

JONES LIBRARY

NORTH AMHERST LIBRARY • MUNSON MEMORIAL LIBRARY

ADVISORY TO THE PUBLIC:

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021 and extended by Chapters 22 and 107 of the Acts of 2022, this Jones Library Equity, Justice, and Inclusion Subcommittee meeting will be conducted via remote means. Members of the public who wish to access the meeting may do so via Zoom or by telephone. No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings in real time, via technological means.

Public Body: The Jones Library, Inc. Equity, Justice, and Inclusion Subcommittee

Date: Friday, February 17, 2023

Time: 12:30am-1:30pm

Location: Zoom Webinar

You are invited to a Zoom webinar.

When: Feb 17, 2023 12:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Topic: The Jones Library, Inc. Equity, Justice, and Inclusion Subcommittee

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://amherstma.zoom.us/j/82020480383>

Or One tap mobile :

US: +13052241968,,82020480383# or +13092053325,,82020480383#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 305 224 1968 or +1 309 205 3325 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 876 9923 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 360 209 5623 or +1 386 347 5053 or +1 408 638 0968 or +1 507 473 4847 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 669 444 9171 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 689 278 1000 or +1 719 359 4580 or +1 253 205 0468

Webinar ID: 820 2048 0383

International numbers available: <https://amherstma.zoom.us/j/82020480383>

Meeting Agenda

- I. Call to Order (Welcome, Raphael, Ginny, Walter, Farah, Mia, & Sharon!)
- II. **Minutes (1-13-23; 1-19-23; 1-26-23) ***
- III. Public Comment
- IV. Library DEI Survey Questions *
- V. Previous Equity Efforts *
- VI. Adjourn

Next meeting: **Friday, March 17, 2023; 11:30am; Zoom???**

*** Please note that the list of topics in this notice was comprehensive at the time of posting, however the public body may consider and take action on unforeseen matters not specifically named in this notice.*

** Indicates Handout(s) will be made available.*

Red indicates vote required.

LEARN • DISCOVER • CONNECT

joneslibrary.org

Jones Library Equity, Justice, & Inclusion Subcommittee Meeting

1.13.23; 11:30am; Zoom

Present: Farah Ameen, Mia Cabana, Melissa Giroud, Ginny Hamilton, Walter Lloyd, & Raphael Rogers

Also Present: Sharon Sharry

- I. Minutes approved
- II. No Public Comment
- III. Welcome Melissa Giraud to our Committee!
- IV. All Gender Multi-stall restroom conversation:
 - A. What outreach can we do to reach groups that maybe haven't been represented—responding to the perceived fear that different generations will have discomfort with the shared restroom concept.
 - B. Safety concerns: oversight of lower level, the multi-stall restrooms will have the least staff traffic flow naturally monitoring the space. Ability to see if stall is occupied if floor-to-ceiling stalls. We would need to apply for a variance to code for multi-stall, each stall would need sprinkler etc.
 - C. Note about the accessible stalls: Walter shared that the larger rectangular stalls in our current restrooms are easier to navigate. Will the new stall designs be smaller? Sharon will enquire.
- V. Gathering public feedback on equity at the library.
 - A. How do we reach people in our community to speak to this topic? Othering/ Belonging. Survey that could be conducted online, via the library website?
 - B. Questions: Who would receive survey feedback? How would we respond to feedback? Equity committee, staff? Does the survey need to be approved by Trustees? (Sharon: No, can be staff initiated) Can survey response be incorporated into our annual action plan, and shared with staff via the action plan?
 - C. Action for next meeting: In advance of our next meeting, submit questions to Farah that would invite patrons to respond to the targeted work this equity committee is doing. How can we improve library programs and access? Something short and easy to respond to, open-ended questions that work.
- VI. **Next meeting February 17th 12:30-1:30**

Submitted by Mia Cabana



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

UPDATED Draft 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=JIMbQUHzPU>

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



**Jones Library Equity, Justice, and Inclusion Subcommittee with:
Jones Library Building Committee (JLBC) & JLBC Design Subcommittee**

Thursday, January 26, 2023

YouTube Meeting recording of this Zoom:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uQgZRLZWtqQ&list=PLcnmFtV6BPFNuN3KC0y364AXI_PNaTLn1

4:30 PM

Draft Minutes

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

Others: Rachel Loeffler (Berkshire Design), Craig DiCarlo (OPM), Will Fernandez (Colliers), Josephine Penta (FAA), Tony Hsiao (FAA), Ginny Hamilton, Walter Lloyd, Farah Ameen, Sarah Draper, Lee Jennings

Absent: Paul Bockelman, 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.

Sarat called the JLBC to order at 4:30 PM. Sound and video check for all panelists.

Gray-Mullen called the JLBC Design Subcommittee meeting to order at 4:32 PM.

Farah Ameen called the Jones Library Equity and Inclusion Subcommittee to order at 4:33 PM

II. Minutes to approve

A. JLBC minutes 01-05-2023 and 01-19-2023

01-05-2023 minutes. Motion to approve minutes made by Sharry. Seconded by Gray-Mullen
Roll call vote.

VOTED: 01-05-2023 minutes approved by Consensus vote.

01-19-2023 JLBC minutes. Motion to approve minutes made by Sharry. Seconded by Gray-Mullen.

Roll call vote.

VOTED: 01-19-2023 minutes approved by Consensus vote.

B. Design Subcommittee 08-30-2022 and Design Subcommittee minutes 01-19-2023

08-30-2022 Design Subcommittee minutes.

Motion to approve minutes made by Sharry. Seconded by Sarat.

Roll call vote.

VOTED: 08-30-2022 minutes approved by Consensus vote.

01-19-2023 Design Subcommittee minutes.

Motion to approve minutes made by Sharry. Seconded by Hicks-Richards.

Roll call vote.

Voted: 01-19-2023 minutes approved by Consensus vote.

III. Town Manager Update – None

IV. Finance Update – Mangano

A. Review and Approval of Invoices - None

V. Collier’s Project Leaders, Owner’s Project Manager – (DiCarlo; Anselone)

A. Project Updates [schedule; designs (Landscaping; Rest Rooms); budget]

DiCarlo shared screen and went over the timeline and a new line added for the Town Council action votes.

Sarat asked to reverse the order and start with the gender inclusive bathrooms.

DiCarlo mentioned the landscape architect who would like to be present for the presentations.

Farah Ameen asked for Ginny Hamilton to be let into the Panelist room.

Sharry added Hamilton to the panelist room.

Penta took over the screen sharing. Penta introduced the landscape architect from Berkshire Designs – Rachel Loeffler.

Loeffler shared screen and showed the existing aerial parcel view.

Loeffler showed street views and mentioned outdoor outlets and congregate spaces.

Loeffler reviewed the current property boundaries and the ways these spaces' function.

Presentation turned to the upgrades to the entries and the aesthetics of the newly refurbished front of the Jones Library.

Further amenities included capturing spaces that could host children's events.

The north side of the building was reviewed.

The planting overview was shared.

Slides showed depictions of the low plantings along pedestrian walkways.

Pedestrian traffic paths and defined spaces for outdoor seating were reviewed.

Parking plan was reviewed.

Loeffler asked for questions from the panelists.

JLBC members asked their questions of Loeffler.

Loeffler responded and noted that Berkshire Design would have to re-group with FAA to discuss the particulars about the dumpster and recycling situations.

More questions were asked about: rainwater collection/gardens, the existing oak trees, landscaping on the Strong Museum side of the library, and the height of the exterior retaining walls.

Loeffler responded.

Discussion between JLBC members, Jones Library Equity and Inclusion subcommittee members, and Loeffler turned to the discussion of the ADA accessibility on the north side of the building.

Loeffler and Penta would work together to do a rendering of the Garden Level entrance to share for a future meeting.

Hammock check-outs were debated by the JLBC members.

Children's outdoor (24' x 24') gathering space was discussed.

Suggestion that community members bring stones for the retaining wall construction.

Sarat invited public attendees to comment on the landscaping plan.

There was a comment/discussion of hard fencing around new areas to inhibit the encampment by unhoused populations.

Walkways on the north side of the building were further discussed as were guardrails and curb rails.

Questions about grading differences were made.

Loeffler referred to the survey sketches and tried to explain the new retaining wall heights.

Discussion also turned to the re-use of the mill stones.

Questions were asked about the addition of an awning to the building to protect individuals from rain and snow.

Penta mentioned that there would be a canopy at the main entrance.

Rachel Loeffler (Landscape Designer) was excused from the meeting.

DiCarlo presented the CLT update.

Penta joined the discussion and confirmed that everything has been aligning with what was shown last week. The cost estimates were correct.

Penta noted 25 – 35% range of wood in the new addition to the building.

There has been no change to the embodied carbon estimate.

Design Topic: Gender Inclusive Toilets

Penta shared screen for Hsiao to narrate the changes to the garden level bathroom design.

Options A, B, and C were reviewed for the group.

All three options meet accessibility requirements and codes.

Each option had different eventualities for the existing janitor's closet.

Privacy and security for each option were detailed and discussed.

Option C was the largest footprint for a bathroom.

Hsiao mentioned that Option A was perhaps the best compromise option.

FAA noted that there was a separate single-use restroom available elsewhere on this garden level.

Follow-up to ensure accessibility to stalls for people in powered wheelchairs.

Committee members asked questions about all three options.

Discussion of a family bathroom co-located in the shared gender-neutral bathroom.

Committee and subcommittee members expressed their preferences for each of the three bathroom options.

Further discussion of variance codes regarding gender-neutral bathrooms and plumbing codes.

Discussion turned to the stall types and how that might impact the footprint of the garden floor bathroom.

Open entry to the bathroom was debated.

Each JLBC member expressed their opinions.

Final bathroom decision would be made at next meeting.

Architects will go back to the drawing board and bring back a design that is a combination of B & C.

Semi-private doors were preferred.

Preferences of the JLBC members for Bathroom Design:

Option B – Sharry, Lefebvre (combo of B & C), Lopes, Sarat

Option C – Gray-Mullen, Hicks-Richards, Mangano, Lopes

Sarat asked if there could be a re-design of option B for the bathrooms.

A. Stefura Proposal – Not ready today
VI. Subcommittee Reports

A. Design – None

B. Public Outreach – None

VII. Correspondence – None

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

IX. Public Comment – None

Sarat thanked public attendees for their attendance.

Sarat thanked Farah Ameen and the members of her subcommittee.

A question was read from the Zoom chat, but the question was discarded due to the fact that the bathroom design in the question had been voted down by the JLBC members.

X. Adjournment

Design Subcommittee was adjourned 6:11 PM.

Equity, Justice and Inclusion subcommittee was adjourned 6:12 PM.

JLBC was adjourned at 6:13 PM.

Link to online agenda for this meeting: <https://www.amherstma.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/15581>

Link to online packet for this meeting: <https://www.amherstma.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/4609>

*Link to YouTube Channel recording of this meeting:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uOgZRLZWtqO&list=PLcnmFtV6BPFNuN3KC0y364AXI_PNaTLnI*

Respectfully submitted to Sharon Sharry and Christine Gray-Mullen on 1/30/2023.

Jones Library DEI Survey Questions
Updated 2-13-23

Survey Purpose?

- 1) What do you want to know? What specific information do you want to know (or know first) to inform what you're working on right now? Over time?
- 2) Relatedly, how can you be responsive to patrons' and potential patrons' answers? When you're responsive people are more inclined to answer your surveys.
- 3) What survey data would be useful to track over time to show improvement?
- 4) What do you want patrons to know? Survey questions can also be a way of communicating about vital services they might not know about to both inform them and measure awareness. Questions like, are you aware that you can visit museums for free with our passes? Are you aware that X number of patrons come to the library for ESL classes every week? Did you know we loan out tools like binoculars, cookie cutters, instruments ...?

Examples:

- 1) [UMaryland Libraries Diversity-Inclusion-Climate Tool](#)
- 2) [Montana State Library Surveys](#) - not DEI centered but could be adapted
- 3) [Buffalo Public Library surveys](#) - some around DEI
- 4) [Santa Clara, CA Library System Patron surveys](#)
- 5) [Geelong, Australia, Library Disability Inclusion survey](#)

Program-related:

- 1) Did this program meet your expectations?
- 2) How regularly would you like to attend this type of program at the library? _Weekly _Monthly _Quarterly _Annually
- 3) Were any aspects of this program challenging to access? For example: timing, age range offered, advance registration, prior knowledge of subject etc.
- 4) Do the library's programs reflect your/your family's interests? What would you like to see more of?
- 5) Do you feel the presenters (library staff as well as contracted individuals) represent our community?

General:

- 1) Is the library a safe/inclusive space for you/your family?
- 2) Do you/does your family feel welcome here?
- 3) Do our collections reflect your interests?
- 4) Do you think people with different identities/backgrounds feel represented and respected here?
- 5) Do your children enjoy playing with others in the children's area?
- 6) If you use a wheelchair, is the library easily navigable?
- 7) Do you feel safe in the restrooms?