

**Library Facility Needs Assessment Committee
(LFNAC)
February 8, 2010
6:45 PM
Town Hall
Meeting Minutes**

LFNAC Members Present: Karen Traub, Mary Anne Antonellis, Martha Field, Dale Houle, Weezie Houle, Michele Regan-Ladd, Lori Tuominen

Absent: None

Guests: Mark Sullivan, D.A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc.
Matthew Oudens, Oudens Ello Architecture
Conrad Ello, Oudens Ello Architecture
Rob Bowen, Co-President of Library Friends
Paul Jacobs, Co-President of Library Friends
Becky Torres
Andrew Webster

Meeting called to order at 6:50 PM

1. Minutes: January 20, 2010, approved
Martha will work with some different ways to highlight the edits and notes added by OEA to meeting minutes so they can be seen when copies are made.
2. Mary Anne distributed information for completing the mandatory educational requirements under the Ethics Reform Bill for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. All LFNAC members must complete the online training program and give a copy of the completion certificate to the Shutesbury Town Administrator.
3. Mary Anne announced that the MBLC announced that they will be announcing a library construction grant round to open May 2010. (Yes, that's a lot of announcing!) Letters of Intent will be due in October 2010 and grant applications will be due in December 2010. A MBLC pre-grant information meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 24th, 9:40AM – 1:30 PM, at the Chicopee Public Library. Mary Anne will attend. Mary Anne will inquire if Mark, Karen and Matt or Conrad could attend.
4. OEA design updates and discussion

***OEA addressed LFNAC comments and concerns about the preferred schemes from the January 20th meeting (options 2b, 2c and 5a) as well as several refinements to the 5a option.
Options 2b and 2c (as presented on January 20th) were essentially variations of the original 2a.***

Option 2b

Initial LFNAC Concern: Porch and entryway *on south side of building* not being seen from Leverett Road

OEA Solution: Return to the *original Option 2a* scenario with a front entrance. The plan would be *similarly* T-shaped with the community room *at the rear, but the massing would revert to three distinct volumes.*

Concern: Roof space for PV was limited *due to bifurcation of the roof by way of the rear wing*

There is not much gained from the smaller outdoor room near the parking lot and splitting the outdoor program area seems problematic.

The building sits well with the wet lands area set back.

A tree line along the parking can be added easily and the existing spruce could be kept.

Option 2c

Initial LFNAC Concern: Position of building relative to the 100 ft buffer because the T-shape juts frontward towards Leverett Road. To push the building back beyond the buffer would push the front entrance back almost *200 ft.* from Leverett Road. If the building is not pushed back then it would *require further review and approval by* the Conservation Comm. and our goal is to have the building set so as not to be an issue for the Conservation Comm., i.e. outside the wetland buffer.

OEA Solution: *The shape and orientation of the Community Wing at the front of the building can be modified to some degree to mitigate the distance the building needs to move to avoid the wetland buffer. Perhaps a compromise solution can be achieved which combines a reduced depth of the Community Wing with a reduction in the encroachment into the wetland buffer. It wouldn't avoid ConCom review, but might improve the possibility for successful approval.*

Option 5a

This scheme is most different from other libraries.

Initial LFNAC Concern: Too much separation of the library wing from the community room wing. *Sightlines need improvement*

OEA presented 3 revisions to the original Option 5a: 5a-1, 5a-2, and 5a-3.

Option 5a, revision 1: Slide the Community Room east which would improve visual connections to the community room from the circulation desk. *History Room maintains former position directly off the lobby and close to the Community Room. Although not located adjacent to the adult room as suggested at the last meeting, it would have off-hours access. Lobby area has been reduced from original 5a, although still larger than the LFNAC program.* Mechanical room, storage room and kitchen may need to be shifted.

The mechanical room *would ideally be located in the center of the building for the most efficient layout of* ductwork and other infrastructure.

Option 5a, revision 2: Increased slide of the community room to the east *improving sightlines from the circulation desk. Porch and entry have also shifted east to allow better relationship between lobby and circulation desk. Lobby extends all the way to north wall allowing access to views and natural light.* The porch area "reaches" toward the parking area and invites.

This uses the middle zone *between the two main gable forms* for tall book stacks *to maintain as much openness as possible in the main space*, but *there is concern about whether there is sufficient stack space available in that area.* We discussed

the need for clear movement around the outside of the circulation desk. This arrangement would generate a clear, arrival feeling to the adult and children's room because the book stacks remaining in the rooms would be low. There is more space to secure and close for off-hours use.

History Room and Young Adults are located at far end of Adult Room from circulation desk.

The entryway into lobby forces a turn to the circulation desk and gives space for people to congregate.

Discussed possible use of north facing clerestory lighting or dormers to bring natural light into the main spaces.

Option 5a, revision 3: ***Maintains same arrangement of main library wing and central stack zone with new adjustments made to the entry, lobby, and community room. As in previous revisions, sightlines from circulation desk to community room are improved by moving community room further east. General re-planning of toilets, lobby, kitchen, and storage along opposite side of lobby from circulation desk. Eliminates exterior lobby windows but locates kitchen well between lobby and community room and accessible to both.*** The entry way is an open vestibule with a double door airlock. There are more open sight lines toward the circulation desk and into the library. ***However, access to storage and book drop by library staff*** is slightly less convenient.

Discussed all revisions.

Discussed concerns about ***wide openings between the two wings and ability to close*** off sections after hours.

One of the most important visual elements of the library as seen from Leverett Road will be the front porch at the northwest corner as well as large openings into the community room.

The double bar scheme has less perimeter area than the T-shape designs. The length ***of the building and its orientation parallel to the road*** may be a benefit to give a good presence to the street. People won't miss it driving by.

MEP (Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing)

OEA met with their MEP Engineers. ***One of the most important design considerations will be developing a tight exterior envelope to reduce air infiltration and thermal loss, reducing loads on heating and cooling systems. Natural ventilation will also reduce dependence on cooling.*** We discussed how often the community room will be used and the number of people. The library program called for 80 people. The more people using the room, the greater the cooling and ventilation demand. ***If 80 people are the maximum allowable occupancy and only anticipated several times throughout the course of the year, then determine a lower occupancy that is more consistent*** and design to that number, such as 65 people. It is beneficial to establish the difference between normal usages versus peak usage, especially if the maximum number in the room would occur only a couple times per year. ***A strategy for minimizing loads for the heating and cooling systems is try to achieve "downsized" systems rather than "right-sized" systems. This suggests a commitment by the owner and building occupants to accepting that***

indoor air is maintained at a slightly lower temperature range in winter and higher temperature range in summer. Air conditioning is needed **as much to control humidity as for actual** cooling.

The design team will price two different options for HVAC systems. **One option is a closed-loop geothermal system with approximately 12 wells (4" dia. At 150' deep and 20' apart) serving 5 zones.** The other option is a high efficiency, traditional, split system; this will be likely be a lower cost system but not as energy efficient or green as the geothermal system. However, some of the newer systems are very efficient and assessing different options will **be informed by energy modeling as well as cost.** LFNAC requested a comparison to a purely conventional system with either oil or propane. We discussed possibly using radiant heat in the children's room; there may be an issue with bringing room temperature up and down rather than leaving it set for long periods of time. Biomass was suggested for investigation.

The installation of PV will help to alleviate some **or all** of the power needs. An estimate of 2,500 sq ft of PV would fit the entire south side of one roof. **Further energy modeling is required to determine the total amount of PV required to provide 100% electrical power.**

During summer, the community room would be used mostly when it's raining. **Air conditioning will be critical to reduce humidity on those days.**

Cost Summaries

OEA shared very preliminary cost estimates of a total of \$2.3 million. We discussed the fire protection, utilities and site work. Materials used will be focused on getting a tight envelope. Options 2b and 2c are similar in cost. For Option 5c, there would potentially be higher roof cost but less perimeter cost.

Discussed a target \$1.5 to \$1.7 million for the cost of hard materials and construction.

We briefly discuss roof and siding materials

Motion by Weezie, seconded by Dale: *To accept Option 5a as the preferred plan to request more detailed design from OEA.*

Discussion ensued regarding access to outdoor program area. The sightlines issues were addressed and the two bars are intertwined and related.

Passed unanimously.

Follow-up topics:

- Amount of stack area

- Closure between lobby and circulation area for off-hours community room

- Community room use: 20- 24 programs per month with 12 – 25 people

- Library building use for staff is approximately 46 hours per week

- Entry storage kitchen lobby area

- Access to the outdoor program area to the south

- Skylights or dormers on north side of building

- Swap Young Adult room with the middle bar stack area

- History room as a nook off the adult room

- Half-hexagon on the end with a history room or reading area

5. Conservation Committee meeting January 14, 2010 – Weezie shared notes

6. Other – meeting with Rosemary Waltos on Friday, Feb 13th, with OEA and Mary Anne to discuss the preferred general layout to date with no commitments
7. Next meeting dates

Wednesday, March 3, 2010, 7:15 PM, Town Hall

Meeting adjourned 9:20PM