

Project: New Glarus Public Library (NGPL)  
Meeting Location: New Glarus Village Hall  
Date of Meeting: 7.14.2015 at 5:00 pm  
In Attendance: Linda Hiland, Wayne Duerst, Jody Hoesly, Becky Weiss, Lauren White (NGPL Building Committee); Jim Gersich (Dimension IV Madison)

---

*These notes are the writer's interpretation of what was discussed at the meeting. If you have any changes, clarifications or additions to the notes, please contact the writer. Thank you.*

This meeting was a Library Building Committee public meeting for the new-site public library conceptual design phase. We followed a written agenda.

General comments:

1. We began the meeting with a brief review of the activities since the last meeting, especially noting progress beg made on the surveying, Storm Water Management Plan efforts, and the collection analysis. Earlier today Linda, Lauren, Jim and Mike Hein met with representatives of Focus on Energy and advances the dialogue on energy modeling supporting incentives and reductions in operating costs of electricity and natural gas. Focus will prepare meeting notes and "bundles" of energy conservation strategies for the Library Board to approve. Further incentives and reductions are expected via WPPI; Focus will coordinate directly with Keith Swartz at Seventhwave, the company that processes the paperwork for WPPI incentives.
2. The design team members had met with Lauren and Deb Haeffner in early-July to review the Collection Analysis:
  - a. A column should be added to reflect the 2011 volumes demonstrating the thinning-weeding that occurred between 2011 and 2015.
  - b. Jody requested that column(s) be added reflecting, at the 2015 volumes, at the preferred shelf-height, and with accessible aisles, how many square feet would be needed at 30 SF per double-faced shelving unit...by comparison to actual (2,074 SF total per the 2013 DPI Annual Report, which includes offices, Circ Desk, etc., not just the shelving area.)
3. The Library Board will be managing a difficult operating budget, re-iterating that there are no additional operating funds available for the larger space, may need to budget for sewer-water, and which also needs to be highly energy-efficient, balancing first-cost against operating cost of electricity and natural gas. In very rough terms, the Focus on Energy incentive could be approximately \$10K.
4. A draft project schedule (now through end of August) was reviewed. The final Concept & Budget Report (CBR) will be issued on 8/28. Linda noted that the timing of the replacement softball diamond would likely drive the construction schedule.
5. The parking variance will be processed as a part of the Site Plan Review process; certain elements of the Construction Documents are needed for the Site Plan Review application.
6. The Library Board has a meeting later today and will discuss results of this Building Committee meeting as well as the idea of engaging an Owner's Rep for the project.

6515 Grand Teton Plaza, Suite 120  
Madison, Wisconsin 53719  
p 608.829.4444  
f 608.829.4445

Review of Collection Analysis and Projected Space Needs Summary:

1. Numbers of volumes in many categories are significantly down since 2011 SCLS statistics. Space needs looks at shelving plus “soft” seating areas. Planning standards are used, especially those utilized by SCLS.
2. Draft One 7.14.2015 of a Projected Space Needs Summary was reviewed. Total Net Square Feet depicted is 10,625. Some space needs to be assigned for boiler-hot water heater but air handling units are either on-grade outside the building, or in a mezzanine in the roof truss space. The target Total Gross Square Feet for the new building remains at 12,000 GSF.
3. We reviewed each listed space line-by-line and compared the current projected space for each, in comparison to what was planning in October, 2012. Some spaces increased but more often than not, spaces decreased. The Multi-Purpose Room (including its Table-Chair Storage Room) was reduced from 1,212 NSF to 1,000 NSF. Lauren expressed concern that this size of a Multi-Purpose Room (classroom-size) may not be sufficient for their needs.

Review of Budget:

1. A Programming-phase Total Project Cost budget, based upon the 12,000 GSF target, was reviewed. The “bottom line” is \$2.07M knowing that the preferred \$number is \$1.8M.
2. Jim advised staying-the-course and letting the design evolve so that more accurate estimating can be done on some defined drawings; also, other factors such as fund raising and incentive monies will continue to focus.

Review of Site Concept:

1. The new site concept plan (Glerner Park) was reviewed. The primary purpose of this plan was to predict impervious surfacing so that Edge could proceed with the Storm Water Management Plan.
2. The stormwater calculations and Plan may require a bioretention basin, rain garden(s), storm water detention pond(s) wet or dry, etc.
3. The current site concept plan depicts a future building addition to the north of approximately 2,200 SF.
4. Building setbacks shown in the concept site plan are for Residential Zoning districts, per Village ordinances. The land would need to be re-zoned in the future.
5. We also briefly reviewed the CSM of the 54.99’ strip of land west of Outlot 47B that will be transferring to the Fire Department. This CSM has not been recorded yet.

Construction Management (CM) initial conversation:

1. Given the budget constraints and concerns about operating costs, Jim mentioned CM as a possible method of construction delivery that should be considered. The CM process was utilized for the Poynette Area Public Library expansion a year or so ago.
2. The “traditional” method of single-prime bids would require the investment in Construction Documents (roughly, ~\$100K) prior to knowing if the project is affordable. Brodhead PL utilized the “single-prime” traditional process, and Verona PL utilized the “multiple-prime” traditional process.

6515 Grand Teton Plaza, Suite 120  
Madison, Wisconsin 53719

p 608.829.4444

f 608.829.4445

3. In a CM At-Risk (CMAR) method, the CM would prepare a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) proposal based upon the CBR only. The GMP would establish the “ceiling” and the final cost would be at or less than the ceiling depending upon the bids, taken by the CM after the Construction Documents were completed.
4. A CMAR Request for Proposal (RFP) would be crafted and it would detail all the groundrules such as, payment for any CM services would be delayed until the start of construction, methods for local subcontractor participation, in-kind donations, etc. A defined CM fee would also be a part of the RFP process.
5. In effect, selecting a CM would be very similar to the process of selecting an architect. The CM would provide consulting services and later, the Library Board would consider whether or not the CM could self-perform any of the work and if so, only after competitively bidding those portions.
6. No decision was made one way or the other on CM and Linda will initiate conversations with Poynette to see what their experience was like.

Action Items (in addition to as-noted above):

1. Jim and Tina will update and distribute the Collection Analysis as described above.
2. NGPL will receive meeting notes and a sign-off sheet on Focus on Energy incentives.
3. D4M will advance the conceptual building and site design; Edge will continue with the SWMP and site components.
4. Edge will complete the topo survey.

Next Meetings:

1. *For the next Library Board meeting on 7/28, yes, a brief 5 pm Building Committee meeting would be needed, to review advancing design and discuss Owner's Rep and CMAR as noted above.*
2. Additional meetings are not formally scheduled yet.

CC: Lauren White (NGPL – for further distribution as desired); Deb Haeffner (SCLS); Mike Hein (HEIN Engineering); Arlen Ostreng (Edge Consulting Engineers); James Hall (OTIE); Tina Gordon, Ray White (Dimension IV Madison Design Group)

6515 Grand Teton Plaza, Suite 120  
Madison, Wisconsin 53719

p 608.829.4444

f 608.829.4445