

Building and Grounds Committee Minutes 3-29-16

Present: Starr LaTronica, Chip Greenberg, Prudence MacKinney, Lindsay Bellville, Pam Becker, Christine De Vallet, Jeanne Walsh, Robert Stack, Leslie Markey. Absent: Jane Southworth

Agenda changes: Starr added discussion about staff comments on current drawings and needs

Minutes of 3/16/16 accepted as read

Old Business:

Discussion of proposal from Steve Horton to act as project manager

Members of the Asset Development Committee shared information about that committee's recent discussion with proposed Project Manager Steve Horton. There was a question about whether it was also necessary to have a Construction Manager or whether that produced too many layers of management. Overall, there's concern about making sure money is managed wisely for this project. For example, scheduling might affect cost, e.g., subcontractors might be more expensive in summer. Committee members shared that Steve seemed knowledgeable and had helpful replies to this question and others, inspiring confidence. Steve said he would talk to Starr about which parts he would need to be involved with and which he would not.

As remembered by Asset Development Committee members, Steve proposed that he might do the work of finding and hiring subcontractors himself. This led to discussion by B&G Committee of the titles and responsibilities of professionals involved in this kind of work. Chip said the Project Manager, sometimes called OPM (Owner's Project Manager), is the owner's representative, directly responsible to the owner. That person is different from a Construction Manager, who is the builder/ contractor. Perhaps Steve was proposing to simplify by eliminating the Construction Manager layer and filling that role himself. Chip thought that this job is right on the edge of being so small that we wouldn't need a CM, but it might be helpful if it's to be carried out in installments over time, which seemed to be the original plan.

Some conversation resulted from this info: Do we have to drag this out? Can't we just do this quickly? Steve seemed ready to make that happen, but the question arises: what time of year? When do we start? Chip doesn't agree that there's an optimum time to start. It's an indoor job; we're not digging a foundation. It will be the right job for somebody who wants a job of this particular length (roughly three months). Staff members on the committee were concerned about timing and disruption of services; for example, the free lunch program is already scheduled for the meeting room throughout the summer. Also, we have to be able to carry out basic library work without too much inconvenience to the patrons.

Discussion with Chip Greenberg about design issues and services

Chip responded to a question about how things would be resolved if staff members want changes in the existing drawings. He said that typically, there's a schematic design phase, followed by design

development. We haven't completed schematic design if we don't know where a specific room is going, but if we agree that, say, we'll have a bathroom on the first floor but have questions about the details, that's a question for design development. We need to solve schematic design before we can do forward. Chip can help us reach consensus as a staff. Further on in the process, approval wouldn't go back to the whole staff; it would go back to the committee or whoever the authority is. The committee affirmed that Starr is the ultimate authority.

Chip clarified items in his contract proposal and how he might coordinate his role with Steve's, e.g., maybe Steve should have responsibility for advocating for us in disagreements rather than that role falling to the architect. They would "sit down together at the beginning and figure out who does what."

Chip answered questions about the fee structure in the contract, saying that it's likely that at some point in the process, we would shift from a percentage fee to a fixed fee. Sometimes that's required in municipal projects. Chip would identify when a request for services is outside the initial scope of the project, and we would negotiate about those additional fees. He would not charge for incidentals like driving and copies made in the course of design work (unless we wanted many additional drawings).

The Committee agreed that we would expect to give Steve and Chip some budget leeway so we don't have to meet about every decision, but we would have oversight, and we would go back to the board about any big changes.

New Business:

Next steps

The Committee will recommend to the Board of Trustees that we hire Chip and Steve for this project. We asked Chip to meet with Steve soon, before the Board meeting, to discuss how they would work together and to refine their proposals. Even if all the details aren't completely worked out, we can still request Board approval while the proposals are being refined.

Staff comments on current drawings and needs

Starr shared notes from staff about the plans and drawings. We talked about a few key items, including options for a children's bathroom and creation of a second tier in the glass room on the first floor. Chip proposed a process for resolving these questions. Some of it should probably include everybody, others probably smaller groups. Starr could coordinate staff groups.

This discussion also led to consideration of the purview of the B&G Committee. Why discuss questions in such detail here if whole board discusses them again? Answer: it's useful to have a committee to make informed recommendations. The whole board tends to trust the recommendations of its committees.

Meeting adjourned at 6:50. Next meeting: Tuesday, April 19th, 4:00