

Library Building Committee Present: Mary Anne Antonellis, Stephen Dallmus, Brad Foster, Dale Houle, Penny Jaques, Molly Moss, Elaine Puleo, Jeff Quackenbush
Andrea Bono-Bunker (MBLC), Roger Hoyt & Neil Joyce (CMS-OPM), Dominik Wit (OEA)
Public: Jill Marland, Amanda Alix

Meeting opened at 5:02 p.m.

Public Comment: None

Review of October 25 Library Building Committee Minutes

Antonellis moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Dallmus seconded.

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

Update on site plan for leach field

The last perc at in the NE corner of Lot O-32 revealed a high-water table which would require 6' high mound and would be located near entry road. This would impact the entrance to the library and stormwater design. A new location just S of the building footprint has been proposed. A perc at this location will be conducted at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, Nov 16. This would also be a raised mound system but will be less visible. This will slow down the project by 30 days. Another 30-60 days were lost during schematic due to the need redesign since the original cost estimate came in high. With the new timeline, bids will now come in May. Concern about the delays was expressed by several LBC members.

Joyce noted that the lost time is money.

Puleo asked Joyce: is there anything we can do to speed things up?

Joyce: This is a question for the architect. He noted that 4.5 months are allotted for creation of construction documents seems lengthy for a simple building such as ours– there should be some opportunity to shorten the length of time.

Houle: If this estimate comes in high, we will need more time.

Wit joins the meeting 5:25pm

In answer to whether the 4.5 months period could be shortened, he noted that schedule presented is as conservative as possible. He will talk to Oudens about how to tighten up schedule.

Joyce: Noted that it is preferable to get bid is spring rather than the summer.

Bono-Bunker: Does 4.5-month period include time for value-engineering?

Wit: No

Septic design

Wit described reasons for moving leach field: storm water handling, drainage, and impact on presence of library.

Jaques; Why does the Limit of Work bump out so far to the west in the SW corner of building in the new plan? Wit: It accommodates the reading garden.

Jaques: According to the ANRAD, the isolated wetland south of the parking lot was determined to be non-jurisdictional. It should be removed from the mapped wetlands on the site.

Antonellis: A perc was done in the new area in 2010. She thinks the raised system in this location will create a natural amphitheater.

Quackenbush: How can we get back on schedule? If the septic system is going to be the same size, can't we get a price now?

Wit: No. The stormwater design requires amount of grading which is dependent upon location of septic and all of this influences the cost estimate.

Wit noted that the cost estimate is close to being done for building portion of the project. He suggested separating the building part from site part of estimate. Stimson wants to capture the best landscape plan possible in DD estimate, so they will wait for pricing. Implementation of the landscaping will be phased as a cost savings measure.

Foster: In the earlier site plan, the septic design was near Leverett Rd., now it's in the back. Do other things change with the new location in leach field?

Wit: The drive remains the same. The proposed new septic location is the least impactful location for stormwater and site work.

Bono-Bunker: Is the reduced scope relevant only to site plan, not building? Wit: Correct

Review of new design drawings

Antonellis will send cost estimate documents to the building committee when this meeting ends. Wit wants to do page turn when we get full estimate for both building and sitework.

Update on well design and engineering

Wit: There is no new information from Fuss and O'Neil on the well. OEA will pay half of engineering/permitting cost after the MBLC reduction. OEA suggests that contract & permitting (\$21K) stay with F&O. With this information we can create contract for the well design.

Antonellis suggests that we wait for perc info before designing well.

Review next steps in the process

Pricing: We should receive the DD cost estimate for building soon.

Next step is perc test, then stormwater design, septic design and stormwater. Wit hopes much can be done simultaneously. Stimson should be able to complete documents late Nov/early Dec. Estimator will need another week after receiving these documents.

NOI: Once the site plan is complete and the Limit of Work is known, the Limit of Work will be staked then we will evaluate trees that need to be removed. Puleo and Jaques will count trees.

Foster: There are lots of moving parts and it's hard to forecast timing. Puleo suggested do the page turn at our next meeting: December 5 at 7 p.m. Meeting on the Nov 21 is canceled.

Review of Geotech report

We received questions from Marland and Alix about the site investigations:

- *Was the actual testing request from the LBC to Tighe & Bond (OTO) sufficiently inclusive/adequate/normative?*

Joyce: Yes.

Antonellis: Request was informed by civil and structural engineer. OTO proposal was approved by them.

- *Is Contaminant Testing requiring prior to construction? Is it required to secure insurance?*
Antonellis: Three licensed site professions have done extensive testing on the site - the only toxic substance found was near radio tower. This is outside the scope of this project and is being addressed. When the well is installed it will be tested for everything that is required for a public well.

Joyce: We defer to town's underwriter. The site has been investigated previously, those tests have met the necessary requirements.

- *What were the financially significant findings of the geo tech testing that adds to the cost estimate of the library build?*

Wit: No.

Joyce: It is common to require geotechnical testing which is used by the engineer to design the building foundation.

- *Groundwater issues. The 2010 OTO report noted that groundwater would not impact the proposed building at the slab elevation (at the time) of 1170.25 feet. The new report states that wet soils were encountered at an elevation of 1177 feet and OTO suggests a perimeter drainage system for the new building to control ground and surface water infiltration. Will this be included in the bid request?*

Wit: potential for water seeping through

Wit: Perimeter drainage is being worked through with structural engineering.

Joyce suggested contingencies for the owner and the contractor.

- *Due to the change in siting, OTO notes there may be buried abandoned utilities associated with the former garage building on the site. Is there any estimate available for costs associated with encountering this or any other buried fill during construction?*

Wit: There are contingencies and noted that we are not digging on the top of garage site.

Joyce; it is hard to quantify an unknown on public document suggested contingencies for owner and contractor

- *Can you explain the significance of the Pavement Design Section change from the 2010 suggested Gravel Base Course of 4 in. + Sand and Gravel Subbase of 6 inches to the current suggested Gravel Base Course of 12 in.?*

Wit: Would have to review details

- *Will the town retain OTO during the final design and construction phases, as suggested in their 2023 report?*

Wit: Will have to get back to you.

Joyce: That is a town question not an OEA question.

Antonellis: Will review that portion of report again and talk with LSP to see if this is warranted. This would be a question for the LBC.

Joyce: It is common for Geotech engineer to establish that foundation is set on appropriate bearing material. For building of this size, could be done in a day. Would meet requirements of report – would not be a significant cost and would be money well spent

Schedule Next meeting will be December 5

Dallmus moved to adjourn. Quackenbush seconded.

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

Meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.