



## **MEETING MINUTES**

Time: 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM  
Date: January 12th, 2022  
Location: Baldwin Public Library  
300 W. Merrill St.  
Birmingham, MI 48009

### ***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
Dianne Schurg	Interior Designer	Merritt Cieslak Design
Leah Klynstra	Designer	Merritt Cieslak Design
David Bloom		Public Comment
Russ Dixon		

## **AGENDA ITEMS**

1. Review proposed skylight demolition & construction strategies
  - The meeting began with Steve giving an overview of the proposed skylight demolition area and he explained that MCD has reviewed the existing drawings and is confident that the proposed skylight will be able to be accommodated by rerouting existing ductwork piping etc. Additionally, he noted that the skylight would have a low slope of approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$ " per foot or  $\frac{1}{2}$ " per foot based on the height difference between the window sill and the top of the roof below. Jim asked Steve if there were any concerns with leaking. Steve said that as long as the installation was done properly based on the specifications and details, there should be no concerns with leaking and added that the skylight manufacturer would likely have a warranty, and that there is never a guarantee of no leaks, anything can leak eventually.

-Frank asked about lighting in the skylight area and Steve said that MCD was proposing LED lights that wrap the perimeter and our lighting consultant had proposed some additional lighting. Jim asked if lighting the peak of the 1927 building was considered and Steve said that it was not included in the budget.

## 2. Review bi-fold hangar door at east end opening

- Steve presented the renderings of the proposed bi-fold hangar door at the east end opening as an alternative to the Nanawall system. He explained that it would likely cost 80-90K and that the doorway height was lower than the nanawall because this type of overhead door affects the height when it is activated in the open position. He noted that a benefit to this type of door is that it will provide additional area that is covered via a temporary awning because the door folds in half and creates an overhang. He also pointed out the glass sidelights on either side of the hangar door. Melissa asked how wide the opening was and whether or not the system was motorized. Steve said that it was about 20' wide and that there were straps that flattened out along the mullions that connected to an overhead mechanism. Melissa asked if the only way to open it was to fully open it with the motorized system and Steve said yes.

-Frank then asked Steve for his professional opinion of the nanawall versus the hangar door, and Steve said that while he felt the Nanawall had a more clean aesthetic, he thought that the hangar door was a good solution. He noted that although hangar doors tend to be more utilitarian, that MCD had detailed it to compliment the architectural expression. Melissa asked about the cost difference and Steve explained that the original full East wall Nanawall was 104k, and that the smaller Nanawall was approximately 50k. Jaclyn asked if Steve had any idea about what kind of maintenance a hangar door would require to maintain the gasket, straps and mechanism, and Steve explained that the library would need to hire a company to regularly service the door- the same as any other large door would require.

Melissa asked if the door manufacturers were local, or located in MI and Leah said that the door manufacturer that was referenced was based out of Minnesota and Steve said that they should contact local reps, and noted that there was a Nanawall rep in MI.

- Rebekah then asked the Building Committee what their preferences were between the Nanawall and the hangar door. Jim, Frank, Melissa, and Kristen were in favor of the hangar door. Jaclyn and Rebekah both preferred the Nanawall- but noted that they didn't dislike the hangar door. There was a brief follow up discussion regarding this, and the group decided that for the time being they would go forward with the hangar door. Jim requested that the Nanawall be kept as an alternative. Steve explained that the problem with moving forward with the Nanawall as an add alternative was that moving forward in the design process they would need to design for 2 different systems for architectural and engineering work which would require additional fees. He noted that it would give the group a good sense of what the options were.

- Jim asked if the cost difference between the Nanawall and the hangar door were only 15-25k would it be worth cutting something else out of the project and using the Nanawall that altogether works better with the facade of the building. Steve noted that the Nanawall could be partially opened which was a benefit, however the hangar door was all or nothing with regards to access.

- The next portion of the meeting was a requested item to the agenda that covered discussions about the add- alternatives and which ones would move forward or be adjusted.

- Jim asked the building committee if they wanted to move forward with the fully heated plaza. There was a discussion where Melissa said she didn't see the need to fully heat the plaza, Frank noted that there was no guarantee that the drop box would be relocated from Bates street to Merrill so it was a long distance for library staff to bring back materials from the side street back to the entrance. Frank also noted that Mark Clemmons had done a study and determined that the existing book drop box location was the best spot for it. Jim said that he wanted the building committee to note that south of the entrance was the preferred spot and Rebekah said that it was highly unlikely that it would be relocated any time soon because Merrill is not wide enough for the box to go on the sidewalk because it causes traffic backups. Frank added that it can be chaotic at times when patrons stop

vehicles in the street off Merrill the way it is currently, and that the City Planner would have to approve shutting down Merrill to a one-way street with angled parking. Melissa suggested having a path of the plaza that led out to the box at Bates street that had the snow melt system instead of fully heating the plaza. Steve said that dropbox aside, from a maintenance and safety perspective it would be an investment to install the heated plaza and would also protect the library. Frank explained that the main concern was that the community would view it as a luxury item. Jaclyn said that she felt that at the very least it would be justified to have the path of snow melt at the entrance as well as out to the dropbox off Bates Street. Frank agreed that for staff safety this was a justified measure. Steve asked if the community would like pricing for the snow melt just at the main entrance as well as out to the east sidewalk. Kristen said she disagreed that the public would see it as a luxury item and noted that for those who are handicapped it would provide ease of access from parking along Bates Street. Steve said that he would get the updated pricing as well as new pricing for the full plaza since the square footage was lower due to the new landscape beds and trees added in the plaza. Frank suggested that if the cost difference were a 30-40k add for the path versus the whole then he felt the committee should include the pathway to Bates and entrance but not the entire plaza. The group then decided that they would include an optional add-on for the whole plaza.

-Rebekah then asked about the green wall, and Steve said that it was not included in the current budget. Steve asked the group if they would like to include it in the list of optional add-ons and they said no. Jim noted that if they changed their minds down the line this was something the library could always install later on.

- Rebekah then asked about the south wall bench and if it was cantilevered and Steve said that the cantilever bench was not included in the budget.

- Jim then asked if the library could get the entire spreadsheet for the project numbers that they could look at item by item and Steve said that he would get that to them.

### 3. Review updated Long Range Vision presentation

- The next portion of the meeting was a discussion of the long-range vision presentation for the City Commission. Steve said that the presentation that he was going to go through to discuss was the revised version of the presentation reviewed in the previous meeting.

- Steve began by reviewing the changes made overall and explained that it is important to note that this project is not just changes out front, that they carry from the Southeast corner all the way into the center of the library. There was a brief discussion about the colored concrete, which some members of the board liked the two-tone and others felt that the light color was too light. Steve said that these types of selections would be refined in the next phase.

-Jim asked if there would be shades on the hangar door and Steve said that it was not included in the budget- but that the entire south wall had shades.

-Steve noted that there would be a 49-person occupant load in the collaboration/cafe space when the gate was down due to means of egress, and he said that there would need to be a sign posted for this. Steve said that another point of egress could always be added if this were a concern to increase the occupant load.

- Melissa asked how many people the elevator could hold and Steve said that it would hold approximately 3-4 people. He explained that since it was a LULA (Limited Use/ Limited Application) that it was designed to take up a smaller footprint. Rebekah asked if it was comparable to the existing elevator and Leah said that it was close, but slightly smaller.

- Steve asked Rebekah if she would like to leave in the view of the Friends area rendering in the presentation and she said yes.

- While reviewing the Schematic Cost Estimates Summary Steve noted that the numbers would be revised to reflect the changes made in the meeting. Jim asked if the Construction

Contingency could be combined with the construction costs and Steve said that it could. Steve asked if inflation for FF&E should be added and the group said yes. Jim said that it should note that all the numbers were projected 2023 budget numbers. Frank said that he thought that all the large numbers should be expressed in the Schematic Cost Estimates Summary so that it was clear that everything was accounted for and Rebekah disagreed and said that since it was located elsewhere in the document they would receive that the summary should be simplified. Rebekah suggested that the page show the total cost, millage and trust, and not show the summary broken down. Jim said he felt that it should include some details. Jim asked Rebekah when the City Committee would get the document with the budget numbers and Rebekah said it would be on Friday. Frank said he felt that there should be transparency on the front end but that they should be mindful that by the end of the day showing the bottom line might be a more direct and successful method.

-Jim asked if they were going to show optional add-ons and Rebekah said yes. The group decided that the two add-alternatives would be the full snow melt as well as the full Nanawall system. Melissa asked Rebekah if the additional money could technically go away and Rebekah said yes, and Steve added that if there was another recession it could. -Steve moved on to the next steps slide and noted that for the schedule it had originally said the construction project start date would be later, and that it had been updated to show Spring 2023.

-Steve asked the board if they had any questions and Melissa asked where the financial breakdown sheet was and Rebekah said that it was at the back of the packet.

#### 4. Public Comment

- The final portion of the meeting was a public comment section.
  - The first guest was David Bloom, who noted that he felt that leaving public comment until the end of the meeting was inefficient.

-David Bloom suggested the edges of the garden bed at the southeast corner be rounded out to reflect the Birkerts curve instead of squared off.

-David Bloom suggested adding more horizontal bands to the hanger door in order to directly reflect the Birkerts curve. He also noted that he preferred the look of the full size Nanawall system. Additionally, he liked that the Nanawall system had a higher door opening and you could see the art installation wall along the glass from the plaza, whereas the hangar door cut off the view to this. David Blum suggested extending the art installation wall the full length of the wall to the east wall because it was a feature that could add interest (Note: this would cover an existing window).

- David Bloom felt that the mullions above the front entrance distracted from the Birkerts curve and suggested that they be horizontal instead of vertical. Steve suggested a large piece of glass there instead.

-David asked the Building Committee why they went with the orientation for the skylight that they did instead of using the previously proposed design by LZG and why it wasn't discussed at any point. Melissa said that it was discussed a while back and that it was ruled out due to space constraints. Jim added that MCD had presented versions early on and that the group had concluded that having the curve provided less space and the curves felt like they were competing. Steve added that this version picked up on the architectural massing of the children's area addition but shared the coloring and language of the Birkerts addition.

-Russ Dixon then commented that the benefit of the Nanawall was that there was an option for the Nanawall to partially open instead of the hangar door which was only able to fully open and he felt that this should be reconsidered. He also added that he felt that the charm of the Birkerts curve was lost in the design of the new entrance.

5. Next meeting for final presentation to the full board scheduled for Wednesday, January 19, 2022 7:30PM

*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.*