



Jones Library Equity, Justice, and Inclusion Subcommittee

Thursday, January 19, 2023

YouTube Meeting recording of this Zoom:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J1MbQUHzPU>

4:30 PM Minutes

Present: Austin Sarat (Chair), Paul Bockelman, Christine Gray-Mullen, George Hicks-Richards, Alex Lefebvre, Anika Lopes, Sean Mangano, Sharon Sharry

Others: Ellen Anselone (FAA), Craig DiCarlo (OPM), Will Fernandez (Colliers), Josephine Penta (FAA), Ginny Hamilton, Walter Lloyd, Farah Ameen, Sarah Draper, Chris Riddle, Todd Holland

Absent: Alex “Zander” Lopez

Glossary of Acronyms: CLT = Cross-Laminated Timber, FAA = Finegold Alexander Architects, JLBC = Jones Library Building Committee, OPM = Owner’s Project Manager (Colliers), PV = photo voltaic, SD = Schematic Design, VE = Value Engineering

I. Call to Order – Roll Call to check audio and video feed.

Gray-Mullen called the JLBC Design Subcommittee meeting to order at 4:33 PM.

Sarat called the JLBC to order at 4:33 PM. Sound and video check for all panelists.

Sarat introduced all of the people from FAA and Colliers.

A quorum for the Jones Equity Subcommittee was identified. Farah Ameen (Chair) called the Equity Subcommittee to order. Attendance. Hamilton. Lloyd. Ameen. Sound and video check for all participants.

It was agreed that Sarat would Chair this meeting.

II. Minutes to approve

- A. Not included in packet and pushed to next JLBC meeting.
- B. Design subcommittee minutes from 08-30-2022.

Minute review and approval pushed to next meeting (for both sets of minutes).

III. Town Manager Update – None

IV. Finance Update – Mangano

Consultants have been hired via FAA. Proposals have been received. Proposals and budget review were completed at previous meetings.

Nothing to add from Collier's.

V. Collier's Project Leaders, Owner's Project Manager - OPM Update – DiCarlo shared screen

DiCarlo reviewed the project timeline and progress bar.

DiCarlo discussed the Value Engineering list (VE).

Di Carlo turned the screen presentation over to FAA representatives.

A. FAA Presentation – Anselone and Penta

Anselone encouraged people to ask questions as the presentation progressed.

Penta shared screen and reviewed the sustainability goals. Penta encouraged questions as she presented.

EUI goal was reviewed.

DiCarlo discussed how photovoltaic panels could be added to this project. Upfront costs via purchasing them during construction and maintenance costs over time.

Another way would be to make the building photovoltaic-ready and once the construction is complete the Jones Library could use a leasing company to install and maintain the system. Library benefits from the solar power but without the upfront costs.

Mangano noted that the Jones Library could still choose to own the system but it would happen after the building is completed.

Sharry asked about energy rebates and if those rebates could pay for the panels?

DiCarlo answered that the contract with Mass Saves is not binding. Money from this contract does not become available until the end of the project.

Committee members asked about the target number and how to reach it.

DiCarlo answered questions from the group.

Construction incentives were discussed by the group.

Sarat asked for clarification as to “why” this presentation was being made at today’s meeting.

Anselone and Penta replied that they were confirming the sustainability goals and wanted the group to vote to approve the goals as FAA and Collier’s move forward with the project.

Interior Finishes

Wood and Steel finishes Floor by Floor: Anselone mentioned it is a hybrid system based on the needs of the building.

Penta went on to discuss what “hybrid” means as it pertains to CLT use in the building.

Penta shared screen. Steel was coded blue and CLT was coded in red tone.

Penta discussed the use of steel and CLT by floor with overview diagrams.

Penta explained why each material is used on each floor.

Mangano asked for a rendering of what a combination of both materials would look like on the first floor.

Penta replied that she did have some images that would show the blending of steel and CLT.

Interplay between interior finishes, steel supports, and the need for lateral structural integrity were also part of the discussion.

Lateral structural integrity – means preparation for an earthquake.

Committee members asked questions about the layout schematic drawings.

Penta shared renderings of steel and CLT for the group from some websites.

Sarat asked about the evolution toward this hybrid design. Sarat thought there would be CLT everywhere.

Anselone responded that ideally it would all be CLT but there are code requirements for lateral loads. That leads to the need for hybrid design to meet seismic necessities/codes.

Anselone promised to follow-up with the structural engineers.

Penta shared more images from other library projects.

Todd Holland asked if there would be a spray applied fireproofing to the steel?

Anselone noted she would have to double check that.

Sara Draper asked what the impact of the hybrid version will have on the full embodied carbon footprint of the building?

Penta stated that they will not know until they run the report.

That report would be generated once the elements are in place in the model.

Anselone stated that making the entire structure all wood would impact the overall cost.

Draper asked about what else could impact the carbon footprint?

Anselone mentioned the energy choices and the finishes. Anselone asked for more time to think about a proper answer to Draper's question.

Penta reiterated that it would be proper to run the energy efficiency model once all of the design decisions had been made.

Anselone explained that the model was set as a hybrid system.

Chris Riddle was invited to speak. Riddle pointed to two buildings in town that were totally CLT – Kern Center at Hampshire and Hitchcock Center.

Riddle asked for an estimate for a completely CLT building.

Anselone noted that could be done but it may lead to additional costs.

Sarat asked, all timber with a cost-increase in what order of magnitude?

The design team did not have that answer at-hand.

Gray-Mullen asked about ceiling transitions and how that would happen and what it might look like?

Penta answered that in the existing building, there would not be CLT on the ceiling.

Anselone mentioned the historic nature of the existing building and use the existing plaster. If the ceilings could not be saved, there would be another gypsum ceiling put in place.

Anselone highlighted the need to save the historic fabric and take into consideration the noise considerations.

Sara Draper stated, again, part of the original decision making for the new building was to do something that was better than what already existed as the Jones Library. The carbon budget was central to the decision to expand the library. Draper, suggested that the reason for making this statement was to highlight the need to take into consideration the overall carbon footprint of the old and new structure.

Anselone mentioned that this presentation was informational. It points to where FAA is in the Jones Library design process. This informs the next steps.

Anselone asked if the rear wing could be all steel and metal and bring more wood into the front of the building?

DiCarlo spoke to the order of magnitude to the increase in cost of going to all CLT.

DiCarlo stated that in general, \$7 per square foot more expensive to do all mass timber instead of a compromise – combination of steel and CLT.

All steel frame and metal decking throughout the entire building would result in a \$450,000 savings over the current model.

Question asked what is the difference between the hybrid model used for the Whole Building Life Cycle analysis and what is being presented today?

What is the percentage difference in use of CLT versus steel?

Anselone stated that they would get that information for the group.

Value Engineering Items:

Three items: Extent of CLT usage in new building, saw-tooth roof, and the existing windows

Anselone mentioned that the roof has come up as a discussion decision point again because, currently, they have removed saw-tooth feature from the roof plans.

Anselone and Penta want to make sure that removal of the saw-tooth roof is what the JLBC members want for the final product.

Lefebvre mentioned the change from natural slate to synthetic slate and whether those savings would impact the roof design.

DiCarlo recapped the decision making around the roofing materials choices.

DiCarlo mentioned \$300,000 would be saved switching to synthetic slate.

Historical tax credits were discussed and the implications of using synthetics instead of natural substances as it pertains to the tax credits.

Long skylight is still part of the addition.

MBLC has been vocal about their displeasure with skylights.

A light monitor may be an eventual compromise.

PV panels could expand due to the expanse of flat roof without the saw-tooth roof.

DiCarlo recapped how all of the roofing materials decisions impact the overall costs.

Sarat commented that he remembered there being a solid decision to not move forward with a saw-toothed roof as part of the overall design.

Existing Windows in the Original Structure

Penta asked for more direction.

DiCarlo mentioned the current cost estimates include replacing the windows.

Sharon asked about possible savings of sticking with the existing windows.

DiCarlo made the announcement \$170,000.

DiCarlo also mentioned that sticking with the existing windows would made it difficult to meet the energy sustainability goals.

Refurbishing the existing windows would be cost prohibitive.

B. Interior Design Services Proposal – Stefura Proposal

Consultant to the design team. Proposal included in packet.

\$102,000 fee for the services.

Additional services request will be the next step.

Sarat asked about the proposed fees and how they ‘sequence-in’ with the overall project calendar for architectural design.

Sarat asked Bockelman and Mangano if they need an endorsement from the JLBC.

Mangano recommended the JLBC should wait to see the proposal before voting.

VI. Subcommittee Reports

A. Design – None

B. Public Outreach – 200+ responses to the bathroom design survey

Lefebvre reviewed the process and thanked the public for their input.

Hamilton noted that the garden level bathrooms would not be the central topic for today's meeting. Hamilton raised the topic of the bathrooms as design decisions were being made quickly.

Hamilton asked if the single-use bathrooms on every level were ADA accessible?

DiCarlo answered that he did not know off-hand.

Anselone answered that yes all of the other bathrooms are ADA accessible.

Sarat thanked Lefebvre and her group for their efforts.

VII. Correspondence – None.

VIII. Topics not anticipated 48 hours before the Meeting – None.

IX. Public Comment – None.

Sarat thanked 11 public attendees for their attendance.

X. Adjournment

JLBC adjourned at 5:50 PM.

5:50 PM - Jones Library Equity Subcommittee adjourned.

5:50 - JLBC Design Subcommittee adjourned.

Link to online agenda for this meeting: <https://www.amherstma.gov/Archive.aspx?ADID=15577>

Link to online packet for this meeting: <https://www.amherstma.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/5318>

Link to YouTube Channel recording of this meeting: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JIMbQUUnHzPU>

Respectfully submitted to Sarat, Sharry for review on 01/23/2023

Respectfully re-submitted to the full membership of the JLBC on 1/25/2023