

Belmont Public Library
Belmont, Massachusetts

March 9, 2016

Assembly Room: 7:00 PM

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
BELMONT, MA

2016 JUL -1 PM 12:02

Minutes

Taken by: Kathy Keohane, Committee Secretary

7:03 PM: The Meeting was called to Order by Committee Co-Chair Nancy Dignan

In Attendance

- Elaine Alligood, Gerry Boyle, Pat Bruschi, Claire Colburn, Nancy Dignan, Jenny Fallon, Hannah Fisher, Kathy Keohane, Gail Mann, Joel Samuels, Anne Paulsen, Peter Struzziero,

Review of Minutes

- Minor corrections requested and meeting minutes approved with motion from Gail Mann, second by Pat Bruschi and approved by all

Introductions

- Reintroductions of committee members as Peter Struzziero and Gerry Boyle not able to attend first meeting

Library Statistical Data

- Peter shared some statistical data about library usage. Reviewed library usage compared to other communities
- Information shared just for context and to help inform requirements for future facility needs

Review of RFP Process

- Prior to the discussion of the process, Claire Colburn expressed concern about a potential conflict of interest for her involvement. She is an architect and works for a firm that could end up bidding on the high school project. She had done some research and had had conversations with town departments to explore possible options.
- Decision made for our committee to further explore the usage of Special Municipal Employee status for all committee members
- Also attending the meeting was Anne Marie Lambert. She was a member of the public but wanted to raise the consideration for the rain garden (addressed further in the meeting summary). She also noted that she had not been able to locate the

meeting agenda. It was determined that the agenda was in fact posted and available as required.

- Gerry Boyle led a discussion about RFQ and RFP process and noted the differences of the two (Request for Qualifications versus a Request for a Proposal)
- Discussion focused on what is the key question that we are looking for either the RFQ or RFP to address
- Reviewed the process that we would follow. Process – including the development of the document, the selection process and the evaluation process would be the same for an RFQ or an RFP

- Agreed to appoint a subcommittee. Subcommittee would work through many of the detailed activities and bring recommendations and deliverables forward to the full committee. Specific responsibilities of the subcommittee to include:
 - Decision on whether RFP or RFQ most appropriate for this project
 - Development of the RFP/RFQ and provide to full committee for review and comment
 - Manage process of posting to the State Register
 - Review submissions from candidates, select finalists and recommend finalists including order

- Gerry also raised considerations as to whether the group wanted to use a fixed fee or a not to exceed. The standard is to include language that speaks to the best value
- RFQ/RFP will be posted as required. Posting will be active for a number of weeks. Selection process will include a number of steps to evaluate responses quantitatively and qualitatively. Process will allow respondents to submit questions and will also include interviews. All committee members are welcome to attend and participate in these sessions.
- Target of June 1st to award the contract. From there, expect that the architect will work for about 16 weeks
- Group discussed members for the subcommittee. Peter Struzzerio, Gerry Boyle, Nancy Dignan, Elaine Aligood, Pat Bruschi and Claire Colburn were nominated and approved for the subcommittee as moved by Gail, seconded by Joel and approved by all

Overall High Level Plan and Additional Considerations

- Discussed the need to frame a high level plan so that we were working collectively towards that
- A number of the committee members noted upcoming considerations with availability to meet
- High level plan noted that architect on board by June 1st. Anticipate 16 week effort. Once hired, architect would spend time with library staff and at facility

conducting the initial assessment. Felt that much of the heavy lifting by architect would take place over the summer months

- Output from architect would include review of the three options – renovation, renovation/addition, and rebuild. We would look to have a meeting or set of meetings in the fall to allow for public input.
- Feasibility committee would then develop a recommendation. Recommendation would go to the Library Trustees and the Trustees would then vote on the recommendation
- A few additional points were raised about having access to the prior studies that have been completed. Peter noted that he has them available in his office. The data and information is very useful. Many of the considerations and challenges are germane to our new study – as example the seismic code considerations
- Ann Marie Lambert noted the work that had been done to assess/design a rain garden for the library. She requested that we note that in the RFQ/RFP. Committee agreed to consider all possibilities with eventual hire in the study process.

Next Steps

- Although a meeting had been scheduled for the full committee for the 28th of March, it was determined that that meeting time would not be needed. Instead, the sub committee would look to potentially meet at that time.
- Full committee meeting schedule TBD

The meeting adjourned at 8:45PM.

Submitted by:

Kathy Keohane
Secretary

Attachments:

February Minutes
March Agenda
Library Statistical Data