

Library Building Committee Present: Mary Anne Antonellis, Stephen Dallmus, Brad Foster, Dale Houle, Penny Jaques, Molly Moss, Elaine Puleo, Jeff Quackenbush
Roger Hoyt & Neil Joyce (CMS-OPM), Dominik Wit (OEA)
Public: Amanda Alix, Rebecca Fill, April Stein

Hybrid Meeting opened at 7:03 p.m.

Public Comment

Alix asked again why the amount of gravel specified in the OTO Geotech report changed between 2010 to 2023.

Where does Value Engineering fit into the schedule? Who is responsible? Wit: if required it is rolled into the Construction Design phase.

Review of Minutes from December 19 Library Building Committee Meeting

Postpone until next meeting.

Review Cost Estimate

Wit: screen shared the Cost Estimate which provided to the group today.

Quackenbush: Asked have you put this back into the Total Project Cost form?

Joyce: We are at \$8.4 million (\$6 million for construction). We are up by \$200-300 thousand His best guess if a \$8.8 and 8.9 million total project cost which is \$400K-\$500K over budget.

He notes that costs not accounted for in Wit's estimate are \$100K for well drilling/testing, plus additional design costs, additional perc tests and soft costs.

Antonellis: Asked for clarification. In email you used the term "Delta to budget". Wit explained delta = change, thus there is a \$285K increase between Schematic Design estimate and Design/Development estimate.

Quackenbush asked Joyce: There is a reduction in design contingency. Is this reasonable?

Joyce replied that reduction expected at this point as more design has been done thus a better estimate can be made. There is also a reduction in escalation as the time frame to construction is now shorter. Bottom line: Cost of construction is outpacing escalation at this time. We want to go to bid as soon as possible

Quackenbush: is furring considered rough carpentry or finish? Witt: Rough

Joyce: Is slate more cost effective than Hardie Board. Wit: Yes, and it is also more durable.

Interior architectural woodwork went up to \$45,238. The Library of Things is partially responsible for this. Wit suggests some reductions here.

Roofing and flashing went up \$21K.

Insulation went up \$13.K

Finishes:

Gypsum increased \$5K. Level 5 finish was spec'd. Quackenbush: We do not need Level 5.

Antonellis: Does this include acoustic panel? Wit: Yes

Tile increased. \$22K; this zeroes out if switched to resilient flooring.

Signage: Doubled in cost, increased by \$5.8K. Building Committee request a reduction here.

Plumbing: Decreased.

HVAC: Increased \$75K. Wit will double check this to better understand why the large increase.

Electrical: Increased \$120K due to light fixtures. The Light Consultant confirmed that we can reduce number of lights on drive.

The estimate includes solar panels

The Building Committee requested a breakdown of the electrical expenses.

Photo Voltaic cost is \$144K - this has decreased \$20K. The building will be Net Zero

Bi-directional antennas are not listed. These are needed for safety communications.

Site work: Minor savings were seen in earthwork and site preparation; this has been balanced by pavement & curbing. Currently granite curbing is included, we value engineer this expense. Wit hopes to redesign east edge of parking (by removing one parking space) so as to omit the retaining wall.

Site improvement increased by \$60K. Wit thinks these can be reduced.

Utilities: \$182.6K increase. This currently includes underground utilities. Above ground utilities would require at least 5 poles. In the end we may save half of this by switching to above ground electrical. Wit will investigate several of the utility costs (fire gate valve, etc.)

Design/Development Value Engineering (VE) List

Value engineering is a systematic approach to providing necessary functions in a project at the lowest cost. OEA presented the following VE options for the Library Building Committee to consider.

- Overhead electrical pole ad alt: \$73K (the savings will be less than this as it will be balanced by the cost of installing multiple electrical poles)
 - Remove one parking stall and paving to allow the drive to shift such that retaining wall can be deleted from project: \$117K savings
 - Replace most of granite with Cape Cod berm curb: \$34K savings
 - Landscape: includes a \$117K expense for trees, which are specified in the NOI. This is not the in the VE reduced price. Jaques noted that tree planting can be phased in over the 3 years of the Order of Conditions.
 - Wood slat bench at entry porch: \$10K cost
 - Vestibule finish is now spec'd as maple, swap to drywall : \$5K
 - Level 5 drywall finish: \$15K
 - Delete 5 light poles: \$18K
 - Not burying refrigerant piping: \$18K
- Revised total with VE options \$6,316,000**

Quackenbush: Made a motion to accept the Value Engineering strategies as presented, with the understanding that we don't have a number for the electrical poles and that the tree expense is not part of this. Dallmus seconded

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

Building construction was estimated at \$6.2 million in August 2023 and is now \$6.3 million.

Quackenbush: Asked about the Total Project Cost (TPC)

Quackenbush: Asked about the eave detail, noting that it is architecturally interesting but likely a costly detail. Can we instead have a standing seam roof edge rather than a flat edge?

Wit: Believes this would not save \$\$.

During a discussion of asphalt vs metal roof, Wit stated that metal provides a better attachment for PV, is longer lasting, easier maintenance, and better aesthetic.

Quackenbush: Suggesting toning down the entry and expressed concern about added cost for the upslope roof.

Houle: Commented that on the insulation detail, more complicated, more expensive

Puleo: Asked why do we have upturned roof?

Wit: The upturned roof is a means controlling snow at the entrance.

Houle: Noted that his concern is not aesthetic but about introducing a membrane roof. He is worried most about ice and snow build up. Wit: the roof contractor assumes responsibility for the membrane.

Antonellis: Asked if this a more expensive option?

Quackenbush asked Joyce: Doesn't the architect owe us a building that meets our stated budget? He suggested that the architect needs to come up with more VE savings. Joyce: Yes.

Antonellis: Would an all-slate building without accent wood save \$\$? Joyce: No, they are similar in cost.

Quackenbush: Commented that he is trying to find big items for savings.

Antonellis: How much is the pink noise system?

Puleo to Joyce: Do you see any significant places for cost changes?

Joyce: As the estimate was provided only hours before tonight's meeting, he has not gone through cost estimate carefully but does not see a silver bullet.

Acoustic drywall: perforated gypsum is premium, but needs to be replaced

Antonellis: Recommended going through the budget to look at eligible vs. non-eligible costs.

Joyce: Suggested that finding cost reductions will be 'death by paper cuts'. He committed to a thorough review of the cost estimate before next week's meeting, noting that we are looking to shave \$0.5 million. Joyce reminded Wit that breaking out the well design/testing (\$100K), the extra round of test pits (\$9K) and the Schematic Design redesign (\$68K) total \$250K in additional costs. And while these are not part of the cost presented by the architect in the estimate, they are still costs that the Town must pay.

Discuss pre-qualification of contractors/process/pricing

This is a means of pre-vetting contractors and subcontractors on public projects in MA. RFQ process. Only contractors who go through the pre-qualification process and meet requirements can submit a bid for project. The process is required for projects over \$10 million. The review is based on 3 categories: management, references, capacity to perform.

Joyce expects 10-15 RFQs from contractors who might be interested. Each takes time to review; he estimates it will cost \$15K. He suggests pre-vetting only contractors, not subcontractors.

The LBC asks 'What is the benefit?'

Houle: Strongly in favor, as only pre-vetted contractors can submit bids.

Quackenbush: This is not a complicated project. He is worried about getting crummy contractors.

Pre-qualification will limit the contractor pool. If we don't pre-qualify we must accept the 3 lowest bidders.

An advantage would be to get the word out to contractors sooner, as we are behind in the process of seeking bids for the construction of the library.

Joyce This is not complex building, we could ask for 'experience with a public library or similar-use public building'.

Joyce explained the timeline: Process takes 6-8 weeks. We want to advertise the RFQ in central register by February 1. RFQs would be due by the 3rd week in February.

We agreed to decide on this at our next meeting.

Fuss and O'Neil task amendment for additional perc testing

We have received an invoice of \$9K for additional perc testing. The Building Committee agreed that it is bad business to charge for an expense without prior approval. Jaques would have voted against this as, in addition to the extra expense, it meant losing a month of time.

Antonellis move to pay the \$9K invoice Puleo seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Moss-aye, Puleo-aye, Jaques-abstain, Puleo-aye, Quackenbush-aye

Other liaison reports

Fuss & O'Neil submitted the Notice for the library building construction to the Conservation Commission today. The Public Hearing will open at 7:00 p.m. on January 11, 2024.

Jaques made a motion to adjourn. Dallmus seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Antonellis-aye, Dallmus-aye, Puleo-aye, Jaques-aye, Puleo-aye, Quackenbush-aye

Meeting adjourned 9:45 pm

Next meeting: Thursday, January 4 at 7.am. This will be a hybrid meeting