

Library Building Committee Present: Mary Anne Antonellis, Stephen Dallmus, Brad Foster, Dale Houle, Penny Jaques, Elaine Puleo

Roger Hoyt (CMS-OPM), Matt Oudens & Dominik Wit (OEA)

Public: Amanda Alix, Jon Lawless

Meeting opened at 12:04 p.m.

Public Comment:

- Alix asked where the 7,225 sf figure mentioned in the NOI came from.
OEA: Civil engineers refer to the full roof area for storm water calculations while architects refer to the building foot print, which is always smaller. For the first schematic design the building footprint was approx. 6,000 sf plus a covered outdoor area and eave overhangs on roof yielding a total roof area of 7,225sf. This information is included in the response to the Conservation Commission in answer to the question posed during the NOI public hearing.
- Alix asked for clarification about Massachusetts Building code which states that more than 7500sf vs 5000sf thresholds for assembly occupancy buildings. Puleo clarified that outstanding questions will be answered through the Library Building Committee.

Update on progress with Construction Phase Developments Documents (CD)

Wit reported that all subcontractors have been released into CD phase.

Value Engineering Update

Wit presented list of VE items which total \$300,000. Wit noted that the architects and subcontractors will continue to look for cost savings throughout CD.

HVAC

A less expensive way deal with HVAC condensate is being evaluated. Separating ventilation and heating/controlling panels from a single unit to two separate units results in a savings. Houle: Commented that running condensate to the building exterior will result in freezing. Wit will investigate.

Landscape:

Sidewalks to South of parking area were removed. One parking space was removed which allows removal of retaining wall.

Paving stone: OEA is looking at lower cost pavers

Delete 2nd egress from community room, reducing the exits from three to two.

Library of Things/staffroom storage millwork: OEA is strategizing to find more savings,

Insulation

Energy cost savings achieved by increasing from 5" insulation to 7" insulation offers minimal gain. Recommend sticking with 5" insulation which saves \$18,414.

MBLC asked about EUI. Engineers are investigating.

Roof detailing

OEA is looking to simplify roof details at roof eave by deleting the flat seam metal roof. There is marginal savings in material but this simplifies installation.

Houle: Why is there double blocking on the wall detail. Wit: This is a requirement from the structural engineer to support roof and make it rigid.

Wit: Showed upturned roof detail over entrance and teens room. The cricketed detail for draining roof has been adjusted for insulation requirements.

A detail was shown that allows replacing portions of the roof. The PVC portion at the cricket can be replaced independently from the metal portion. Garland (roof manufacturer) has reviewed and OK'd the new detail.

Dallmus and Houle questioned how and whether this will work. Wit will follow up.

Houle: Expressed concern about integrity of entrance roof new design. He noted that this is not the same system that we approved before. Wit: Garland owns warranty for full system.

Oudens: Added that once Garland signs off on these details an outside engineer will do peer-review.

Life cycle cost analysis

Per MBLC's request, OEA did a life cycle cost analysis over 100-year period for the building's exterior envelope.

Siding

Option 1 Slate shingles + Alaskan yellow cedar boards

Option 2 Alaskan yellow cedar shingles and boards

Option 3 Hardi Plank Boards + Hardi Trim

100-year Lifecycle Cost

Lifecycle cost: \$312,081

Lifecycle cost: \$730,305

Lifecycle cost: \$620,673

Note: Additionally, slate is resistant to wetland conditions

Roofing + PV reinstallation

Option 1 Metal seam roof: 40-year warranty

Option 2 Asphalt shingles roof: 30-year warranty

Lifecycle cost: \$1,098,262

Lifecycle cost: \$1,792,700

Note: While asphalt is cheaper to install initially, it needs to be reinstalled more frequently (and thus PV need to be reinstalled more often)

Antonellis: Asked Wit to send this document to MBLC

Plumbing code revision

New 2024 plumbing code requires additional bathroom fixtures per occupancy. There is no leniency in when this new code goes into effect which poses a challenge so late in our design process. To meet new code, we need to add another toilet and sink in the women's bathroom. There are two options: 1) meet code by revising building design or 2) ask for relief from local plumbing inspector due to hardship based on need to stay within building footprint. OEA is pursuing dual level strategies: pursue variance to code and revise bathroom design.

Antonellis: Noted that the two bathrooms are currently non-gendered. This change would require gendered bathrooms to meet the women's fixture requirement.

Oudens: You can't have a multi-stalled, multi-gendered bathroom. Both restrooms need to provide at least 1 ADA-accessible toilet/sink.

Wit: We must provide 3 stalls for 100-person occupancy.

Antonellis: Expressed concern about the impact on trans- and non-binary gendered people.

Revised bathroom design would bump out exterior wall but stay within existing roof footprint.

Puleo: Does new design affect septic system? Wit: It requires another floor drain but OEA is still investigating the effect on septic system. This hinges on whether capacity is calculated by occupancy or number of fixtures. We hope that it's occupancy, which hasn't increased.

Timeline

OEA is planning meetings with relevant town agencies and National Grid. They are still aiming for 75% cost estimate by mid-March and 100% CD in late April.

Review of Minutes from Previous Library Building Committee Meetings

September 19, 2023 Meeting Minutes

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

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

January 4 2024 Meeting Minutes

Dallmus made a motion to approved the minutes as corrected. Houle seconded.

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

Update on NOI and Conservation Commission meeting

The NOI Public Hearing to construct the new library was opened on January 11. Several questions were asked by Commission and public. The Public Hearing was continued to February 8. Dorowski, wetland scientist at F&O, is compiling answers and will forward responses to the Conservation Commission prior to the February 11 meeting. Discussion ensued about posting a concurrent LBC meeting to allow discussion by the committee if needed.

Update on well drilling quotes

We are contacting three well drillers for quotes: Quabbin, Cushing, CT Valley Artesian Well.

Highway Department will remove and trim several trees to allow access for well installation.

The building location has not been staked. We will ask Wit to stake building location.

The Board of Health is aware of the well but, as it is a public water source, DEP is the permitting agency. F&O will coordinate this process and will collect and test samples.

Committee liaison reports

Friends: A bake sale and sale of restocked inventory of Shutesbury merchandise will be held at the March election.

Upcoming meetings

Next full Library Building Committee meeting: February 6

Next Library Design Subcommittee meeting: February 7

Continued NOI Public Hearing: February 11

Houle made a motion to adjourn. Puleo seconded.

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

Meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.