



MEETING MINUTES

Time: 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM
Date: April 27th, 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
Ron Cieslak	Design Advisor	Merritt Cieslak Design

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Review Design Assumptions from SD Phase
 - A. Nanawall vs. hangar door
 - The meeting began with Steve giving an overview of the previous steps taken and the items undetermined from Phase 3A Schematic work. He then reviewed the proposed options regarding the east wall addition and the discussion as to whether the library building committee wanted to move forward with a design incorporating the Nanawall or the hangar door. The group reviewed the pro/con handout from MCD which illustrated the various differences between each option and he also noted the 15K price difference. He then went on to discuss the hangar door although it aligned with the Birkerts addition certain materials stand out such as the rubber gasket along the top and bottom edge, he also noted the potential water infiltration in the instance that there was wear and tear on the rubber gasket. He noted that the hangar door can act as a canopy and provide additional covered space along the east wall as a benefit that was not included in the pro/con document.
 - Steve noted that MCD was in favor of the Nanawall option. He additionally added that MCD is still considering whether to add a curb along the bottom edge of the glass. He also noted

that the Nanawall is still considered new technology so there weren't as many existing references like there are with the hangar door. He added that the existing architectural language of the south facade of the children's addition was much more closely related to the Nanawall and that the nanawall would complement the existing conditions much better.

- Steve suggested a revision of the butt glazed corners that were shown in the renderings, instead of a butt glaze at the corners of the glass to use a low profile aluminum to protect the glass in the long run.
- He then shared new rendered views the Nanawall vs the hangar door conditions and explained that the Nanawall required less visual obstructions and had a stronger visual connection the the plaza and Shain Park. He said that this was because the mechanics of the Nanawall system had a cleaner aesthetic. Jaclyn asked about the track in front of the floor for the Nanawall system and whether it was flush with the flooring or if it was something that could be tripped on. Steve explained that it was not completely flush and that it would have a slight lip on it. Jim added that there was some community concern with water seeping in along the track and Steve explained that MCD would be working with civil engineers to create a slight imperceptible grade that would slope away from the building and Jim said that was good. Steve also added that MCD would be working closely with civil to determine whether a trench drain would be required but that that was still undetermined. Steve also added that MCD found that insect screens with the nanawall were an option. Overall Steve explained that MCD would like further information and specifics from the staff and board on how the indoor/outdoor space would be used.
- Jim then brought out a sketch which showed an option with a smaller Nanawall centered in the east wall glass, and explained that instead of sidestacking the system he felt that it should be centered with glass windows at either side and 2 doors that slide to either side. He explained that he felt that the nanawall looked too big for the library's purposes and created a larger opening/opportunity for birds/ insects to come in. Steve said that if the doors were to be 10' wide and 9' high to align with the Birkerts banding and centered on the space, then it would need additional structural support above to support the doors and he suggested that it may require additional columns at either end as well. Jim asked if MCD could do a rendering of this option. Frank added that he disagreed with Jim's concern on how frequently the Nanawall would be utilized and felt that it would get used more than Jim anticipated. Frank also said that he felt that the plaza would need adequate shading so that midday in the summer people wouldn't be sitting out in the direct sunlight.
- Steve said that MCD could do a sun study for different times throughout the year. Frank said that he felt strongly that there should be adequate shade coverage there especially with the cafe right along that wall and that overall it would be much more appealing to a wider demographic of patrons. Kristen added that the drawback to the smaller Nanawall system would be that patrons approaching from that side might think that it is the new entry and be confused if it doesn't open, for instance if they thought it was a new slider door. Missy noted that she previously preferred the symmetry for the Nanawall, but now felt that the current option was best. Jaclyn said that that symmetry would create a set opening whereas the proposed Nanawall system would create variability with the opening size.
- Kristen said that having the nanawall doors open to either side would also create that stacked tinted effect on the interior but that instead of at one side it would then be at both sides. Steve added that as designers symmetry is very important, but he also explained that the existing building language isn't entirely symmetrical and that balance can be architectural without symmetry.
- Jim then asked Steve if the East and South facades would be the same and Steve said no because they were different systems, he also noted the transom window above the east wall door opening. Jim asked if the verticals for the east wall could match the thickness of those along the south wall because it breaks up the continuity between the additional south and children's addition South facades and Steve said that MCD could take a look at it. Ron noted that since the proposed Nanawall framing overlaps it creates a thin profile and also increases the strength to brace against wind loads up to 90 mph.

- Frank asked when the building committee would need to answer and Steve said in the next few weeks it would be ideal.
- Frank said that the pros and cons of both decisions would need to be presented to the entire board before making a final decision. Jim asked Steve if just one rendering could be presented to the board with the symmetrical nanawall and Steve said that additional research would be required and that the end result would look more similar to the hangar door because it would require the additional structural support overhead.
- Rebekah said that what she would recommend would be for the building committee to show the board the 2 options first as well as Jim's sketch and if they see merit in it as an option, then it can be pursued at that point.
- Frank asked if they should present all 3 options and Jim said it's more like 2+ options, Steve suggested that it be added to the pro/con list but that it didn't need to be rendered. Steve also said that he felt that it might be mistaken as an entrance, but that it is worth it to consider it as an option because it's such a unique application.

B. Snowmelt, partial vs full- suggested bid alternate

- Steve suggested that through the design development and CD's that it be presented as a bid alternate. He suggested it be included as a requirement to give the board options when the bids come in. Frank said that he spoke with Valentine and Nikita who felt that doing the full snow melt was too cost prohibitive.
- Jim mentioned being concerned with maintenance issues being costly and Steve said that while it was a risk, these systems were used much more frequently in recent years and that it helped prevent unforeseen cost issues with liability claims as well as minimized the need for regular maintenance costs for salting and clearing sidewalks. Ron added that the piping in the systems are continuous so that a connection shouldn't fail and shouldn't require the sidewalk to be torn up in order to make repairs.
- Jim asked if an additional heating system would be required for this and Steve said yes that an additional boiler would need to be installed at the lower level mechanical spaces, and that there would be a typical maintenance protocol like any other mechanical system. Jaclyn asked if it would require an additional water heater or if it could be tied into the existing and Steve said that the existing was not quite powerful enough to support this so it would require an additional smaller one.

C. Coffee services- staffed (contractor) vs. in-house

- Steve began this portion of the discussion by stating that he recalled that the building committee had been leaning towards not using an outside contractor or staffed coffee station, but that a self- service option could be pursued. He also noted that in this case it would require the library staff to maintain it (set up, cleanup, and maintenance of equipment etc.) and that he felt that the best route to determine this would be to meet with staff to determine what exactly that process would look like. Steve mentioned that aspects such as storage space, ergonomic use, practicality, power/ water supply requirements, millwork design and equipment were all special needs and considerations that would need to be decided during the design development phase.
- Rebekah said that Robert had been working with coffee companies to help give us an idea of what equipment and machines might best serve this purpose. Steve said that it would be helpful to have that information early on to make sure that the mechanical and electrical drawings could support this.
- Jim said that he had been in discussions with coffee shop owners as well who said that they were interested in a partnership where they could come in and be responsible for maintaining the self-service option as well in order to take the weight off of the staff.
- Frank said that some libraries offer k-cups and Rebekah said that this would be a bean to cup machine. Steve said that the sooner MCD could get this information the better.

Rebekah said that she would get the information from Robert to share for reference. Jim said that he felt that a recommendation should be made to the board for a decision. Jaclyn and Rebekah both mentioned that they were concerned because the cafe was at the entrance and the cafe would be the patrons' first impression when entering the library.

- Frank suggested holding a workshop with the entire board to hear all input and Steve and Rebekah both said that they felt that the library staff were capable of making those determinations without a workshop.

2. Design Items Needing Further Development

A. Furniture- MCD to specify or LDA or other?

- Steve noted that although there had been an earlier discussion about whether or not to work with LDA, no decision had necessarily been made. He also noted that the types of furniture that would need to be specified would be Cafe tables and chairs, task chairs for the study rooms and the circulation desk as well as the Circulation room, tables for the study rooms, and furniture for the patio.
- Rebekah said that the library would like to work with ISCG in Royal Oak and that they had a contact already (Mary Jo) whose information could be shared with MCD. Steve said that MCD could work closely with them to make sure that what is being proposed that everything coordinates with the finishes and palette. Jim said that he felt that MCD could recommend a conceptual design palette to the rep and although they are the distributor that MCD would be providing a clear vision.
- Rebekah said that Dianne could select from their catalog and coordinate with the rep and Steve agreed and said that it would be ideal to work as a team to provide a variety of options.

B. Millwork design

1. Information Desk
 2. Friends Shelving
 3. Idea Lab display
 4. Coffee Service
- Steve said that for all millwork Friends shelving, circulation desk, hold shelf, Hot Picks, Friends storage, Idea Lab pickup and the cafe millwork that additional meetings would need to be held with the respective users in order to highly consider the ergonomic scale, and design properties to support the anticipated uses. Steve said that MCD would work with Rebekah to coordinate those meetings.

C. Finishes- Throughout DD

- Steve said that while MCD had previously alluded to the many finishes that would need to be specified, during the DD phase those selections would be reviewed and discussed to make final selections.

D. Fixtures (plumbing, lighting, etc.) Throughout DD

- Steve explained that, similarly to the interior and exterior finishes, that the lighting fixtures would need to be selected. He also noted that many of the lighting fixtures would be specialty lighting to highlight the architecture such as ribbon of light at the underside of the Bikerts curve, the ring of light at the column and the recessed ceiling feature outside the study rooms, and even the lighting at the skylight to augment darker times of the year etc. He said that there would be technical/ specifications and cut sheets to review, and that all of these decisions would need to be made throughout the DD process.

E. Window Coverings

- Rebekah said that it would be a requirement for the window coverings to start at the top of the window. Steve added that they should be housed high enough so that when they are open you can't see them and a valance could potentially be incorporated in order to disguise it.

F. Artwork

- Steve said that while MCD had shown a Calder and a Picasso as a reference in the renderings that artwork would need to be selected for the spandrel glass and the space above the vestibule.
- Rebekah said that she has a friend that is an artist that she talked to about getting a proposal for a sculptural piece to go above the vestibule. She said that the medium would be materials such as acrylic and wire. Steve said that having a sculptural piece there would really activate that space.
- For the artwork in front of the spandrel glass, Steve said that having artwork there also helped create intrigue as well as activate the cafe/collaborative space. He suggested that if anyone knew of any artists who might be interested that they have them present a proposal. Additionally, he noted that video art projected onto the surface could be shown there. Jim suggested covering the spandrel glass with an opaque surface and Steve noted that this was not accommodated in the budget.

3. Other Staff and/or Board Items

- The next portion of the meeting was a discussion of any concerns or questions from the Staff and/or board. Jim expressed concern regarding potential snow buildup alongside the addition glass. He asked what kind of plan was in action to prevent it from sitting there and causing damage. Steve said that MCD would be working with the civil engineer to coordinate based on where the snowmelt is and isn't- and he added that it may even require drains at the concrete walks.
- Rebekah asked where MCD planned to have the temporary entrance be located while it is under construction. Steve said that this needed further investigation but said it could potentially be located at the Children's wing on the north side, which might be the most accommodating location. Rebekah said that there would need to be a ramp there to provide ADA access and Steve said that this would need to be included as a requirement when bidding out the project to have a contractor address this in their work plan. There was a brief discussion about how steep the north side of the building is to the entrance. Jaclyn asked if the duration of the project construction would require the temporary entrance and Steve said that it would. Steve also mentioned that there are adjustable ramps available to rent that could be utilized during that time.

4. Soil Borings

- Steve said that although it was not a part of the scope of work MCD would get proposals from 3 different geotechnical engineers, and do not anticipate any poor soil.
- Frank and Rebekah said that they had borings done for phase 2, and Steve said that it could be used as well but that since it's a glass enclosure it can't move at all and that it also depends on the locations where they were taken. Ron added that anything that they already have would be useful to be provided to MCD.

5. Review Schedule

- The next portion of the meeting was a review of the schedule provided by MCD. Steve explained that the next couple of weeks would be spent reviewing. Steve then said that #2 on the schedule is ongoing and that #3 is technically already begun and will continue all the way to August. Steve also explained that in mid/ late July MCD would work with FRS again to make sure that the pricing is current. He also explained that MCD has a good working relationship with FRS and that they had a lot of experience with institutional work and that they had a good reputation with their clients. Steve also shared that while he had not worked with Daily for construction administration, that he has worked with an estimator,

Scott Wheeler, with Daily and had found them to be incredibly thorough.

- Steve then said that while it was not included in the Agenda that he would like to discuss the Construction Manager (CM) vs General Contractor (GC) approach. He advised the building committee to consider using a CM for this project because it had enough unique features that he would feel more comfortable with this approach. Jim asked Steve to explain the difference between the two options. Steve explained that while the CM can also act as a GC, a GC does not necessarily act as a CM. He explained that typically the GC approach is based on a lump sum and that it is more a closed book approach where you don't see the breakdown of numbers. He then explained that the CM approach is essentially hiring a manager to be a team member throughout the process and helps weigh against the budget and they also bid to out multiple subcontractors who can be selected by the building committee as well. Steve said that this option offers more control and takes out the uncertainty of the GC process. Ron asked the building committee if they thought the City would entertain that process. Rebekah asked if an RFP would be required for each of the subcontractors and Ron said they wouldn't.
- Missy asked if a whole new item would be required for the budget for a CM and Ron said that doesn't cost more, its just a different process- which is more transparent.
- Jim asked if the higher the construction cost the higher the fee for the CM and Steve said that at that point there was already a fixed number for the construction cost that they would need to adhere to because of the budget.
- Frank also said that when construction began, Bruce and Mike (from the city) would be coming in regularly to oversee the process. Jim asked if the board needed to make the decision and Ron and Missy said that the City had to make this decision.
- Jim then asked how many of these types of building committee meetings would take place throughout the DD phase and Steve said that typically during the DD process there really aren't regular meetings, that meetings would take place on an "as needed" basis. Missy asked if it would be helpful to meet with the building committee about once per month and Steve said that he didn't think it was necessary. Frank asked if there were going to be more renderings and Steve said that that portion of the process was wrapping up.

6. Public Comment

- The final portion of the meeting was a public comment section. Russ Dixon noted that he was pleased that MCD was proceeding with the project for continuity's sake. He shared his input as an experienced architect that he agreed with MCD that a CM was the better method for the construction process as well as his input that he was a full advocate of the large Nanawall design.

*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.*