

Construction Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/4/11, 3:30PM, Meeting #5

Attended:

Kathrine Soscia (KS), Suzanne Johnson (SJ), Jennifer Bollerman (JB), Kim Giery (KG), Tracee Ugenti (TU), Vincent Rodgers (VR), Jan Miller (JM), Nicole Turzillo (NT), Gail Barraco(GB), Dave Clemens (DC), Lauren O'Connell (LD), Robert Grimm (RG), Victor Canseco (VC), Bob Viola (BV), Sandpebble (SBI), Construction Committee (CC).

SJ: Recap status of programming data from Cohen Associates. Some staff commented that the programming needs are not what they expected based on interviews with Alex Cohen. Some confusion of terms and basis of information delivered. Shelving linear footage was mentioned by KG and VR as either misunderstood or inaccurate. SJ has scheduled a phone call w/ Alex Cohen for 8/5 to come to better understanding by both parties.

SJ: Asked how accurate the programming has to be in order to arrive at an overall square footage number. VC answered to try to be within 5% and space can be reallocated if necessary.

SJ: Voiced doubt in the sq. ft. numbers, as shown in program needs analysis.

KS: Sq. ft. numbers are too low. Questioned whether it may be better to tear down the existing building rather than renovate.

SJ: Continued on to comment that LPL needs more than 10,000 sq. ft.

KG: Said that she thinks AC miscounted existing shelving but this method of counting requires explanation.

VC: Suggests getting Cohen Associates to LPL to better explain in person, either Aaron or Alex.

JB: Stated that the accompanying narrative was very poorly written. She felt that the overall square footage for the 10 year plan was ok for adults. JB further states that she does not see why additional space for 25 year plan is so high.

TU: Dissatisfied that the program did not include a nice office for head of circulation. While TU said she understands the move toward self check, she still feels the ILL area needs to be larger.

VR: None of the friends needs were addressed in the program needs analysis.

KG: States she has difficulty visualizing space as stated in sq. ft. DC offers to bring in the Brentwood Library renovation plan so she can have a better understanding of space.

BV: Offered to describe sq. ft. area in the parking lot on a Sunday when the Library is closed to help facilitate area visualization.

RG: Joins the meeting.

BV: reviews the meeting minutes from the 7/20 CC meeting, without comment from CC/Board.

RG: Surprised that in the various construction scenarios submitted to the Board earlier in the day require a shutdown of the building. Stated later that he did not associate all necessary items.

VC: Explains the Design Charrette (for A/E team) process and that the basis of scenarios was the list of articulated goals from the Goal Setting Charrette. While reviewing the schedule per scenario with CC the potential for moving out of the current building may be necessary.

GB: Points out that "jack hammers and libraries don't go together"

RG: Points out the Board is responsible to the community.

GB: Points out that LPL is not doing what Mastic did, it's one thing to say what the community wants vs. what they will pay for.

DC: 1st item: is more space - not renovated. 2nd item: Suffolk County Libraries have done renovation/new construction while phasing.

BV: Adds that the building may close but not the library and that SBI understands and supports the value added to the community by LPL.

VC: Responds that as per the goal list in able to achieve LEED Certification, flexible spaces and ample day lighting, phasing would carry a much higher price tag. VC further points out that SBI works for LPL and will proceed based on Board decision but for the draft conceptual budget and schedule, the premise was the list of goals. SBI can refigure the budget numbers based on a completed schematic design for additional scenarios.

RG: Minimize community engagement in Design Charrettes going forward; it's the Boards job to guide on behalf of the community. The design team will be responsible to the Board if every community member has a different idea; we'll never get a final design.

RG: Board wants to hear more input from staff about program needs analysis.

VC: States that you can't restrict input. Continued discussion about possible temporary locations and phasing. All agreed that library scenarios will remain intact.

VC: Said SBI could and would figure a budget and schedule that reflects what the Board chooses to do.

JP: Tries to get a handle on how long library would have to close and that short durations may not be so bad.

DC: States that LPL is the only library to move itself 25 years ago, with staff and help from School District personnel.

BV: Comments that investment is not limited to finances, inconvenience, and a temporary facility is an investment as well.

KG: May not be so bad to relocate for construction.

VC: You control the A/E team because their compensation is based on overall sq. ft. not cost.

GB: We don't know what we don't know.

VC: A move for 5 months costs the same as for 2 years.

JP: All touchstone goals are revolutionary and asked which scenarios require move out. All of them to be consistent with goals, all systems are related. In order to be responsible to the goals & design charrette closing the building becomes necessary. "Stay within budget", is high on the goals list.

Next Steps

Board to decide:

- Greater understanding of program data from CA
- Staff engagement in a localized Charrette
- Determine overall sq. ft needs
- Choose a Design Team
- Review what the community would support

The next CC meeting will be: 8/17 at 4:00 PM. Room TBD.

This represents a recap of the meeting to the best of my understanding. Please make your comments by 8/12 or the information will become a matter of record.