

CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY
Minutes of the Special Board Meeting
June 15, 2018
Trustees Room Louis Stokes Wing
12:00 Noon

Present: Ms. Butts, Mr. Seifullah, Ms. Rodriguez,
Ms. Washington, Mr. Corrigan (arrived, 12:12
p.m.), Mr. Hairston (departed, 1:02 p.m.)

Absent: Mr. Parker

Ms. Rodriguez called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m.

Director Thomas stated that when he began his tenure at the Library as Director nine years ago, he received many phone calls from individuals in response to newspaper articles, inquiring if the Martin Luther King, Jr. branch was going to be sold to developers. In response, the Library had to have several community meetings to assure the public that the branch was not being sold.

Three years ago, we had initial conversations with the City because the City was looking to sell the police station and there was a belief that there was a developer who would be interested in our space as well. As those conversations continued, the City and the Mayor were clear that if there would be any movement toward the purchase of the branch, the library would get a space ensuring that the community would get a building that would be better than the one that they had before.

The Director stated that because of this process, we are well on the way to building an iconic building that the community will be very proud of.

The Director acknowledged Lillian Kuri, Vice President, Strategic Grantmaking, Arts & Urban Design Initiatives, Cleveland Foundation, who was in attendance. The Director referenced a conversation with Ms. Kuri who stated that the building should be iconic and one that people from around the world would want to visit. Ms. Kuri helped to provide funds to move the design competition forward.

Director Thomas thanked LAND Studio who assisted the Library in working through the difficult and complicated process as 31 architectural firms from around the world responded and expressed their interest to help design and build the new branch. Of the 31 firms, the list was reduced to 9 firms. As the process continued, 3 firms were selected to make presentations.

Director Thomas stated that today we will review the ranking and recommend the top designer.

Joyce Dodrill, Chief Legal Officer, stated that this journey began when we put out an RFP in connection with the City of Cleveland for the use of our building and their police station.

Ms. Dodrill reviewed in detail the following timeline:

September 17, 2015: Board of Library Trustees authorizes Library to negotiate with developer for the construction of a new MLK branch

Established contract parameters of:

- Minimum of 15,000 square feet
- Architecturally iconic design
- Meeting space for approx. 300 people - Drive-up window
- Library service be uninterrupted
- 50+ free parking spaces

August 29, 2016: Board of Library Trustees approves agreement for development and relocation of the Martin Luther King, Jr. branch

- Authorizes contract language allowing developer to retain air rights over library building which increased developer's contribution by \$1.2M

May 2017: CPL accepts a \$93,000 grant from the Cleveland Foundation to conduct a design competition

June 13, 2017: Board of Library Trustees authorizes Library to consider alternate location which would entail the library being partially tucked underneath apartment building

October 2017: CPL issues Request for Qualifications and Design Brief, and receives over 350 inquiries from design firms around the world

November 2017: Statements of Qualifications from 31 design firms are received by CPL from seven states and three countries outside the United States

January 2018: Interviews are conducted of nine semi-finalist design firms selected by five-member Selection Committee with advice from a ten-member Advisory Committee

February 2018: Selection Committee, with assistance and recommendations from Advisory Committee, selects top three design teams to participate in the Design Competition:

- o Bialosky Cleveland & Vines Architecture
- o MASS Design Group & LDA Architects
- o SO-IL & JKURTZ Architects

March 2018: Two-day site visit and workshop conducted with three top firms

May 9, 2018: Designs are presented by three top firms to members of the Board of Trustees and the Advisory and Selection Committees

May 10, 2018: Designs are presented by three top firms to students from Cleveland School of the Arts and to the general public

May 14, 2018: Advisory and Selection Committees meet to discuss and score design submissions, Selection Committee makes preliminary ranking

May 18, 2018: Independent consultant completes analysis of budgets submitted by teams

Jeremiah Swetel, Chief Operations Officer, stated that these 3 firms each offer innovative designs for the Advisory and Selection Committee to consider. Mr. Swetel gave an overview of each firm:

Bialosky Cleveland & Vines Architecture

Bialosky Cleveland

- Founded in 1951
- Based in Cleveland

- Led by Jack A. Bialosky, Jr.
- Projects include Tri-C Metro Campus Center, Muskingum University campus library, and Edgewater Beach House

Vines Architecture

- Founded in 2008
- Based in Raleigh, NC
- Led by Victor Vines
- Projects include Harvey B. Gantt Center for African-American Arts + Culture, Charlotte, NC and the Tenley Friendship Library, Washington, D.C.

MASS Design Group & LDA Architects

MASS Design Group

- Founded in 2008
- Based on Boston, MA
- Led by Michael Murphy
- Projects include numerous social justice projects including The Memorial for Peace and Justice in Montgomery, AL

LDA Architects

- Founded in 1995
- Based in Cleveland
- Led by Dominick Durante
- Projects include historic preservation, and institutional buildings including the Richmond Heights City Hall and Beachwood Community Center

SO-IL & JKURTZ Architects

SO-IL

- Founded in 2008
- Based in Brooklyn, NY
- Led by Jing Liu

- Projects include the CTF Museum in Hong Kong and the Jan Shrem and Maria Manetti Museum of Art in Davis, CA

JKURTZ Architects

- Founded in 2016
- Based in Cleveland
- Led by Jonathan Kurtz
- Projects include StirnHall at Hawken School and Bertram and Judith Kohl Building at Oberlin College

After thanking Ms. Dodrill and the Legal Department for ensuring that this process was kept in alignment and transparent, Mr. Swetel reviewed the following design parameters set forth in the Library's Request for Qualifications:

- Building size of 20,000 square feet over 1 or 2 floors
- Building is situated beneath 5-10 story apartment building
- Building provides access to plaza
- LEED Silver or better
- ADA-compliant and barrier-free
- Flexible interior space capable of being reconfigured
- Central open space capable of service as "public square"
- Central meeting space for 300-400 people
- 125 seat auditorium
- Use of perimeter shelving
- Spaces to house separate collections for adults, children, teens, etc.
- Smaller meeting room with kitchenette
- At least 4 quiet study rooms
- Restrooms with direct line of sight from circulation desk
- Meeting spaces and restrooms are accessible for after-hours use
- Space for at least 30 public computers and laptop bar

- Mixture of lounge and table seating
- Vending area with casual seating
- Staff work area behind circulation desk
- Three portable service desks
- Shipping and receiving entrance with storage space
- Book drop is required, drive-up window is desired optional feature
- 24-hour lobby for book drop and holds
- Space provided for bicycle racks
- Adequate entrances for patrons coming from Euclid Ave. and parking garage
- Space is provided to house Anisfield-Wolf Book Award collection
- Space is provided to house 20,000 books

Mr. Swetel gave an overview of the following renderings provided by **Bialosky Cleveland & Vines Architecture**

- Exterior
- Exterior from plaza with view of 1st floor interior
- Interior
- Anisfield-Wolf Book Award Collection

Building features:

- 24,438 square foot building
- Library consists of two levels
- A covered drive-through service
- window is located on the west side of the library
- A 24-hour lobby is located on the Euclid Avenue side of the library
- First floor of library opens to outdoor plaza, allowing for programming
- Auditorium and separate meeting spaces
- Helix stairway connects first and second floors
- Second floor glass façade is designed to look like interlocking hands
- Anisfield-Wolf Book Award collection housed on second floor
- Apartment building is raised above library, allowing natural light to fill the interior of the library

Mr. Swetel gave an overview of the following renderings provided by **MASS Design Group & LDA Architects**

- Exterior
- Exterior from plaza with view of 1st floor interior
- Interior
- Anisfield-Wolf Book Award Collection

Building features:

- 20,754 square foot building
- Library consists of three levels
- Second floor houses collection and doubles as large meeting and event space when shelves are rolled out of the way
- Lower level houses auditorium with stage and meeting rooms
- Exterior of library is wrapped in mosaic glass designed to resemble underground railroad quilts
- Anisfield-Wolf Book Awards to be displayed using 3-story tall helix sculpture
- Design features outdoor seating steps on plaza side of building, allowing for outdoor programming
- Outdoor plaza features reflecting pool and portrait busts of community leaders

Mr. Swetel gave an overview of the following renderings provided by **SO-IL & JKURTZ Architects**

- Exterior
- Exterior from plaza with view of 1st floor interior
- Interior with view of "mountaintop"
- Anisfield-Wolf Book Award Collection

Building features:

- 22,550 square foot building
- Building consists of one floor with a mezzanine
- Main floor of the library is raised to resemble a table, a reference to the "table of brotherhood" in Dr. King's "I Have a Dream" speech
- Mezzanine designed to resemble a mountaintop and houses Anisfield-Wolf Book
- Award collection in sculptural "forest of ideas"

- Library floor is designed to be open and flexible
- Design features a 24-hour lobby with entrances on Euclid Avenue and Reserve Court and is shared with residential building
- Seating stairs leading to mezzanine can be used as seating for large events, and a stage can be set up on library floor
- Meeting rooms are accessible from 24-hour lobby
- Design incorporates outdoor space on both sides of building independent of the proposed plaza

Ms. Dodrill gave an overview of Public Feedback opportunities and summaries of their results:

- Teams presented their designs at a public meeting on May 10, 2018
- Public was given the opportunity to ask questions to the teams and to make written comments to the Library regarding the designs

Bialosky & Vines

➤ 18 positive comments, 1 negative comment

MASS & LDA

➤ 48 positive comments, 2 negative comments

SO-IL & JKURTZ

➤ 15 positive comments, 5 negative comments

Ms. Dodrill gave an overview of the Scoring Criteria:

Aesthetics

- Architectural expression - interior and exterior
- Design's ability to honor Dr. King and to elevate user experience
- Urban fit with University Circle, Development

Functionality

Ability of the design to support library operations

Flexibility of design/use of multi-functional spaces

Inclusion of requested features:

- Flexible central open space

- Separate teen and children's areas
- Meeting room
- Dual entrances
- Drive-up window
- 24-hour lobby
- 125 seat auditorium
- Library is under 5-10 story apartment building

Achievement of Project Objectives

- Adherence of submission to total project budget of \$10M
- Budgets evaluated by independent estimator and adjusted accordingly

Ms. Dodrill explained that the first three parts of the scoring criteria were evaluated by the Selection Committee with the advice of the Advisory Committee. The budget information was applied to the scoring later.

Ms. Dodrill stated that the Advisory Committee was made up of prominent stakeholders in the University Circle area many who themselves are architects and community leaders. The Advisory Committee included:

Lillian Kuri, Cleveland Foundation
 Debbie Berry, University Circle, Inc.
 Khrystalynn Shefton, Famicos Foundation
 Denise VanLeer, Fairfax Renaissance Dev. Corp.
 Irwin Lowenstein, ReThink Advisors
 Dionne Broadus, CWRU
 Diane Davis Sikora, Kent State University
 Jeffrey Streaun, Cleveland Museum of Art
 Chris Nance, Greater Cleveland Partnership
 Christopher Connell, Cleveland Clinic

Advisory Committee met on May 14, 2018

Considerations were:

- Public feedback
- Responsiveness to the Library's requirements
- Each member voted for the team they thought best met the Library's requirements
- Budget was not taken into consideration

ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S RANKING

* Ranking was based on all scoring criteria except for budget

- (1) SO-IL & JKURTZ (5 votes)
- (2) MASS & LDA (3 votes)
- (3) Bialosky & Vines (0 votes)

SELECTION COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION

Selection Committee Members

Felton Thomas, Jr., CPL Executive Director
Toni Parker, CPL District Manager and MLK Jr. Branch
Manager
Alan Seifullah, CPL Board of Trustees
Eric Herman, CPL Capital Projects Manager
Chris Ronayne, University Circle, Inc.

Selection Committee met with the Advisory Committee on May 14, 2018 to score and rank the three designs

- Scoring took into account the first three evaluation criteria: Aesthetics, Functionality, and Achievement of Project Objectives
- Adherence to project budget was evaluated independently
- Scoring took into account the discussion and recommendation of the Advisory Committee

SELECTION COMMITTEE'S RANKING

- (1) SO-IL & JKURTZ
- (2) MASS & LDA
- (3) BIALOSKY & VINES

Ms. Dodrill noted that this was the ranking of the Selection Committee without consideration of the budget.

Mr. Swetel stated that it can be a challenge to make sure that the objective of the design is achieved as well as assigning value to the construction on a conceptual level. Mr. Swetel gave an overview of the Budget Evaluation:

- Each team submitted a budget estimate of the cost to build their respective designs

- Budget estimates were reviewed by civil engineer Erin McGuiness, P.E. of McGuiness Unlimited, Inc.
- Original budget estimates were adjusted to take into account building costs, local market conditions, and other factors affecting construction estimates
- McGuiness Unlimited scored each of the budget estimates based on completeness and accuracy of budget and relationship of budget to the estimate

Mr. Swetel stated that one of the challenges in estimating on a conceptual level, planning this out over 18 months to 2 years, you must consider escalation costs and market conditions. Because those types of numbers are still in flux, you must assign a percentage of what you think that number might be in the future.

Mr. Swetel reviewed the design costs for each firm.

BIALOSKY & VINES: BUILDING COST

Initial estimate of hard costs:	\$ 8,730,000
Adjusted estimate of hard costs:	\$ 9,400,000
Estimate of soft costs:	\$ 3,133,333
Estimated total project cost:	\$12,533,333

Amount over project budget: \$2,533,333 (25.33%)

MASS & LDA: BUILDING COST

Initial estimate of hard costs:	\$ 9,000,000
Adjusted estimate of hard costs:	\$ 9,700,000
Estimate of soft costs:	\$ 3,233,333
Estimated total project cost:	\$12,933,333

Amount over project budget: \$ 2,933,333 (29.33%)

SO-IL & JKURTZ: BUILDING COST

Initial estimate of hard costs:	\$ 7,300,000
Adjusted estimate of hard costs:	\$ 7,200,000
Estimate of soft costs:	\$ 2,400,000
Estimated total project cost:	\$ 9,600,000

Amount under project budget: \$ 400,000 (4%)

Mr. Swetel stated that when we take the Selection Committee scoring and add in the budget estimate, the final ranking is as follows:

- (1) SO-IL & JKURTZ
- (2) BIALOSKY & VINES
- (3) MASS & LDA

Mr. Corrigan stated that the 4 categories had point rankings for each separate category. Based on 100 points, the first 3 categories had 75; then we added the eligible 25 points from the budget estimate to come up with the total ranking. This accounts for the change in the initial ranking of the Selection Committee to the final ranking.

Ms. Washington asked for more information on the comments at the public meetings regarding MASS.

Ms. Dodrill read for attendees some of the positive written public comments provided at the presentation for MASS & LDA.

Ms. Washington asked Ms. Dodrill to share some of the negative comments for SO-IL & JKURTZ

Ms. Washington stated that she had difficulty reconciling the obvious public response and the direction of the Selection Committee. Ms. Washington stated that by looking at the budget estimates, she understood how the weight skews towards the firm that received the highest score.

Director Thomas stated that the Advisory Committee considered the functionality and the fact that MASS was made separate from the apartment building. When you looked at one of the last features of the functionality piece, it said that it had to fit within the space and this obviously did not. When MASS & LDA were asked whether they chose to have a conversation with the developer about separating the Library building from the apartment building if they had to, they simply responded that the developer would understand and that they could change the developer's mind.

Ms. Butts asked if the developer ever weighed in on that.

Director Thomas stated that although the developer did weigh in last week and it had nothing to do with our decision making.

Director Thomas stated that the developer stated that they would not move forward with the MASS concept of building a separate apartment building as they discovered it would be more expensive.

Ms. Butts stated that the Library has paid for all of the ideas and we own them now and perhaps some of the ideas can be used even if we choose a different firm.

Ms. Washington stated that she considers this the library for that community and is having difficulty with the fact that the decision of the Advisory and Selection Committee is skewed another way. Perhaps there can be a compromise from a price perspective and meeting the qualifications.

Ms. Washington asked if there were a way to ensure that given that they got more negative written comments from the public about their design to reconcile some of their design to ensure that there is a happy medium between the public and the highly respected people on the Advisory and Selection Committee who provided the final recommendation.

Director Thomas stated that in this process, we wanted to evaluate the architects to determine if we could sit down with them and then work through what the design could be. Given the parameters that we put forward, SO-IL scored the highest. Although we believe that we could have worked with all three architects, this was a competition to rank the three in a way show the Board that these are the firms that showed the ability to follow through with this process.

Director Thomas stated that we do have the ability to change things and the design submitted all three would not be the final design that we would move forward with as a Library.

Mr. Hairston stated that the staff and public have done a wonderful job with this process which has been a long one. This Library is very important to the City and the world and needs to happen. It is equally important that any who drives by or a youngster who may be visiting,

clearly understands that this is Martin Luther King, Jr.'s library.

Mr. Hairston expressed his concern that the Library gets the best according to public input and feasibility of what we are trying to build. This building should be iconic and compliment University Circle.

Mr. Hairston stated that although he is not personally happy with the recommendation, if we could incorporate some of the other pieces from other designs that the community was looking for, he would be satisfied.

Director Thomas stated that there were aspects of all 3 designs that the Committee liked and did not like. No design will have everything that we like. It was a very difficult decision but we worked with what we had.

Mr. Seifullah stated that he participated in meetings with the Advisory and Selection Committee as well as several meetings with the community and was impressed by all 3 finalists and their presentations.

Mr. Seifullah stated that he was surprised that MASS decided to go outside of the specifications and not meet the criteria that the building must fit into a space that has a building over top of it.

Mr. Seifullah stated that he is also sensitive to the Library fiduciary responsibilities. If we exceed the budget, we must identify where the funds will come from. It is probably best to start a little below the budget prospects and add on to that as opposed to trying to figure out how to secure additional funding to complete the project.

Finally, Mr. Seifullah stated that he was not disappointed that SO-IL JKURTZ was ranked number one and he supports that recommendation. One way or the other, we will have a new Martin Luther King, Jr. branch that we will be proud of. If we do not think that we will not be proud of it, then we will not do it.

Ms. Butts stated that we must make sure the public likes it better than the one we currently have.

Mr. Seifullah stated that he believed that the public would like either of the three designs better than the

one we currently have which is not to say that they dislike the one that they have. However, if we are going to move and build around the corner, the public will be very pleased with what the final results are going to be.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that we must remember that a lot of the decisions were made by the Selection Committee prior to seeing the budgets.

Ms. Butts stated that the architects stated that they would be within the \$10 million.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that it was her understanding the Committee made their decision and ranked the three firms prior to seeing the budgets that were being put forth. SO-IL JKURTZ had the best budget for the Library as it was under \$10 million but the selections were made for other purposes as well. When the budget came in, the scoring was blended.

Mr. Corrigan shared his observation, as he has had the advantage of being part of the last architectural competition held for Main Library and Stokes Wing; and thanked LAND Studio, the Cleveland Foundation and staff who helped to work on this. Although we got good ideas and proposals, the challenge remains that we must rank as the law requires so that if we are not happy with the budget negotiations or contract, we are obligated to go with the next firm. If we are not happy with the second firm we then go to the third firm. That is the law and it provides protection to the Library as a public entity in this process.

Mr. Corrigan stated that he attend the presentations for the school students and found strong and profound likes and dislikes in all three designs. However, Mr. Corrigan noted that of the three teams, SO-IL had the best sense of what the Library was about in honoring Dr. King, being a community place and recognizing the dramatic connection between the Anisfield-Wolf collections and what Dr. King stood for. We will not build the proposal that was put in front of us. We are going to build what is put in the contract. Having these ideas make it much easier for the selected firm to do the right thing.

Mr. Corrigan referenced the quilt and stated that he cautioned the Library to ensure the historic accuracy of the quilts.

Mr. Corrigan stated that he liked MASS Design Group but was disappointed that they could be so cavalier about what the Library's requirements were. When asked the question, the firm stated that they would talk the developers into changing their mind.

Ms. Washington stated that she fully appreciated all of the work that went into the process but was really interested in learning what the public had to say about the designs and how they were ranked.

Ms. Washington expressed that there is a gap between what the public liked and the final recommendation. SO-IL did rank high in meeting our budget needs and it puts them in a position to continue conversations around bringing their initial design more closely into something that the public would like. Ms. Washington stated that she, in good faith, would not be voting on this recommendation today unless there was clearer language in the resolution that part of the negotiations includes that a part of their design will reconcile with that.

Ms. Washington stated that while SO-IL JKURTZ seemed to be a strong qualified firm and ranked number one that we could at least start the conversation to ensure that their initial design which is strong can become something that the public will be a little more comfortable with and proud of.

Mr. Hairston asked for more details describing the interior walls in the SO-IL design.

Mr. Swetel stated that these were movable partition walls that can section off areas as the branch has different programming. The walls can be pulled closed for separate program such as children's story time, teen activities, etc.

In response to Mr. Seifullah's inquiry, Ms. Swetel confirmed that the walls would function similar to the walls in the second floor of the Louis Stokes Wing.

Director Thomas explained that libraries of the future are being built with very open and flexible spaces. The positive is that because it is open, staff can see clearly throughout the space. The negative would be possible noise issues as a result of the open space.

Director Thomas stated that with every design that was being put forth, we were going to have the firm change the design to be best suited for what we needed. Every one of them is now situated where they would have to go to the community to reset how they were going to move forward. There would be no firm that we would accept all that they did. All three would have to be redone. In SO-IL's case, we would be looking to see how we would create more private spaces for those who desired private spaces.

Ms. Dodrill identified several private spaces on the rendering.

Mr. Corrigan thanked Steve Litt, of the Plain Dealer, who was present, and stated that he did a wonderful job at reviewing this process for the Library.

Ms. Butts stated that she spent hours viewing the video presentations. Although she preferred MASS, Ms. Butts stated that she was very disappointed with their refusal to comply with the guidelines.

Mr. Seifullah stated that we will have a great looking library.

Ms. Rodriguez acknowledged guests who chose to comment.

Marva Patterson, member of the Carl Stokes Brigade, expressed appreciation for a process that allowed the community to provide input. Although we were having problems at first with losing the library, we came to the conclusion to participate in the process and look at the designs to decide which one best fits the needs of the community. Ms. Patterson stated that the community felt that MASS had the best design and could meet the needs of students. Ms. Patterson expressed that a separate building would not be affected by possible emergency issues that may occur had it been built under an apartment building. Ms. Patterson stated that

students should have their own dedicated space away from adults. Finally, Ms. Patterson stated that there would be busts of notable persons. Finally, Ms. Patterson stated that the design by SO-IL may have acoustic issues.

Mr. Seifullah explained that before the designs had begun, the Library sold the air rights above the new branch location which was a part of the financial aspect. Selling the air rights allowed the developers to build the apartment building above the branch.

Ms. Butts stated that the developers would not give the Library \$5 million as originally promised if they had the air rights not been sold.

Mr. Corrigan stated that we would not have to renegotiate what the money is as that is how we got to this number.

Ms. Dodrill indicated that the Board agreed that for \$1.2 million the developers would have the right to build in the air space above the building.

Ms. Dodrill stated that in order to separate the buildings, we would have to convenience the developers that they could afford to do that financially and would have to renegotiate our agreement not knowing what this would mean for the \$1.2 million.

Ms. Rodriguez acknowledged Christopher Maurer, Principle Architect, Redhouse Studio.

Mr. Maurer stated by suggesting that the building should be separated was not intended to sound stubborn. Mr. Maurer stated that an email was sent to the Selection Committee on the date of the presentations that outlined several different massing studies. Although this is our preferred study, this is a design competition to present this in a way that shows the concept and the community input that we receive recommended that the building should be separated and that is why we went in that direction. The email showed several massing studies which have the developer building on top of the building we had designed.

Mr. Maurer offered to show the Board emails on his cell phone that were addressed to the Selection Committee

from Michael Murphy, the lead designer on this presentation. Although the emails were sent to the Selection Committee, Mr. Maurer wanted them to be brought to the Board's attention as well.

Finally, Mr. Maurer stated that MASS is extremely amenable to working with the Library and the developer for the best fit.

After Ms. Rodriguez thanked Mr. Maurer for his comments, she acknowledged Seth Duke and Dominick Durante, Jr., LDA Architect.

Mr. Duke stated that their intent was to make a better library and a better apartment building. The fact that they were separated makes both buildings better. The studies that they conducted and the people they have spoken to show that there would not be an additional cost by separating them. We believe that the issue of air rights can be translated into ground rights. Therefore, the building can be taller and we have more space and allowing the buildings to be better positioned on site is a benefit.

After Ms. Rodriguez thanked attendees for their comments, Mr. Seifullah introduced the following resolution.

Resolution Selecting and Ranking Most Qualified Architect/Engineering Firms and Authorizing Negotiation of Agreement with Top-Ranked Firm for Martin Luther King, Jr. Branch

Mr. Seifullah moved approval of the following resolution. Ms. Rodriguez seconded the motion, which passed with four in favor and one abstention by Ms. Washington.

WHEREAS, On February 15, 2018, this Board approved the selection of the three most qualified architect firms in the design competition for the new Martin Luther King, Jr. Branch. The three firms approved by this Board are, in no particular order, the following: Bialosky + Partners Architects and Vines Architecture; MASS Design Group & Partners and LDA Architects; and SO-IL + JKURTZ; and

WHEREAS, On March 13 and 14, 2018, the three design teams participated in a two-day site visit consisting of meetings with the Library, developer, and community stakeholders as well as a tour of the site of the future MLK branch; and

WHEREAS, Following the site visit, the design firms were given until May 7, 2018 to prepare conceptual designs based on the Library's building program and on the information gathered during the site visit ; and

WHEREAS, On May 9, 2018, each of the three firms presented their conceptual designs to members of this Board, the selection committee, and the advisory committee; and

WHEREAS, The selection committee, along with members of the advisory committee, met on May 14, 2018 to determine the most qualified of the top three design firms; and

WHEREAS, The selection committee recommends that the top three firms be ranked in the following order with the first being the most qualified:

- 1) **SO-IL + JKURTZ**
- 2) **MASS Design Group & Partners and LDA Architects**
- 3) **Bialosky + Partners Architects and Vines Architecture**

Now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Library Trustees hereby accepts the recommendation of the selection committee, and announces the selection of **SO-IL + JKURTZ** as most qualified, **MASS Design Group & Partners and LDA Architects** as second most qualified, and **Bialosky + Partners Architects and Vines Architecture** as third most qualified; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board authorizes the Executive Director, CEO or his designees, to enter into negotiations for an agreement with the most qualified architectural firm in accordance with the requirements of Ohio Revised Code Section 153.69 which provides, among other things, that if the Library fails to negotiate an agreement with the highest ranked firm for a price that is fair and reasonable, it shall terminate

negotiations with the highest ranked firm and enter into negotiations with the architectural firm ranked the second highest. This process shall be repeated again with the third ranked firm in the event negotiations fail with the second highest firm; be it further

RESOLVED, That upon completion of negotiations, the Executive Director shall submit the agreement to this Board for final approval.

Ms. Rodriguez adjourned the Special Board Meeting at 1:17 p.m.

Maritza Rodriguez
President

Thomas D. Corrigan
Secretary