

**PUBLIC NOTICE**  
**SPECIAL Meeting**  
**North Valley Public Library**  
208 Main Street, Stevensville, MT 59870  
Tuesday, February 8, 2022 at 2pm  
**Meetings are open to the public.**  
Community Room  
**In-person OR by Zoom**

***Agenda***

- Call to Order/Roll Call
- Public Comment<sup>1</sup>
- Guests
  - ❖ Jacob Wright from MMW Architects & his team
- Business
  - ❖ Scope & Cost of Preliminary Architectural Report (PAR)
- Public Comment
- Adjournment

To Join by Zoom:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86842109339?pwd=dktPdWp3SzI1S1lLcE9aNkNuaWoxQT09>

Meeting ID: 868 4210 9339

Passcode: 042162

One tap mobile

+13462487799,,86842109339# US (Houston)

---

<sup>1</sup> If you are a member of the public and are unable to attend the Board meetings, the Board would still like to hear from you. Please email the Director at [denisea@northvalleylibrary.org](mailto:denisea@northvalleylibrary.org) or you can email board members directly. A link to Trustee contact information can be found on our website at [northvalleylibrary.org/board—information](http://northvalleylibrary.org/board—information).

**North Valley Public Library**  
Special Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, February 8, 2021 at 2 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 pm

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Victoria Howell, Chair  
Leon Theroux

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Caitlin Dunn, Vice Chair  
Kim Tiplady  
Dianne Snedigar

**STAFF PRESENT**

Denise Ard, Director and Melanie Carroll, Manager

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**GUESTS**

Jacob Wright, Rob Cullin, Janet Nelson, Aaron McConkey, Jordan Creveling, Lukash Pruss, Eric Webber, Steve Brackman, and Donna Bainbridge

**BUSINESS**

**Scope & Cost of Preliminary Architectural Report (PAR)**

Jacob Wright introduced his team and began the discussion by asking what options the Board would like included in the Preliminary Architectural Report. He referenced earlier discussions with Victoria and Denise regarding the property owned by the Stevensville Community Center and inquired whether this was an option to be included. Victoria responded that the specific property of the Community Center was not necessarily a focal point of the project and they wanted to look at an undisclosed off-site location. Jacob said he they could include a generic location, but it would obviously need tweaking once a final location was chosen as the scope would not account for every cost that may be incurred. Jacob asked if they were looking at any other options at the library's current location besides the demolition of the current building and a rebuild. Victoria said there were no other options at the current site. Given the recent reports on mold and other known issues with the building, Jacob wanted to know how in-depth did the Board want to look into the demolition and rebuild of the current site. He recommended keeping analysis of the current site to a minimum because of all the issues with the building and the current site he could almost guarantee that it would cost more to rebuild on site. He also said it would be difficult to get contractors and builders interested in the project. They do not like to work on rebuilds as there are many liabilities and unknowns and they like a clean site. Denise wanted to clarify that he was saying that it would definitely cost more to build on site. He said in his opinion based on his experience it would. Denise said they still needed an analysis of the cost to rebuild on site because the community would need to be informed and have pictures, but if he thought it would cost more, she asked if they could give an analysis without adding too much to the cost of the PAR. She added she already has reports on some of the faults in the building such as asbestos reports. He said they could review those reports and recommended doing a walkthrough of the current site with his team and bringing a general contractor as well to do an overview

cost analysis. He commented that they could do a full review, but it would cost more for the PAR which may not tell the board anything they did not already know about the current state of the building. Leon said that he liked the idea of a walkthrough. Leon said previous to being a board member he volunteered for many years as handy man for the library and did repairs and minor renovation on the library buildings. He said he would like to participate in the walk through and answer any questions and give additional context. Victoria said that they could do a general overview of the current site and include the costs associated with temporarily relocating the library during construction.

Jacob asked how involved they wanted the Rethinking Libraries team of Rob Cullin and Janet Nelson to be involved in the PAR process. He said it was up to the board, they could be involved heavily or barely at all. Denise asked how they would be involved in the process. Rob answered that he was not sure how much community involvement they already had, but part of their job is to build community engagement. Leon made reference to the recent library survey, commenting that the community wanted to stay on Main Street and also had issues with parking, but other than that, there was not much input. Denise said that the response for that survey was not real great. Rob commented that generally for a district this size, a good representation size would be about 250 to 300 people. Denise said the library's most recent survey included people outside the library district so they did not get close to that amount of input from the taxpayers of the library. Victoria commented that they definitely need help engaging the community. Denise said that the facilities plan that she compiled for library did not give a recommended square footage but listed what rooms needed to be bigger. She said what she compiled was a bare minimum that the board could agree upon. Rob said that they could perform a multifaceted space assessment to look at those needs, the space required for them, and what the community wants. Denise asked how much could be completed remotely. Rob said that they can do most if not all of it remotely.

Jacob asked if anyone on his team or the board had any more questions to determine the scope of the PAR. His team responded that they had everything they could think of at this time. .

Leon said that he was concerned about potential growth of the new building to meet the community's needs in ten or twenty years. He would like to plan ahead and would like to see the design of the new building anticipate future growth and the building should be engineered and designed with the ability to be expanded at a later date. Jacob commented that he brings up a great point about the ability to expand. He said with your existing space you would have to build up and any later expansion of any site should be part of the design. With a new building in a different location, you would be able to do it later. Leon said he believed that the town had a building height restriction of 4 stories.

Denise commented that they would like to have a building that is more energy efficient and that the library has been tracking utility costs and could provide that information to them for an analysis of increased energy in new construction. Jacob agreed and said that was a common request. She asked if they would have the cost analysis ready by the next board meeting the next Wednesday. Jacob said he would have to check, but most likely they would not have it ready by then.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 2:51 p.m.

Minutes by Melanie Carroll & Denise Ard