Present: Mary Anne Antonellis, Stephen Dallmus, Brad Foster, Dale Houle, Penny Jaques, Molly Moss, Elaine Puleo, Jeff Quackenbush, Lauren Stara (MBLC), Matt Oudens (OEA), Dominik Wit (OEA), Roger Hoyt (CMS), Porpla Kittisapkajon (OEA)

Public: Carolyn Platt, April Stein, Mike Vinskey, Steve Bressler, Weezie Houle, Penny Kim, Frank McGinn

Puleo opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Executive Session Foster moved to enter executive Session for reason #7: To comply with, or act under the authority of, any general or special law or federal grant-in-aid requirements (copy from agenda) Dallmus seconded.

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

After a brief discussion of the Executive Session draft minutes from January 31, 2023, minor changes/corrections were made.

Foster made a motion to approve the amended Executive Session January 31, 2023 minutes. Dallmus seconded.

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

Return to Open Session

Public Comment – none.

Review minutes

Dallmus made a motion to accept the April 4 Minutes as amended. Quackenbush seconded. Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Houle-aye, Jaques-aye, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye, Quackenbush- aye

Foster made a motion to accept the April 11 minutes as amended. Houle seconded. Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Houle-aye, Jaques-aye, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye, Quackenbush- aye

Dallmus made a motion to approve the March 15 LBC Design Subcommittee minutes. Quackenbush seconded

Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Quackenbush-aye.

Dallmus made a motion to approve the March 29 LBC Design Subcommittee minutes. Quackenbush seconded

Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Quackenbush-aye.

Discussion about Public Forum, schematic design options

Carolyn Platt noted that the public forum ran well.

Puleo reminded the group of the public comment policy; public comments are confined to the beginning of each meeting.

Overview of Norwell and Webster Libraries Puleo and Jaques visited the Norwell Library with Stara; Jaques & Puleo each visited the Webster Library separately. Puleo presented a slide overview of the two OEA-designed libraries.

Norwell Library, completed in 2021

- Isolated location makes it feel like you are in the middle of nowhere
- 21,000 sf, one-story U-shaped building, 11,000 population in Norwell
- Slate siding on the exterior facing the wetlands; stained cedar siding on other facades
- 100+ meeting room, with wood floors, adjacent kitchen, high ceilings with soundproofing
- Maker's space, children's story/craft room has resilient floor
- Staff area sufficient for 8, break room, director, asst director office
- Adult room high ceilings, long narrow room. Concerns about sound bleed into adult room
 were noted by staff. Built in desks at window height with shelving in between windows
- 2 porches, one screened both have outdoor seating

Gladys E. Kelly Library in Webster completed in 2018

- In town center, bordering town green. Two story building, with lobby open to 2nd floor
- 20,000 sf library 17,000 population in Webster
- Meeting room 100+ people, pantry with kitchen area
- Tall windows with pattern and shade panels are for solar control
- Lobby open to second floor
- Children: room/not enough room for library of things
- Has both TWEENS and TEEN areas (door to Teen Room is locked due to problems)
- Separate periodical room Stara doesn't recommend a separate periodical room

Webster staff noted that they don't use lobby space; the assistant librarian would have preferred more usable upstairs space.

Stara: The decision to not use meeting room after hours is an organizational culture decision in Webster Library. Didn't inject enough flexibility into design. Lobby is a very large space; Oudens: This was intended to be overflow space from program room. Lobby and program room can be closed off from rest of building.

Webster had a staff of 3 with same size building as Norwell – they needed it to be open for good sight lines.

Locked teen room: Antonellis commented that different libraries have different philosophies about working with teens. Some lock space and are punitive while others work with teens. Stara noted that while this wasn't done in Webster, MBLC wants teens room away from children's room.

Library Building Committee decision regarding which schematic to move forward

Puleo asked: What should we do about comments that have arrived after the public forum? Oudens doesn't want to address them individually – doesn't represent sufficient number of residents.

A number of comments related to the flat roof. Oudens: From practical standpoint – there are no structural concerns. He added that he wants snow to stay on the roof rather than fall off. The aesthetics of a flat roof are a different issue.

Foster: reminded us of the tension in the triangle of cost, aesthetic, and functionality (net zero) Jaques: Compared the three OEA libraries that she has visited. West Tisbury is inviting, warm and has a great "sense of place". Norwell is a dramatic, "cool" feeling space. Webster is unattractive and "cold" with lots of non-usable.space. She hopes we do not end up with an unattractive, uninviting library with lots of wasted space.

Quackenbush commented that there are lots of opportunities to "warm" the building as design continues. Antonellis is primarily concerned that the building will be structurally sound. Oudens: We have a long way to go with design, including the balance of glazing vs. solid wall and materials choices. He noted that we are now at a good place with the building size. Houle: We need to start with determining if we can afford the basic rectangle

Oudens: Since the last meeting OEA has focused on revisions to Option 2 in an effort to stay on schedule.

Houle made a motion to support the Option 2 schematic design. Quackenbush seconded. Roll call vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Houle-aye, Jaques-abstain, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye, Quackenbush- aye

Hoyt commented that he was impressed with depth of questions at forum. It's apparent that we have been working on this for years.

Further discussion regarding goals for schematic design

Oudens began a presentation of revisions and updates to the building since our last meeting. The square footage has been tightened. The space between the two bathrooms in the lobby has been removed.

Quackenbush: Why is covered outdoor area off meeting room?

Antonellis: So that programs can be flow from inside program room to the outside space. Antonellis also noted that the meeting room is small and lobby is large; she recommends taking space from lobby and adding to meeting room.

Dallmus would like to see more natural light in the meeting room. Currently it's windows face onto the covered outdoor space. Jaques asked about rotating the space 90 degrees windows to face west rather than south (and into the covered space).

Stara asked for full dimensions of the building. Oudens: The building is 170 feet long, 45 feet wide. The 5427 sf came from last spring's cost estimate, he pointed out again that this is not a realistic number. The grossing factor is skewed because of small size of library – 6000 sf is more realistic.

Wit gave a landscape and civil engineering update.

Mechanical systems: Air-handling units and sprinkler units will be located in the structural system above girders, out of most obvious view.

Dropped ceiling over bathrooms and circulation/office area will house air handling units. There will be high ceilings in other spaces.

Since a backup generator is required for the fire sprinkler system and since the desire is for the library building to be able to function as a community warming or cooling space in case of a community wide power failure, a permanent propane generator is required rather than a roll up generator (which would be rented)

A 20,000 gal. water storage system is required. As the site does not have town water. Solar consultant presented 3 options 1) flush mount (more labor intensive, more mechanical attachment) 2) ballasted (reduced mechanical attachment, reduced servicing) and 3) dual tilt (reduced mechanical attachment, balanced production). Similar cost for all three options. Quackenbush asked: When will energy model be done? Oudens: By end of schematic phase.

The schematic design will be submitted to the estimator on April 28. We should have the estimate by mid-May. Our OPM team will review the cost estimate.

Quackenbush asked: What will be included in the pricing set? OEA: Site plan, mechanical plan, narrative from solar consultant.

Stara: Will you be working with Hoyt and Joyce? It would be helpful to have them divide costs into eligible and ineligible costs. MBLC needs to see final schematic package before submission.

A Design Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for April 26 at noon. Oudens will meet with Antonellis before that. As we don't need another meeting until we have the cost estimate, we will cancel the May 2 meeting. Our next meeting is May 23.

Lot O-32 No new information

Committee liaison updates None

Unanticipated business Additional survey work is required by OEA (topography, trees of a certain diameter). We agreed to go with Eisner, at a \$2000 savings over the other quote. Work must be completed in 2-4 weeks.

Foster moved to adjourn at 9:17 pm. Moss seconded.

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