



## **MEETING MINUTES**

Time: 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM  
Date: December 22nd, 2021  
Location: Baldwin Public Library  
Via Zoom

### ***MEETING MINUTES ARE RECORDED IN BLUE***

#### Attendees:

Frank Pisano	Board President	BPL Building Committee
Melissa Mark	Board Member	BPL Building Committee
Jim Suhay	Board Member	BPL Building Committee
Rebekah Craft	Library Director	Baldwin Public Library
Jaclyn Miller	Assistant Director	Baldwin Public Library
Kristen Tait	Circulation Director	Baldwin Public Library
Steven Schneemann	Principal Architect	Merritt Cieslak Design
Ron Cieslak	Principal Architect	Merritt Cieslak Design
Dianne Schurg	Interior Designer	Merritt Cieslak Design
<a href="#">Leah Klynstra</a>	Designer	Merritt Cieslak Design
Matthew DeSchutter	Estimator	Frank Rewold & Sons

## **AGENDA ITEMS**

1. Review Conceptual/ Schematic Design Deliverables Presentation
  - The meeting began with Steve giving an overview of the summation of the work done for phase 3. Steve shared the presentation file and discussed that the work done by FRS was a preliminary cost estimate.
    - Jim asked a question about the Staff input for Initiative 1 on page 4/34 of the document presented. He asked whether the language should be changed from 'satellite locations' for the revised circulation desk. Steve explained that the original discussion with the staff included a concept to have the circulation desk down at the street level. Steve said the language in the presentation could be changed to "relocated location" and Jim said that would work. Additionally, on page 4/34 Steve asked Leah to add 'hot picks' as an item listed under Initiative 1.
    - Steve noted that Rebekah had reached out since the previous meeting and informed MCD that the library would most likely not proceed with a staffed cafe. He added that this would reduce the overall footprint required for the cafe counter.

-Melissa said that she thought it would be best to keep their options open as to whether or not the library would host a staffed cafe, and noted that the decision would likely not need to be made for a considerable amount of time- likely during the design development phase. She asked Steve if he agreed with her mindset and he said that he did. Additionally, he added that it ultimately would be predicated on how the library wants to present the cafe to the community.

- On page 5/34 of the presentation, Rebekah asked that the language be revised to note the "Architectural language of the [1927] building.."

- On page 6/34 of the presentation, Steve noted that there were words misspelled: language and physically.

- Jim requested that adding a point about the connection to Shain Park be included as an item on page 6/34 of the presentation. Jim also requested that it be noted that the original circulation desk footprint was too large and Steve said that these could be added.

- On page 7/34 of the presentation, Steve noted that 'hot picks' should be added to category 4, circulation. Ron noted that the language should be more specific and say "circulation desk."

-Jim requested that for category 1, plaza, should include items "outdoor program area" and "outdoor public seating."

- On page 8/34 of the presentation, Steve mentioned the addition of trees to the plaza and explained that it was based on conversations with Mark Nikita. He also explained that the addition of trees to the plaza would provide seasonal sunshade, however he noted that this would limit types of use for the space.

-Jim explained that he and Frank had met with Mark Nikita, and that Mark had commented that the plaza could benefit from more trees because the way it was shown would be too hot in the summer. Jim noted that he and Frank agreed and that they were more than willing to limit the outdoor program space to gain the benefit of sunshade. Jim also explained that Mark had suggested increasing the size of the landscape bed along the south wall and expanding it in the N/S direction. Steve said that this would be fine- suggested an additional 6-8' expansion to the landscape bed and also suggested maintaining a path between the new main entrance and the plaza area. Missy asked if this could be determined later and Steve and Matthew explained that nailing down these types of details now would help create a more accurate representation of the budget.

- Steve noted that the new trees were based on the conversation that he had with Mark Nikita and although they cut off the connection to Shain Park, that it will still be much more connected than the existing conditions.

-Frank suggested using some other kind of shade structure, and Steve explained that shade structures such as sail shades/ tensile shades would create a more seasonal element/ however they would be more expensive than trees, and Frank said that they should stick with the trees. Jim asked if adding the trees/additional landscaping would decrease the cost because of the square footage of pavers and snowmelt system and Steve said he thought it would be a wash.

- Jim commented that he was surprised that the full snow melt system was still being presented. Steve and Matthew explained that due to the cost of various elements if they removed the snow melt system then they would come under budget, Jim asked if they reduced the square footage of snowmelt and took it out of the plaza then could they add the skylight back in- and Steve said that they weren't the same cost. Jim said he would like to rework various budgetary factors in order

to get the skylight off the alternates list and back into the base list. Steve said that they would look into it and then explained the cost difference.

-Steve then went on to explain that MCD looked at decreasing the skylight size by 25% and still felt like it achieved the original design intent and would be less expensive. Melissa asked if there was any concern with ductwork for such a large area of glass ceiling and Steve explained that MCD had already looked at the mechanical drawings as well as a photo sent by Rebekah of the existing conditions and said that MCD felt confident that this could be reworked around it.

- Frank and Jim said that they did not want the skylight to be presented as an add-alternate, but that it should be factored into the base cost.

- Steve transitioned to discuss the budget on slide 9/34 and Jim asked if the revised skylight size retained the symmetry at the opening and Steve said that it did.

- On page 25/34 of the Schematic Cost Estimate Summary the 2nd item the name was changed from 'estimate contingency' to 'design contingency'. Steve also commented that the arch/engineering fees would likely be lower if MCD was used for the next phase.

- There was a discussion about the contingency percentage rate and it was decided that both be shown as 7%. It was additionally requested that the construction contingency would be included in the construction costs and that the estimate contingency be changed to "owners contingency" and be moved in order under #6 Arch/Eng. Fees.

-Melissa asked if there were things that absolutely needed to be decided at this point in time, and Steve said that the goal was to present what is reflected in the cost and then have separate renderings that illustrate some of the add alternatives that are not included in that number.

- There was a discussion about the add alternatives list, and which items should be included in the base. Jim questioned whether there was something that could be done to incorporate the skylight into the base cost. Steve explained that approximately 332K of the cost would need to be taken from other parts of the project in order to include the smaller, conventionally framed skylight. He added that he believed the reason the glass fin structure cost was much higher than what was anticipated is that the local glass companies grossly overestimated the cost because they were unfamiliar with the installation of the product. Frank also said that he felt it was important to keep the nanawall into the base as well to maintain the connection to the outside. Steve explained that MCD did incorporate a smaller nanawall to the east wall which was included in the budget number- however it wasn't the length of the full east wall.

- The next portion of the meeting was a review of the renderings, Jim asked whether a swing door could be added to the east wall instead of the smaller nanawall system in order to protect from weather and still have a door there for access, Steve explained that if that were the case then it calls into question the need for a vestibule- which would take up interior space. Frank said he would prefer to have the full size nanawall than a swing door. Jim said he didn't like the look of the full size nanawall because it looked like an aircraft hanger. Steve said that Mark Nikita had suggested using an aircraft hanger door instead of the nanawall system to cut costs and said that he was looking into it as an option. Melissa asked Rebekah which she would prefer to have and Rebekah said the skylight.

- Melissa asked Steve if the plaza heating were removed from the budget, could the funds be used towards the skylight. Steve explained that when the snow melt was taken out, the total came in under budget so it was actually added back in

because none of the add alternatives were the same cost. Melissa asked if the owners' contingency could be reduced in order to cut costs to include the skylight in the budget and Steve explained that the owners' contingency is typically used for those kinds of things.

- Rebekah noted that in the next few weeks Mark Gerber was supposed to be giving her updated millage numbers, and the millage was expected to increase, which would give more flexibility with city contributions to the project. She suggested going forward with the project with the skylight as an add alternate and then said that technically the library had money that could be used towards it and that during the design development phase the numbers could end up being lower than anticipated and then at that point the skylight could be put back into the project.

- Jim asked Steve to reduce the owners' contingency from 7% to 5%, and Steve said that he would do that. There was a brief discussion about reducing the construction contingency to 5% as well, and it was decided that it would be maintained at 7%.

-There was a discussion regarding how the options in the budget could be adjusted in order to free up some money to go towards the skylight. Steve said that if the owners' contingency was reduced to 5%, and the snowmelt system for plaza heating, cantilevered bench and green wall were removed then it would provide about 140K towards the skylight. He also noted that he and Matthew from FRS would need to corroborate the 332K as the cost of the smaller conventionally framed skylight. Jim said that LZG's skylight was larger square footage and a considerably lower cost and Rebekah and Frank said that they did not feel comfortable moving forward with LZG's number. Steve said that MCD and FRS would work hard to get a more accurate number for the skylight. Jim suggested going back to LZG's concept of the North/South oriented Skylight if the funds accounted for it. Steve explained that he thought LZG's number for the skylight was too low and that MCD felt that having the skylight reconnect the facade of the 1927 building from the interior is more effective. He also noted that LZG's skylight would bring more light into an area where it wasn't needed as much rather than adding more light the center of the library along the original facade where MCD was proposing it should go.

-Ron said that he thought MCD and FRS should remove the glass fin skylight and glazing as add alternatives, as well as the full size nanawall at the east side. Steve and Jim said that there was no harm in leaving them as add alternatives. Jim said as long as the skylight is removed from the add alternate list. Steve said that he would leave the glass fin structure as an add alternative.

- The discussion then moved on to the renderings. Jim said that in the meeting with Mark Nikita, Mark said that the addition looked like a 4th element and that it should be merged with the recent addition. Steve said that MCD had looked at making all white mullions to match the recent addition, and felt that matching the LZG glass and the Birkerts mullions was the best solution. Steve then shared images from with the mullions on the addition matching the LZG addition and Kristen, Rebekah and Frank said that they felt it made it look more like a 4th building and that they did not like it. Steve noted that it was a matter of opinion that although Mark Nikita did not favor the dark mullions on the addition, that when he spoke with Dave Chasco, Dave thought that it was well done. Jim said that other architects felt that this did not respect the Birkerts curve, Steve explained that previous architectural styles contained more grand elements for entrances for public buildings. Steve said that the original intent of Birkerts was a product of its time and is being updated and refined in order to solve a lot of challenges that the library is currently undergoing. As far as respecting the Birkerts curve, MCD is keeping the curve intact by not emulating it but allows it to remain and also respecting the LZG building.

- Jim said that he felt the two-toned plaza didn't work well and that Mark Nikita had agreed with him. Steve said that he had also discussed this with Mark Nikita, who had told him that he felt that if the contrast of lighter of the two tones was toned down that it would work better. Steve said that this comment was incorporated into the design.

- Jim added that he and Mark Nikita felt that the black spheres could go away and save money, that they were unnecessary. Steve said that they were identical to the ones from Shain Park- as an extension of the park. Kristen suggested that a bike rack could go there instead. Steve asked if they should be taken out and Melissa said yes.

- Jim noted that the bench was still shown as cantilevered. Steve said that this could be removed. Rebekah noted that she did not like the unfinished look of the LZG bench and that she preferred the cantilevered design.

- Ron asked if the snow melt system was kept at the entrance and the group said yes. Steve said that if there wasn't a snow melt system then there would need to be an 8" curb against the side wall of the glass because otherwise snow would pile up against the glass.

- The next topic covered was the relocation of the cafe counter and Steve noted the fritted glass on the backside of the counter. Jim asked why it was no longer facing south. Steve explained that before the smaller nanawall was introduced it had a clear flow of traffic but with the smaller nanawall system the path was interrupted. Melissa asked about plumbing and Jim and Melissa felt that it made more sense to keep it in the original location. Steve said that it would be put back how it was before.

-Jim asked if the extra space in the book sorting room was wasted space. Kristen explained that due to the mechanics that it was a desirable space for functional reasons. Jaclyn asked if the design would be comparable to what was existing and Steve explained that it was.

- Jim asked if the roof colors could be shown as the same color. Steve said that they could.

-Steve asked if an option for looking at an air hanger door should be pursued and Jim said as long as it was an add alternative. Rebekah asked if this should be in the design development phase and Steve said it was more of schematic design.

-Dianne asked a clarification question about where the 7% inflation number came from, since the previous meeting a 5% inflation was discussed and Steve explained that between the meetings Rebekah had reached out and said that the board wanted to stick with a 7% inflation number.

-There was a brief discussion about when construction would begin and it was decided that the presentation would say that construction would begin in Spring of 2023.

## 2. Next (final) Building Committee meeting scheduled for January 12, 2021 4:00PM

*Note: These minutes represent the best efforts of **Merritt Cieslak Design** to record discussions and decisions at this meeting. Please report any errors or omissions to the author upon review.*