revit and Energy Modeling.
9. This site has some geo-environmental challenges – wetlands, possible chemical impacted soils, etc. Please cite specific examples of your firm’s experience with new construction under similar circumstances.
10. After construction completion, how does your Firm conduct follow ups for quality control and solicit customer satisfaction feedback?