



Board of Trustees Meeting
Saturday, October 18, 2008 10:00 a.m.

MINUTES

President Burtch called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

IN ATTENDANCE

BOARD MEMBERS: John Burtch, Bryce Kurfees, John Magill, Charles Motil, Brian Perera and Amy Sharpe.

ALSO PRESENT: Ann Moore, Director; Kate Porter, Assistant Director; John Forgos, Owner's Representative and Nancy Roth, Administrative Secretary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Perera made a motion for the Board to go into Executive Session in order to discuss a specific personnel issue. Magill seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. VOTING AYE: Burtch, Kurfees, Magill, Motil, Perera and Sharpe. VOTING NAY: None.

The Board went into Executive Session at 10:02 a.m. The Board came out of Executive Session at 10:20 a.m.

DISCUSSION OF TIMELINE

Burtch said that he would like to engage in a discussion about the timeline. He said that the selection of an architect for the renovation/expansion project is the most important decision that the Board will be making. He said that it is too important to decide on the basis of a telephone interview. He said that it would be a mistake to rush the process.

Burtch said that he hoped the Board would be able to make some cuts in the submitted proposals and to then plan to discuss the best ones in detail. He said that the Board should move along without the constraint of a timetable. He said he would like the library to have conversations with the directors of libraries worked on by the top candidates. He said the library needs to know if the architect was easy to work with, to get an idea of options of how to conduct business during the renovation process, what things worked and what did not. He noted that some of the libraries listed by the candidates are accessible within a couple of hours drive if the Board wanted to do so.

Sharpe said that many of those questions could be done over the phone with other library directors. Magill said that the Board should make visits and exercise

due diligence. He said that if these steps were taken, the Board would be looking at a November 2009 ballot initiative rather than the May ballot date. He said that this would be a reasonable timeframe that would allow for community outreach, etc. He said that he would be willing to take time off from his job in order to visit other libraries. He said that the library needs to know how the process was working with the architect, not just the pretty end result.

Kurfees noted that the locations of the candidate firms would also have an impact on the timeline. The Board did reach a consensus that they did not want to make an architect selection on the basis of a phone interview. Motil said that there were problems in planning for a November ballot initiative, but that an August special election remained a possibility. Magill said that all eight firms should be notified of the change in the timeline.

The board entertained a brief discussion of the possible school bond issue in November.

PROCESS FOR EVALUATION OF SUBMISSIONS

The Board entered into a discussion of the eight submittals. It should be noted that Perera said that due to an unexpected press of business, he had been unable to review the submissions at all and would be unable to comment on them. The Board had received responses from the following firms:

1. Acock Associates
282 N. Front St.
Columbus, OH 43215
2. Holzheimer, Bolek & Meehan
7227 Chagrin Rd.
Chagrin Falls, OH 44023
3. Jester, Jones and Schifer
6209 Riverside Dr.
Dublin, OH 43017
4. K. R. Montgomery & Associates
1020 Jackson St.
Anderson, IN 46016
5. SEM Architects
167 S. State St., Suite 200
Westerville, OH 43081
6. Joel Snyder & Associates with DesignGroup
744 S. High St.
Columbus, OH 43215
7. Vivid Design Group
445 Hutchinson Ave.
Columbus, OH 43235

8. Ziska Architecture
5325 Naiman Parkway Suite A
Cleveland, OH 44139

In their discussion, the Board was able to eliminate Jester Jones Schifer, SEM Architects and Vivid Design. It was noted that none of these firms had adequate experience with library design.

Further discussion led the Board to eliminate Ziska Architects. It was noted that they had only done ten libraries. Magill had concerns about the role of Mr. Fleishman as a consultant and the extent to which he might be involved in the project. The firm presented Wayne County Library as an example of their work; however they only did a segment of the project. The actual design work was done by Dan Meehan, now of Holzheimer, Bolek and Meehan. In addition, the Board noted that Ziska was proposing to partner with Bob Smith as their library consultant. The Board noted that Smith had been interviewed for the planning study but not hired.

DISCUSSION OF RFQ'S SUBMITTED

The Board continued their discussion of the remaining four firms. The discussion was free-ranging, but comments are consolidated here for clarity's sake.

AYCOCK

- Kurfees said he found their approach creative.
- Magill said he was not impressed with their submission. He said that the majority of their experience was not with public projects and that they were used to larger projects.
- Magill said that due to their limited library experience, the firm seemed to be relying on Susan Studebaker, who had no design experience.
- Forgos said that he held Acock in very high regard, but that he did not think they would be a good match for the library. He said that the firm was used to producing a more high-end retail project and that costs might be a concern. He said he could see the project coming in at \$30 - \$35 million if Acock was selected.
- Magill said he would rank Acock third.

HOLZHEIMER, BOLEK AND MEEHAN

- Moore said that the firm of Holzheimer, Bolek and Meehan was one of her top three choices.
- Forgos said that the firm of Holzheimer, Bolek and Meehan was one of his top three choices.
- Forgos said that Dan Meehan had written a good proposal but might be spread a little thin due to other work currently underway.

- Magill said that this proposal and the one from Montgomery stood out.
- Moore noted that Dan Meehan has designed many libraries.

K. R. MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES

- Moore said that K. R. Montgomery & associates was one of her top three choices.
- Forgos said that K. R. Montgomery & associates was one of his top three choices.
- Magill said that there was a variety in the size of library projects they had done. He said that the depth of their response was good.
- Magill said that he had some concerns about the depth of the staff available. He noted that the project manager has only done three projects, but was a former UA resident.
- Moore said that she had some concerns about the depth of the staffing available and the distance involved.
- Magill said that this proposal and the one from Holzheimer, Bolek and Meehan stood out.

JOEL SNYDER/DESIGNGROUP

- Moore said that the collaboration of Joel Snyder and DesignGroup was one of her top three choices.
- Forgos said that the collaboration of Joel Snyder and DesignGroup was one of his top three choices.
- Magill said that he did not like the Snyder/DesignGroup proposal. He said that it lacked two résumés for people who would be involved in the project and was too general.
- Kurfees, Burtch, Sharpe and Motil disagreed.
- Kurfees said that both Joel Snyder and DesignGroup were local firms and had history with the library.
- Perera said that he was not happy with Snyder's lack of experience in library design.
- Sharpe noted that perhaps Snyder should not have been the lead architect for the project due to prior disagreements with some Board members during the planning study.
- Forgos said that Snyder has a good rapport with the city which will be important for the project. He said that DesignGroup does not have a good working relationship with the city. He noted that their collaboration brings the best of both worlds. He said that DesignGroup would be doing the design work, while Snyder would be the planner which is his strength. Forgos said it was a good match.
- Magill said he would rank Snyder and DesignGroup fourth.

NEXT STEPS

Kurfees suggested that all four firms be given a personal interview and then a second cut made to two. He suggested that libraries who had been clients of the two remaining firms could then be visited.

Burtch asked Moore and Sharpe to make some calls to get feedback from some of the libraries listed by the candidates. Kurfees suggested that Forgos also be involved in those calls. Burtch noted that there could be feedback from these client libraries that could help the Board eliminate or confirm these candidates.

Magill said that he did want to meet with the architects in order to get a sense of their vision and to be able to ask them questions. Magill said that the end result is important, but so is the process taken to get to the end.

Forgos said that clients become unhappy when an architect talks them into something that they didn't want or didn't know they were getting. He said that it is important for the Board to be sure of what they want in the end and to be able to be strong with an architect. He said that a client has the right to reject a design if it is not what they want.

Moore said that she has a basic list of questions to use to ask client libraries about their experiences with the candidates. She indicated she would email it to the Board members for their review and any suggestions they might have for additional questions.

Forgos said that he wanted to address the 18 day issue of what the library needs from the architect by November 11th. He said that through the planning study process, a lot of the preliminary work has already been accomplished to use as a foundation. He said that an architect would use that schematic and enlarge it for the preliminary submission to the city. He said he would be responsible for creating the cost estimate to use for the bond request in conjunction with the architect. He said that the Board will need to realize that the material initially submitted to the city is not the final version. He outlined what the Board can expect to get from the architect:

- A written program of what is needed by the library.
- "Bubble" pictures of how space might be changed, but that will continue to be refined.
- Proposals, beginning with a planning proposal which has already been done.

Burtch asked how the Board can get reliable cost figures for City Council if they don't know what the building will look like. Forgos noted that the first set of figures presented to the city don't have to be precise. He said that is just a starting point. He noted that not all costs associated with the project would be construction costs. He said that fees, permits, phone and computer costs along

with parking lot repair would not be part of the initial estimate. He said that the Board does not need to know how the space is going to be used at the time of submission, but just how much space there is going to be.

Forgos suggested that the Board think of the over-all project as a pyramid. The cost estimate is the base of the pyramid and the finished product is the tip of the pyramid. The actual cost is what is in-between the base and the tip. He said that the process of design is just beginning. He said that an architect will need to look closely at what we have and determine how to maximize that space and then add only what is needed. He said that the Board will have to be willing to reject a design that is not what is wanted if necessary. He said that it is important that the Board be the driving force of the project, not the architect.

Motil said that the library needs to select the architect who has the creativity and vision to be able to translate our vision into a design and who will be a working partner with the library. Forgos said that the conceptual design would be needed in February and that the library will then start to pin-point where the money will be spent.

After some discussion, the Board agreed to take the following steps:

- Notify the bottom four candidates that they have not been selected.
- Notify the top four candidates that the timeframe has been adjusted.
- Select library-clients of the top four firms to interview by phone.
- Prepare and review questions to be asked of the library-clients.
- Inform Lynda Murray of final four candidates for any feedback she might have.
- Maintain plan to have a Special Board Meeting on 10/21/08 at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Perera made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Kurfees seconded the motion. VOTING AYE: Burtch, Kurfees, Magill, Motil, Perera and Sharpe. VOTING NAY: None.

The meeting adjourned at noon.

John V. Burtch

Amy P. Sharpe