

Library Trustee's Meeting
August 13, 2021, 4:00 pm via Zoom

In Attendance: Jacquelin Apsler (Chair); Dennis Picker; Barbara Myles, Director; Lisa Rothenberg, Assistant Director; Teresa Horwitz, Bookkeeper/Administrative Assistant, and Peter Sugar

Absent: Lucy Maulsby, Ron Chester

1. FY2023 Parapet Repairs Project:

The bid we received for the parapet repairs project was more than our budget. As a result, we need to go back to the Community Preservation Committee and ask for additional funding. Peter sent a revised budget to the trustees prior to the meeting and explained how he determined that we need to ask for an additional \$205,000 for this project.

- a. The bid we received was for \$451,000. However, the general contractor did not include the costs for removing the netting that is now covering the disks and securing the scaffolding when construction staff are not at work. After Michael Louis, our Simpson Gumpertz & Heger project engineer, reviewed the bid, he suggested changing the flashing termination detail to reduce the cost of the project. Peter agreed with Michael's suggestion. Changing the flashing termination detail and adding the costs for removing the netting and securing the scaffolding reduce the base project cost from \$451,000 to \$443,500.
- b. The bid included an add alternate of \$21,400 to cover the possible costs if the steel tubes that are holding the parapet disks up need to be replaced. We won't know if the steel tubes need to be replaced until the masonry is opened and the steel tubes are inspected to see if they are bent and/or damaged. It was agreed to add \$21,400 to the project budget for FY2023. Making a new possible budget of \$464,900.
- c. Peter consulted with Michael Louis and a cost estimator as to what a new bid would look like for next year. Estimator said that the cost for materials should increase but not too much as things are settling down. However, even though it should only be a 5% increase in the material cost he suggested that we include an increase of 10% for the construction costs. Ten percent cost escalation is \$46,490 bringing the project cost to \$511,390.
- d. SGH made a new proposal for their fees and oversight. The original proposal was for \$66,000, with 6 site visits. However, after some negotiation they said that they could do the project with 4 site visits which is the minimum and that brings the costs down to \$60,000. Now the new total cost of the project is \$571,390.
- e. The estimator also suggested adding a 5% construction contingency in case something unexpected is found during construction. Five percent construction contingency is \$28,570, which brings the total cost of the project to \$599,960.
- f. The CPC awarded the library \$355,000 for this project and Graham Gund donated \$40,000 toward this project for a total of \$395,000 appropriated for this project. After going through the bidding process, we now believe the project cost is \$599,960. We need \$204,960 to bring appropriated funding to \$599,960.
- g. Jacquelin had questions that were answered by Peter. (1) Is SGH's proposal in writing? Yes, SGH has written the proposal already.

(2) Who will oversee the punch list? SGH will oversee everything including the punch list.

- h.** Dennis had questions that were answered by Peter. (1) How does the current SGH costs of \$60,000 compare to the previous proposal? Only asking because the previous cost was \$30,000 and am concerned that CPC will question the large difference in the price. Peter explained that this overall bid is in fact less then the previous one because with the last proposal, one of the fees (the design fee) was separated out. This current proposal includes everything: the project manager, redoing all the documents, the oversite, and the rebid process. They could send the detailed description to CPC, but it is very technical, and they may not understand all of it. Peter will break out the components in a summery for CPC so that they will better understand all the details and the change in the price.

2. The \$60,000 proposal was made in FY22; have they agreed to keep the price the same for FY23? Yes, this will be the price.

3. Would it be in our best interest to have two separate warrant articles for the \$60,000 SGH fees and the rest of the project, so that bidders would see that this \$60,000 is not available to be spent on their portion of the project when they review publicly available information prior to bidding? No, this may make things more complicated in the end, as we have never separated amounts in previous projects when they will take place during the same fiscal year.
- i.** Peter asked the Trustees to concentrate on the 10% cost escalation and 5% construction contingencies. Do we need both contingencies? The estimator already suggested an increase of 10% to the cost of construction, when he thought it would most likely be 5% so there is already an additional 5% built into the numbers, and therefore that could be counted as the full contingency amount. Jacquelin made the point that with everything so vague now with the potential costs we should keep the higher number and if CPC wants us to cut something that 5% would be where cuts can be made. But in the end the revised budget will include an additional \$205,000.
- j.** Barbara suggested that with the flashing changing to copper panels, which could make the exterior of the library look different, should we make the Historic District Commission aware of the change? Peter mentioned that he had walked the outside of the building and the copper panels wouldn't be visible from the ground. Therefore, we can show the HDC the change but let them know that it will not be visible. Barbara will see about getting on the agenda for the HDC.
- k.** Peter said that he spoke with Eric Zimmerman, Chair of the CPC. There is a possibility that there could be a special town meeting in November to vote on various projects. We should note that the trustees are in favor of a special town meeting, and we will pursue it if it is to happen.

Vote on budget request. Peter motioned to go to CPC and ask for the additional budgeted amount of \$205,000. Dennis seconded. There was a roll call vote:

Yes: 3 No: 0

The vote was approved unanimously.

2. **Approve Meeting Minutes for July 27, 2021:** Dennis moved to approve the meeting minutes as amended, Peter seconded. There was a roll call vote:
Yes: 3 No: 0
 The minutes were approved as amended unanimously.

3. **Adjournment:** Peter motioned to adjourn the meeting at 4:29 pm, Dennis seconded. There was a roll call vote:
Yes: 3 No: 0
 The vote was unanimous, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:29 pm.
The trustees will then reconvene for Executive Session to discuss the Self-Perpetuating Trustee Recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Horwitz

Library Trustees Executive Session

August 13, 2021 Convened at 4:30 PM via Zoom

Recorder: Jacquelin Apsler

Present:

- Self-perpetuating Trustees: Ron Chester, Peter Sugar
- Appointed Trustees: Jacquelin Apsler, Lucy Maulsby
- Elected Trustee: Dennis Picker

1. Discussion of the self-perpetuating trustees' recommendation for the open trustee position
2. Motion to approve the recommendation by Peter Sugar and seconded by Ron Chester
3. Approval of the recommendation by roll call vote was unanimous – **Yes: 5 No: 0**
4. Adjournment: The Executive Session was adjourned at 4:52 PM by a unanimous roll call vote