

SAUNDERS HOUSE STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE

Monday, January 22, 2018, 10:30 am
Byers-Davidson Room, Saunders House
88 Middle Street, Gloucester, MA

Attendance: Peter Feinstein, Prudence Fish, Deborah Kelsey, Jane Mead, Bill Remsen, David Rhineland, and Mern Sibley (Chair)

1. Welcome and introductions - this meeting is being recorded
2. Approval of minutes of 12-18-17. David moved to approve the minutes as presented; Bill seconded. Jane abstained because she was not at the meeting; all else voted in favor and the minutes were approved.
3. Discussion and voting on Lynne Spencer's proposal for the Saunders House assessment
 - a. Stage 1 and CAD surveys: Mern could not track down Richmond, French Design who did the original survey. Bill received PDF floor plans from Bill Finch; there were no dimensions included, so we would need to verify major dimensions and learn the scale of the drawings. Could be redrawn and converted to CAD.
 - b. Peter suggested setting priorities on the tasks so Dorr & Whittier (D&W) gets what they need for the Library Building Plan.
 - i. Need an understanding of the square footage. Of the 28,000 square feet committed in the Library Building Plan how much will be in the Saunders House?
 1. Need to know structural stability and access.
 - ii. Phase 2 of Lynn's proposal meets D&W's needs.
 1. Some of the tasks would be D&W's responsibility.
 - iii. Peter will talk to Brad Dorr to confirm D&W's needs in writing.
 - c. Discussion on details of the proposal
 - i. Six-month timeline, could be shortened.
 - ii. Public presentation by Lynn would help support fund-raising which is scheduled to start in six months.
 - iii. Will meet more often as needed to speed the process along.
 - iv. We would like a standard American Institute of Architects contract.
 - d. Next steps:
 - i. Peter will communicate with Brad Dorr re: D&W needs.
 - ii. Mern will reach out to Lynn with suggestions for updating the proposal, giving her 10 days to update. (see attached letter)
 - e. The Committee needs to approve the contract and make a recommendation to the Board one week before the Board meeting.

- i. With this in mind, the Committee will meet again to discuss the revised proposal on Friday February 9th.

4. Adjourn

5. Next meeting is February 9th to discuss the proposal. Next full meeting is February 26, 2018 10:30 am

Respectfully submitted,
Tracy Bowen

Actions Summary

Peter will communicate with Brad Dorr re: Dorr & Whittier's needs from Lynne Spencer.

Mern will reach out to Lynn with suggestions for updating the proposal, giving her 10 days to update.

January 22, 2018

Dear Lynne,

Thank you for sending the SVG proposal for Saunders House. The Saunders House Stewardship Committee met today and we are looking favorably on the substance of your proposal, including the scope of work, your understanding of the project's needs, and the proposed total cost. However, before we can approve your proposal and send it up to the Library Board for final approval and signature, we are asking you to revise the proposal to make it somewhat clearer, especially to non-technical reviewers, and to provide some additional information. The goal is to remove any areas of uncertainty and to make it simple for the Board to sign the contract. Points of clarification are listed below.

One substantive point of concern for us is the total time until project completion. The end date appears to be 6 months from project start. While stakeholder meetings and reviews of submissions can wreak havoc on schedules, we were hoping that the work could be completed considerably faster, especially since Dore and Whittier has indicted that they are anxiously waiting for the results of the Saunders House work. For overall planning purposes, Dore and Whittier are most interested in the total square footages that are feasible for library functions in Saunders House. (If you could assign reasonable times and deadlines for our submission reviews and approvals, this will encourage the stakeholders to be efficient and on time.) Please reconsider the total schedule and see to what extent it can be shortened.

Proposal Updating Recommendations

1. Please reorganize the 4 separate files submitted into one unified proposal document. The proposal pages should be numbered and the proposal dated. There should be a Cover page and a Table of Contents. The proposal should be seen as a stand-alone professional document. This proposal may be used for fund raising purposes. Please correct in the revised proposal all typos and obvious cut and pastes from other documents.
2. Prepare and include in the proposal a simple Scope of Work at the start of the document. This should include the specific tasks, naming the persons or entities responsible for completion. These are already listed in the "Proposed Fee' matrix. These tasks shall also be shown in the project timeline (see item #6). This information will also be in the Contract (see item #8). One minor point is the need for a paint analysis of the important and historic Davidson Room. This will be useful for future fund raising. It is unclear if such an analysis would be performed under SVG's existing conditions assessment. It is requested that this task be included in the Scope of Work. It should be broken out as a specific line item cost.
3. For non-technical reviewers, clarify in the proposal the difference between schematic plans and specifications and final, working drawings and bid-ready specifications. It is important for everyone to understand the difference between a Historic Conditions Assessment and final working drawings and specifications (bid documents). The HCA is the logical first step in deeply understanding the existing conditions and proposing appropriate solutions.

However, it does not create bid documents! These are a second step outside the scope of this SVG contract.

4. Elaborate briefly in the proposal on how SVG will build on Bill Finch's 2006 important report. The SVG will include work, such as structural analysis, ADA access, and code compliance that Finch did not cover. In addition, 12 years have gone by and conditions and requirements have changed and must be reviewed again independently. The SVG work is not a duplication of Finch's work.
5. Discuss in more detail the preliminary and final deliverables, especially the formats, drawing scales, the quantities of submissions and the schedule of delivery, review and approval. The following is proposed for deliverables (subject to SVG input):
 - a. All interim and final architectural drawings and plans shall be delivered as paper and electronic copies. For paper plans, how many originals are estimated? What size will the drawings be? What scale will the drawings be? How many copies of each original will be submitted? All plans shall also be delivered electronically as both PDF and as CAD DXF files.
 - b. All interim and final written reports shall be delivered both as paper and electronic copies. What format shall the paper reports be in? (Presumably bound, letter size, vertical format.) How many paper copies of the interim and final report shall be submitted? All written reports shall be submitted electronically as both PDF and MSWord files.
 - c. Copies of all project photos and other documents collected and utilized for the project, such as reports from consultants, shall be submitted electronically. All photos shall be high-resolution digital JPG files.
 - d. Final electronic submissions shall be on thumb drives. Preliminary electronic submissions may be via the Internet, pending resolution of DropBox accounts and other file size issues.
 - e. Interim and final submissions should include at least 5 copies of everything, including printed and electronic documents.
6. Prepare and include in the proposal a detailed project timeline, sub-divided by weeks. While the "Proposed Fee" matrix is useful, this critical information, bulleted below, needs to be better presented.
 - a. Project tasks
 - b. Task durations and milestones
 - c. Project initiation and completion
 - d. Dates for submissions
 - e. Dates for stakeholder review and approval
 - f. Dates for payments, keyed to task and submission milestones

Ideally this information could be included in a Gantt chart. However, there are other acceptable ways to present it. In addition, specific schedules for tasks, submissions, and payments can be prepared if that will facilitate management of the project.

7. Elaborate in the proposal about what cost estimates will be included in the final Report. While many services are specifically excluded in the initial SVG proposal, it is somewhat unclear what will be included. Presumably cost estimates will be included for code and ADA compliance as well as needed structural work?
8. Include in the proposal the appropriate American Institute of Architects (AIA) contract - presumably B104-2007 the Standard Form of Agreement between Owner and Architect for a

Project of Limited Scope or B105-2017 (The Short Form), if you think it adequate. The AIA contract should be filled out by SVG and be ready for signatures.

9. Prepare and include in the final Report a simple historical time line to collect and present the notable dates in the construction, renovation, and uses of Saunders House as part of the historical background of the site.

Since we are trying to move this project along, we are requesting that you electronically re-submit the revised proposal to the Saunders House Stewardship Committee by February 2, 2018. (This is 11 days from today.) This schedule will give the Saunders House Stewardship Committee adequate time to review it and then to submit it to the Library Board for its own review process in advance of its meeting on February 20. Assuming no issues, final approval and contract signing should take place on that date.

We look forward to working with SVG on this important project.

Mern Sibley
On behalf of the Saunders House
Stewardship Committee