

MEETING MINUTES

ISSUE DATE 3 December 2020

MEETING INFORMATION

MEETING DATE	21 November 2020	MEETING TIME	1:00 pm
MEETING NAME	Project Stakeholder / Public Meeting #4	MEETING LOCATION	Virtual Zoom Meeting
PROJECT NAME	Ely Library Planning		
FEH PROJECT NUMBER	2020313		
MINUTES PREPARED BY	Emily Sewell		

ATTENDEE NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE	EMAIL
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kevin Eipperle	FEH DESIGN	563.583.4900	kevine@fehdesign.com
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christy Monk	FEH DESIGN	563.583.4900	christym@fehdesign.com
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emily Sewell	FEH DESIGN	563.583.4900	emilys@fehdesign.com
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Greiner	FEH DESIGN	563.583.4900	kareng@fehdesign.com
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gregg Baum	FEH DESIGN	262.968.2055	greggb@fehdesign.com
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Sellon	Library Director	319.848.7616	ssellon@ely.lib.ia.us
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> See Sign-In Sheet			

DISTRIBUTION Core Committee, Design Team, Meeting Attendees

PURPOSE Review options from the second day of the Design Workshop Spark Session

DISCUSSION

1. Goals for Success – Reviewed
2. Criteria Chart
 - a. The design team has begun to fill this out with the weighting established by the group.
 - b. This has been further refined and is attached to these minutes.
3. Site Review
 - a. A4 – Existing Library Site with a one-story addition to the north and a two-story addition to the east.
 - i. This plan is an update after review of plans A1 and A2.
 - ii. This plan incorporates a terrace and/or solar panels on the roof
 - iii. Isometric drawings of the building were included for additional context.
 - iv. A concern over lack of parking remains.
 - b. D3 – Krob site with a one-story building
 - i. This plan has been revised to incorporate some of the elements of floor plan F1.
 - ii. The number of study rooms was questioned by the participants.
 1. Sarah confirmed that two study rooms would be sufficient.
 - iii. This plan may be more effective if the plan was flipped so that the meeting room spaces are to the north.
 - iv. The incorporation of the mechanical spaces into the ceiling and chases in the walls for future additions will be incorporated in any final design. It was questioned whether a crawl space would be of benefit for running mechanical and electrical, but this space can get damp.



- v. Two isometric drawings were developed for this plan.
 - 1. The more traditional design with sloped roofs were favored by some participants.
 - c. D4 – Krob site with a one-story building incorporating city hall
 - i. The addition of the city hall spaces on to this plan would reduce the number of off-street parking spaces available.
 - 1. Participants voiced that they did not think that increasing the occupancy while decreasing the parking spaces was a good idea.
 - ii. This plan incorporates the city hall plan in addition to the library square footage and does not reduce the 18,111 square feet planned for the library and community spaces.
 - iii. This plan shows more of a catering kitchen rather than a full kitchen, which is what is currently available at the city hall building.
 - iv. There may be more funding sources available for a joint facility.
 - d. F – Vista South Site with a one-story building
 - i. This plan is considered the least walkable location
 - ii. Discussions about the Vista intersection have led to two different options.
 - 1. One option is to turn Vista to the north so that it meets State street at a 90-degree angle.
 - 2. The second option is for vista to turn south and meet Rowley at a 90-degree angle.
 - 3. Either of these two options would impact the two Vista sites.
 - e. G3 – City Hall Site two-story addition on to the existing city hall building and full renovation of the city hall building.
 - i. This plan would need to relocate the existing jungle gym, basketball court, and tennis court.
 - ii. Participants did not like that the adult section was separated from the children’s area and did not allow for parents to watch their children outside of the children’s section.
 - iii. There has been flash flooding around this area that may cause problems with building in this area.
 - 1. The city is working to remedy this issue.
 - iv. This floor plan incorporates the same levels from the existing city hall building.
 - 1. This will just exacerbate the existing accessibility issues of the city hall building.
 - f. G4 – City Hall Site one story building including a new city hall building and the demolition of the existing city hall building.
 - i. Many participants voiced a dislike of the removal of the existing building.
 - ii. This location on State street would serve as an excellent draw to Ely.
 - iii. There are a good deal of efficiencies having staff located in the same location.
 - g. I3 – City Park Site one-story building
 - i. This incorporates plans for a future subdivision and shows the library on approximately 9 lots of the proposed subdivision.
4. Budgets
- a. Preliminary Budget Estimates were developed for 7 of the plans.
 - i. These budgets are total project budgets and include soft costs like furniture, equipment, additional insurance, project site acquisition costs, printing costs for construction documents, ribbon cutting party costs, etc. These should be used to differentiate the order of magnitude for the different options.
 - b. A1 - \$5.3-5.4 million
 - c. A4 - \$5.6-5.7 million
 - d. D1 - \$5.2-5.3 million
 - i. All sites not incorporating the existing library building and adjacent site incorporate a \$500,000 sale price in the total project budget estimate.



- e. F1 - \$5.4-5.5 million
 - f. G3 - \$5.6-5.7 million
 - g. G4 - \$6.7-6.8 million
 - h. I3 - \$6.0-6.1 million
5. Polling to determine the preferred site and preferred floor plan
- a. The results of this polling are as follows:

Ely Spark Session	
Day 2 Voting	
Favorite Site	
#1	
A	2
B	0
C	0
D	24
E	0
F	0
G	1
H	0
I	0
Favorite Plan	
#1	
A1	0
A4	2
D1	1
D3	21
F1	2
G3	0
G4	1

6. Next Steps in this process
- a. Up to this point we have conducted programming, which determines the needs of the community and library for the next 20 years.
 - i. Planning beyond 20 years tends to be highly inaccurate due to a multitude of variables like technological advancement
 - b. The current phase of design we are in is called conceptual design.
 - i. The goals of this phase are to determine the general location, form, and adjacencies of the program elements.
 - c. Typically, in a public library design, the conceptual phase will be modified and refined to one option which is agreed to by both the stakeholders and the general community in the form of survey responses.
 - d. That one option is then taken into schematic design where it is further defined, including the location of walls, door, windows and the general aesthetic of the library
 - e. This is typically the time in the process when libraries will pause for fundraising.
 - i. Renderings of the schematic design building for fundraising purposes is very common.
 - ii. Fundraising can take only a few months or can take years. This depends on the funding sources available.
 - f. Once the library board has secured enough funding for them to feel comfortable proceeding, the design development phase can begin.
 - i. This phase begins to look at details of the building and explores exterior and interior finishes and materials.
 - g. The last phase of design is called construction documents.



- i. This phase is for the design team to complete all of the documentation, including drawings and specifications, for the bidding of the project to general contractors.
7. The next ATF meeting will take place on Zoom at 6 pm on December 10th.

This is the author's understanding of the items discussed. Please notify us of any discrepancies within 7 days so revised minutes can be issued.

ATTACHMENTS Sign-In Sheets, Goals for Success, Decision-Making-Criteria Chart

ATTENDANCE SHEET (VIRTUAL)

MEETING INFORMATION

MEETING DATE	21 November 2020	MEETING TIME	2:00 PM
MEETING NAME	Project Stakeholder Meeting #4	MEETING LOCATION	Zoom Video Conference

PROJECT NAME Ely Public Library

FEH PROJECT NUMBER 2020313

PURPOSE Review options from the second day of the Design Workshop Spark Session

NAME	COMPANY	PHONE # / EMAIL
------	---------	-----------------

Jennifer Norman

Jaime Allard

Carrie Ebel

Dan Whitaker

James Higdon

Alan Wery

City Admin

Eldy Miller

James Serbousek

April Miller

Erika Uthe

Keith and Justine Schultes

Mary Nelson

Kay Hale

Rebecca Sammons

Mark Krob

Fred Kiser

Shauna



Ely Public Library

Goals for Success

26 October 2020

1. Space to Serve a Growing and Changing Community
2. Welcoming, Attractive, A Draw to Ely
3. Accessible to Everyone
4. Hub of the Community that Supports all Activities / Groups / Programs Indoors and Outdoors for Outreach at All Hours
5. Plan for Access to Technology, Wi-Fi, Power and Future Innovation
6. Flexible for Changing Uses
7. Space for Staff to Work Effectively and Efficiently
8. Sustainable to Operate into the Future with an Efficient Layout and Design to Minimize Increased Staffing
9. Promote and Support Lifelong Learning as a Pillar of the Community
10. Promote Economic Development
11. A Safe and Secure Environment for Patrons and Staff
12. Project and Process to Pull Community Together, Promote Pride
13. History / Archive/ Connect to Ely's Future and Past
14. Identify / Ask / Secure as Many Funding Sources and Revenue Streams as Possible and Minimize Tax Impact



CRITERIA CHART

Ely Public Library



Goals-Based Criteria		Weighting	Design Options																						
		Factor	A1	A2	A3	A4	B1	B2	C1	D1	D3	D4	E	F	F1	G1	G2	G3	G4	H1	H2	I1	I2	I3	
1	Traffic Flow	3.4																							
2	Ease of Access	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	2
3	Walkability	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	1	1	1	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3	3	2	2	2	
4	Central to Downtown	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	
5	Future Expansion Capabilities	4.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	
6	Safety	4.6																							
7	Floodplain Verification	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	
8	Cost of Site	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Visibility - Bike, Stroller Safety, etc.	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	
10	Accessibility of City Utilities	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	0	0	0	
11	Site Availability for Purchase	4.1																							
12	Site Size	4.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	4		4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	
13	Parking	4.3	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3.5	3.5	3.5		4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	
14	Promote Economic Growth	3.7																							
15	Welcoming/Attractive	4.4																							
16	Environmental Sustainability	4.2																							
17	Buildability/Soil Quality/Site Conditions	4.1																							
18																									
Total Score		67.9	27.3	27.3	27.3	27.3	24.7	24.7	24.7	32.2	32.2	32.2	13.2	26.3	26.3	36.5	36.5	36.5	36.5	28.9	28.9	21.2	21.2	21.2	
Ranking																									
Decision not to study further at this time													x												
			A1	A2	A3	A4	B1	B2	C1	D1	D3	D4	E	F	F1	G1	G2	G3	G4	H1	H2	I1	I2	I3	