



RICE LIBRARY BUILDING COMMITTEE

February 13, 2019

6PM

Council Chambers

Town Hall

AGENDA



1. Review and Approve Minutes
 - a. November 29, 2018
 - b. December 11, 2018
 - c. January 29, 2019

2. Design Status and Update (Scott Simons Architects)
 - a. Review Communications
 - b. Review Project Goals and Schedule
 - c. Progress Update
 - d. New Business

3. Next Meeting

Materials: (available in the Project Drop Box)

- Draft Minutes
- Design Status and Update detail

2018-11-29

DRAFT

**Rice Public Library Building Committee
Meeting Minutes**

RFP review

Attendees:

Jim, Kendra, Jeff, Chuck, Jenn, Peggy, Lee, Doug

George – excused absence, Tim – recused absence

Debated how best to evaluate the proposals:

Whether to let each person speak about their favorites and or make remarks good or bad about the proposals.

Kendra suggested we cut to the chase and list our top 3 with some remarks about each.

We went around the table and listed our top 3 and what made them stand out for each of us.

Top two vote getters:

Scott Simons

Holzman Moss Bottino

Based on their decades of library & public work & quality of their portfolio.

Their responses were good and their consultants well qualified.

Trying to determine 3rd and 4th place proved more difficult.

Evaluations from the committee here were all over the place and for different reasons.

It was decided that rather than open the selection to 4 that we should keep it to 3 so as to provide more time with the top 3 rather than limit each trying to interview 4 during our next meeting.

The 3rd choice was finally narrowed after recount to ARQ.

Arq was a contender for the quality of their response and well established local reputation in the foreside. They have a consultant on board who has a good depth of library experience and working with historic structures. They were eventually chosen as the 3rd firm to interview.

Winter Holben was popular because of their detailed schedule and approach as well as their detailed response to the rfp. It was felt they lacked the depth of experience and library specialty however.

Jsa too garnered votes for their experience & quality of proposal. Their response seemed a little generic. Their design examples were seen by some as institutional or bland.

Oak Point has good experience & a quality portfolio. It was felt that they did not address the specifics of Kittery & the library in their proposal.

Archephenalia had an interesting design proposal but did not have the depth of experience and not everyone was pleased with their preliminary concept.

Lavalee Brensinger has good experience but their proposal & portfolio was lacking something to distinguish it.

CMK has good experience but not specific to libraries and their portfolio was underwhelming in terms of its graphics and the quality of design represented.

Next meeting is December 11th – interviewing 3 finalists.

1 hour / firm - Q & A

20 minute delivery

25 minutes of questions

15 minutes of transition

Come with lists of questions to ask – general and/or specific to each.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20

1
2 **Rice Public Library Building Committee**
3 **Meeting Minutes**
4 **December 11, 2018**

5 **DRAFT**

6 **Architect Interview**

7 Kittery Committee Attendees:

8 Jim, Kendra, Jeff, Chuck, Jenn, Peggy, Lee, Doug, George, Tim

9 Architects (in order they were interviewed)

10 1st - Holzman Moss Bottino

11 2nd - Scott Simons

12 3rd - ARQ

13
14 **1st Interview w/ HMB**

15 Kevin & Amanda were representing the company and presented to the committee.

16 They would be the primary contacts for the project with Kevin as the local contact.

17 They did not bring any of their consultants or other team members.

18 They presented, and fielded questions reasonably well. The most important take away that
19 they left committee members with and Kendra & others cited in discussions after the
20 interviews was the idea of establishing guiding principles and program goals for the project w/
21 the committee and public input sessions which would be referred to constantly throughout the
22 design & development to maintain focus and achieve success.

23 They brought models to help explain their process and referred to slides of other projects.

24 They had a good portfolio of library projects for exhibit and clearly had the know-how.

25 Topics of discussion:

26 local sourcing, local imagery, mock ups during the process to test construction details and
27 ideas, potential historic tax credits, how to blend old & new, importance of accessibility for the
28 renovated library, function & flexibility for working, programming & user experience, patron &
29 staff convenience, minimizing staff demands through the design & layout, multi-purpose
30 spaces, being able to close areas for different programming, archival storage, noise,
31 sustainability – budget may require hard choices for systems, finishes and space, client &

32 local driven, explore multiple evaluation options w/ client/committee.

33 Jim: How do you assess power & infrastructure needs? What is your process?

34 Answer: Work closely w/ engineers from the outset to evaluate different options and how they
35 affect design, discuss those options w/ the committee. Jim was not satisfied with this
36 response and thought it somewhat generic.

37 Kendra: How do you work and find consensus to develop guiding principles with a large &
38 diverse community of people and patrons?

39 Answer: Lots of questions asked in different ways & formats, then review & check those with
40 the committee. It has been their experience that the essence of the project is always found
41 through this process.

42 Lee: What are your observations of changes in libraries and how they function?

43 Answer: Less about collections – more about services & programming, flexibility. Cited their
44 project at Rutgers – minimizing collections, maximizing space, power needs for devices,
45 underfloor cabling.

46 Peg: How do you make the library a welcoming and convenient place for teenagers?

47 Answer: Providing a measure of privacy and independence is important through the use of
48 sight lines and furniture, patterned glass perhaps, interesting spaces.

49 Jenn: How do you get maximum buy in from the public?

50 Answer: Participation & publishing those principles, it is an iterative process with multiple
51 formats for discussion and input using physical props, video, plans, discussion & written
52 documents.

53 George: Historic nature of building is so important – how do you meld the old with the new?

54 What is your experience doing that?

55 Answer: Guiding principles – capture them early, reinforce it and check it repeatedly
56 throughout the process. They cited a number of libraries around the country they had worked
57 on.

58 Chuck: Things learned good & bad? What would you do now & what would you not do?

59 Answer: Bad – rubber floors in teen room – they off gas & smell despite their being a green
60 product. Good – Indoor/Outdoor spaces, establishing the vision and palette of materials &

61 colors, using 3-D visualization.

62 Tim: How to manage the staff & consultants, where you are remote from the job site?

63 Answer: They will be here early on and commuting, using skype and other technology makes
64 it easy to communicate. Kevin will be almost wholly dedicated to this project.

65 Jim question: Budget will be important – how do you propose to handle it?

66 Answer: Engaging a local contractor and/or cost estimator.

67 Jim question: Do you do your own estimating?

68 Answer: Yes, they develop a rough matrices & cost/s.f. - keep developing throughout design
69 development – includes contingency elements & cost alternatives.

70 The RFP called for a targeted approach with a separate line in the cost proposal for this.

71 Their response was not satisfactory.

72 Doug question: Is the budget number we have provided going to be challenging?

73 Answer: Yes!!

74 **2nd Interview w/ Scott Simons**

75 Scott and 3 associates were representing the company and presented to the committee.

76 There was a representative from Lassel as Mike was unable to attend and 1 consultant.

77 They presented and fielded questions very well. The most important take away that they left
78 committee members with was their breadth of experience in library and public buildings in
79 Maine. Their demeanor was quiet & confident, conversational. They sat down at the table
80 with the committee members. They all had decades of experience with the exception of 2.
81 Their projects are attractive, sophisticated and fit their context. Mike has a good history with
82 the Town of Kittery bringing projects in on time and under budget; he is also local.

83 Scott posed the first question: Why are we here?

84 Jen responded: I want a library the community can be proud of.

85 George: Important historic building & process for the town.

86 Tim: Community space in the Foreside.

87 Chuck: How to meld the old and new?

88 Jim: I want a happy committee & community to make this important project happen on a
89 limited budget.

90 Kendra: Doesn't want the community broken apart by the process.

91 Jeff: Sustainability – balancing budget w/ design goals.

92 Doug: Community show piece right in the Foreside – can be so much more than a library.

93 Lee: Wonderful opportunity for library refresh.

94 Peg: Accessible, convenient, fun kids spaces

95 Scott: Thank you for your input.

96 They then explained their process: community engagement, hands on charrette w/ planners,
97 engineers, architects and community, they were Falmouth's 7th architect and finally brought
98 the community together around a design. Sarah from Lassel Architects highlighted the
99 successful process at the Shapleigh and Mitchell Schools and their relationships within the
100 community and boards, the cost & energy savings made, and the effects on the operating
101 budget. Scott discussed the success they had at the Portland Library creating a business
102 center within the library – engaging community members, engaging the street, having the
103 services take on the complexion of the community, sustainability can mean minimizing staff
104 demands to operate the library through design and energy systems & flexibility – doing more
105 with less. Cited the Falmouth and Bangor Libraries in terms of their fundraising needs and
106 how they helped with that process and working on a state registered historic structure.
107 Discussed the Bar Harbor project which was a \$5 million-dollar renovation similar to ours.
108 Ryan on his staff was a historic parks architect. Another staff member was a historic architect
109 working in Washington recently.

110 Doug thought he really spoke to the community & historic aspects of the project and
111 discussed the landscape as well which represents a huge opportunity.

112 George really like the Mitchell/Shapleigh School projects – the process and results.

113 Jim: Can you speak to schedule, programming, historic aspect & site?

114 Answer: Mid January start, mid June design work & engagement done ready for marketing
115 and November vote. 2 week intervals w/ committee, periodic community engagements 2-3,
116 wants to achieve community ownership.

117 Kendra: How does the history w/ Lassell and the Library help or hurt?

118 Answer: It is a good basis for starting. Simons and Lassell will be working in concert.

119 Chuck: What have you learned good & bad?

120 Answer: Good – improved process for working w/ community, energy efficiency gains, 3rd
121 party estimating during the design process, importance of events and programming demands
122 for community libraries.

123 Lee: Love the idea of pecha kucha & business centers as part of programming

124 Scott: Work with their engineers to model energy and designs for cost effectiveness.

125 Ryan: Community engagement is best done by a variety of people, community members,
126 architects, landscapers, etc.

127 Jim: How or will Scattergood Design be employed?

128 Answer: They are historic consultants and might do an assessment.

129 Jim: Do they need to? We are not taking federal funds.

130 Answer: Might not want to close off historic opportunities.

131

132 **3rd Interview w/ ARQ**

133 Paul & Lucy were presenting along with Dean Rykerson, their engineer Roy and library
134 consultant Maxine. They sat down at the table with us and used slides to refer to portfolio
135 projects. Paul & Lucy would be the principle contacts and stressed their long tenure in Kittery
136 and the Foreside specifically. They pointed to their design work for non-profits and
137 community members. Their experience with tight budgets.

138 They presented and fielded questions reasonably well. The most important take away that
139 they left committee members with was their library consultant was really top notch and had
140 some great ideas about the opportunities in today's libraries both inside and outside,
141 emphasizing programming, flexible spaces, life size chess, business centers, landscape.

142 Topics of discussion: sustainability & programming, historic aspects, engaging community,
143 library specialty with Maxine, early introduction of mechanical engineer to integrate systems
144 and test feasibility & cost. Other consultants include cost estimators, civil, lighting, geotech &
145 landscape. They cited their work on the Children's Museum in Dover and an animal shelter in
146 NYC where they had to install an elevator while maintaining a safe and functioning work
147 environment, Dean's work on Boston Public Library.

148 Maxine: We remember best what we learn first. What are libraries for? What was your first
149 experience with a library?

150 Collections – ok, Services – good, Community – best The library that engages the community
151 is the best library.

152 Innovations in libraries: maker spaces, tactile learning spaces, programming flexibility –
153 closing off spaces for different groups, times or activities, business incubators & centers,
154 enticing from the outside – gardens, culinary programs, untethered staff, meeting spaces.
155

156 Paul: Scheduling & Milestones
157 design development – permit & land use
158 1st workshops – w/ library staff, committee, community in that order
159 Utilize different forums of engagement – school teachers, small groups, large group not as
160 much

161 Brainstorming & Programming Development
162 Need to right size the library for budget & function - programming is critical
163 Mechanical Consultant: Maybe you design it for net zero if you cannot pay for it immediately
164 but the infrastructure is there and you add to it when and if you can.

165 Paul: Computer modeling for design & development, maybe Dean makes a model
166 Lucy: Highlighted their experience with the logistics of projects w/ constraints of federal, state
167 & local agencies, zoning & setbacks, traffic, & pedestrians.
168 Stress the local and unique capability they bring.

169 Kendra: You are voters as well as residents & property owners. How do you reconcile
170 working on this?

171 Paul: It is about the process & collaboration.

172 Lucy: We want to listen first then show ideas

173 Doug: What do you think of the budget?

174 Answer: It is tight! It will be a challenge – rightsizing is key, systems integration, cost
175 estimating are critical. Energy modeling proves savings. Their engineer Roy also designs for
176 lighting, av, tech. Etc.

177 Lee: integrating technology is key and providing flexibility for that – floor and ceiling
178 accessibility.

179 Roy, Paul, Lucy, Maxine: Build it flexible
180 Dean & Maxine might start the community engagement process, then Paul & Lucy start
181 working to assemble those ideas, the engineers assess it & model it then back to Paul and
182 Lucy for more refinement.

183 **Discussion & Conclusions:**

184 HMB it was felt was not going to be close enough and their presentation was not as good as
185 the others. The primary contact did the least amount of talking.

186 ARQ did not have enough specific library experience, but their library consultant had a lot of
187 great ideas. Their delivery focused too much on the constraints of the project.

188 **Assessments & Take Away:**

189 Scott Simons was overwhelmingly picked as top choice, with Tim voting for HMB.

190 Team – Scott Simons

191 Experience – Scott Simons

192 Community Engagement & Process – Scott Simons

193 Finding local, guiding principles – HMB

194 Library programming & flexibility – ARQ/Scott Simons

195 **Next objective:**

196 Get Simons under contract in January and get the ball rolling.

197 Next meeting is January – TBD

198 Meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm



75 York Street
Portland, Maine 04101
phone 207 772 4656
fax 207 828 4656
www.simonsarchitects.com

Meeting Minutes: Meeting No. 01

Date: January 29, 2019
Project: Rice Public Library Renovation and Expansion
Location: Kittery, Maine
To: Kendra Amaral Town of Kittery
Jeffrey Pelletier Building Committee
Jim Anderson Building Committee
Douglas Green Building Committee
Lee Perkins Building Committee – Library Director
George Dow Building Committee
Jennifer Brewer Building Committee
Peggy Meyers Building Committee
Prepared by: Scott Simons Scott Simons Architects
Ryan Kanteres Scott Simons Architects
Chris Berry Scott Simons Architects
Mike Lassel Lassel Architects

Meeting title: Kick-off Meeting

1. Introductions/Establish Communications

- A. Committee members, roles and leadership
 - 1. Committee members introduced
 - 2. Kendra Amaral was identified as the primary point of contact, but copy Jim Anderson and Lee Perkins
- B. Design team makeup and responsibilities
 - 1. SSSA team introduced themselves Scott, Chris, Ryan, Mike described their roles
 - 2. SSA will take the lead in the programing efforts and Lassel will take the lead in documenting existing conditions
 - 3. Ryan Kanteres will be the primary point of contact, but please copy Chris Berry on all correspondences
- C. Establish expectations of committee workshops
 - 1. Communications to go through the primary points of contact for both committee and the design team. (Kendra and Ryan)
 - 2. It is important that the design team inform the building committee when time sensitive feedback is need, and it is important that the building committee provide information with in the specified timeframe.
- D. Address and contact information; e-mail communication, contacts
 - 1. Kendra Amaral - KAmaral@kitteryme.org
 - 2. Lee Perkins - lperkins001@hotmail.com (preferred email address)
 - 3. Jim Anderson - jim.anderson@wsp.com
 - 4. Ryan Kanteres - ryan@simonsarchitects.com
 - 5. Scott Simons - scott@simonsarchitects.com

project:
file:

2018-0200 Rice Public Library Meeting Minutes 1.29.19

date:

2/7/19
Page 1 of 2

6. Chris Berry - chris@simonsarchitects.com

E. Meeting Minutes

1. The A/V recording of the committee meetings from the council chamber will be the official record
2. The design team will issue minutes for meetings with the building committee
3. The committee will get to review and approve prepared minutes

2. Project Goals and Schedule:

A. Long term goals

1. Establishing priorities – Expansion and Renovation; transparent process; community support
 - A. The importance of planning approval was highlighted
 - B. These goals were identified as factors in formulating Stakeholder representation

B. Short term goals

1. Establishing priorities – Complete Phase 1 + Successful Referendum Vote; transparent process; community engagement
 - A. These goals were identified as factors in formulating Stakeholder representation

C. Process:

1. Programming: Stakeholder interviews + feedback
2. Committee Workshops
 - A. Iterative process/alternative studies to elicit feedback/develop preferred options
 - B. Staff interviews will be scheduled the week of Feb 4th
 - A. How best to connect to user groups was discussed?
 - i. Survey monkey was identified as a possible tool
 - C. Other Stakeholder interviews will be scheduled the week of Feb 11th
 - A. Representation from School Dept, Kittery Community Center, and the Foreside Business was discussed

D. Proposed Phase One

1. Programming + Schematic Design Schedule
 - A. SSA presented a draft schedule indicating a 5-6 week Programming, and a 12-16 Schematic Design duration

E. Final Products

1. Program Statement, Site Plan, Floor Plans, Exterior Elevations, Building Sections, Schematic Design Report, Renderings, Project Budget
 - A. SSA will bring examples to the next committee meeting

3. Getting Started

- A. Schedule Program Interviews with library staff, trustees, community leaders, parents, teens, others, etc.
 1. SSA will coordinate with Lee about Staff interview and Lee and Kendra for other groups
- B. Schedule Existing Conditions Investigations through end of February
 1. Lassel Architect is well underway and will share first Existing Condition Building Model with the rest of the design team this week
 2. Design sub-consultant assessment visit will be scheduled in the next week or two
- C. Discuss Project Budget
 1. Jim and Kendra gave additional clarification and background regarding the \$4.3 million budget

4. Next meeting time

Feb 13 6:00 pm



75 York Street
Portland, Maine 04101
phone 207 772 4656
fax 207 828 4656
www.simonsarchitects.com

Meeting Agenda: Meeting No. 02

Date: February 13, 2019
Project: Rice Public Library Renovation and Expansion
Location: Kittery, Maine
To: Kendra Amaral + Library Planning Committee
Prepared by: Scott Simons Scott Simons Architects
 Ryan Kanteres Scott Simons Architects
 Chris Berry Scott Simons Architects
Meeting title: Building Committee Meeting No 2

1. Review Communications

- A. Primary contacts: Building Committee – Kendra Amaral, Design Team – Ryan Kanteres
- B. Accept previous Meeting Minutes

2. Review Project Goals and Schedule:

- A. Long term goals Review priorities – Expansion and Renovation; transparent process; community support
- B. Short term goals Review priorities – Complete Phase 1 + Successful Referendum; transparent process; community engagement, planning approval
- C. Process: Programming: Stakeholder interviews + feedback
 Committee Workshops
 Iterative process/alternative studies to elicit feedback/develop preferred options
- D. Proposed Phase One
 - 1. Programming + Schematic Design
 - A. Iterative process/alternative studies to elicit feedback/develop preferred options
- E. Final Products
 - 1. Program Statement, Site Plan, Floor Plans, Exterior Elevations, Building Sections, Schematic Design Report, Renderings, Project Budget

3. Progress Update

- A. Review of Program Interviews progress
 - 1. Meeting with staff completed
 - 2. Meetings with stake holders on going
 - 3. Overview of preliminary assessment and observable needs
- B. Review Status of Building Assessments
 - 1. Structural in progress
 - A. Site visit scheduled
 - 2. Mechanical, Electrical, etc
 - A. Site visit times TBD

4. New Business

5. Next meeting time

TBD