

**GREAT NECK LIBRARY
MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
Monday, October 29, 2009 – 7:30 P.M.**

A special meeting of the Great Neck Library Board of Trustees was held on Thursday, October 29, 2009, at the Atria of Great Neck, 51 Great Neck, Road, Great Neck, NY 11021 [Agenda attached]

The following Trustees were present constituting a quorum:

Martin Sokol – President
Andrew Greene – Vice President
Janet Eshaghoff – Secretary
Marietta DiCamillo – Treasurer
Anna Kaplan – Assistant Treasurer
Varda Solomon – Assistant Treasurer
Josie Pizer

Also present:

Jane B. Marino – Director
Laura Weir – Assistant Director
Neil Zitofsky – Business Manager
Kevin Seaman – Legal Counsel

Dan Hueberger & Ernesto Vela – DattnerArchitects
Frank Messano – Park East Construction
Kim Gennaro – Environmental Consultant, VHB
Harold Lutz – Traffic Engineer, VHB

The attendance sheet, signed by members of the public who attended the meeting, is attached.

President Sokol called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. and thanked everyone for coming.

Kevin Seaman introduced himself as Legal Counsel to the Great Neck Library and acted as moderator for the meeting. He began by stating that this was the second of a series of three public meetings dedicated to the Main Building renovation/expansion project. The purpose of the meeting was twofold. Firstly, the Board will review plans with the architect as to which is the most appropriate plan to present to voters. The second is to provide the public with sufficient information so they will have a better bearing when asked to vote in the referendum in 2010 to approve the financing and construction of the

building. The Board cannot set the date for the referendum until the environmental aspects of the expansion/renovation are fully considered by the Board, as well as other relevant agencies including the Town and the villages. Legal notice will be placed in the newspapers 45 days prior to the vote, weekly for seven weeks.

Right now the Board is looking for input from the public and the Board will be considering as to what best meets the public needs as regards library services that will be provided and will continue to be provided. When asked by a member of the public if the referendum will be binding, Mr. Seaman replied that the voters will be approving the financing and also the construction of this project by way of a binding referendum. The bond will probably be for a 20-year period that will probably be financed through the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York. The public will receive all the details and how it will impact on their tax bill based on an estimated prevailing interest rate at the time of closing.

Public Comment [Gentleman]: How many months will it take to complete the environmental study? Kim Gennaro replied that once the Board determines the scope of the project it will take between four to eight months depending on the issues they are evaluating and coordinating with the Town.

Public Comment: [Lady]: Whether the public will vote on the three designs in the referendum. Kevin replied that all three plans will not be voted on by the public. But the Board is meeting with the architect and the construction manager and they will make a decision as to what is best financially and practically while taking into consideration the future of the Library and the needs of the community.

Public Comment [Lady]: Residents in the Atria are concerned about the future of the library but more concerned about the Station Branch and the disposition of a lease.

Trustee Solomon made it clear that the money to operate the branches is part of the annual operating budget. The money to build the new building will be approved via the referendum. They are independent sources of funds.

Next, the Trustees and the Library Director introduced themselves, after which President Sokol introduced the professionals: Kim Gennaro, environmental consultant; Harold Lutz, traffic engineer; Frank Messano, construction manager and Dan Heuberger and Ernesto Vela, architects. The floor was given to Mr. Heuberger to review the different options. He commenced by saying his firm is based in NYC and he has been working with the Board since March or April on the design of the Main Library. The entire process to this point is available in a 100-page report which can be seen on the Library's website.

Mr. Heuberger began by outlining the process. When the Library hired him, he was provided with a list of requirements of things that would go in the new building based on

10 years of feasibility studies, public surveys, and needs assessment as to what are the things most desirable and some of the problems with the building.

..

Some of the positive things that came up over time were the beautiful site, the level of service, the size, and the depth of the collection, and the programs. Some of the negative things had to do with the physical building itself – not nice atmosphere, building is 40 years old, size and type of meeting rooms not conducive to different groups meeting at the same time, and the children’s department is cramped with high shelves that cannot be reached by kids. This was the starting point.

The other starting point is outside the building, the site itself. He showed aerial photos of the site with the building and the pond. The building fits in the site very well but the major challenge with the expansion is where to put the addition because there is very little room. Any future building project is hemmed in by the pond on one side, which is wetland, and the parking lot. Parking is a function of what’s going on inside the library. A bigger building requires more parking. Based on the available site, views from the neighboring properties, the road, and the pond, and wanting to keep all of the parking as possible, the area which is currently the concrete patio is the only area for the addition. The addition will just be like the existing library, a two-story addition wherein the bottom floor of the addition extends the bottom floor of the library and the top floor extends the main floor of the library, which is the main entrance level.

Mr. Heuberger then showed a picture of what the proposed Option B would look like. The existing building will be intact; it will not be demolished but gutted. When travelling along Bayview Avenue, it will actually look almost entirely the way it looks today. The plumbing and electrical system over 40 years old is inefficient and will be totally replaced. The architecture is aging and the lighting is poor and energy inefficient and glary at night. The shape of the addition follows the contour of the present concrete terrace.

The new entrance will be pretty much in the same place as the existing entrance. The existing building is made out of stone panels. The new building will have copper clad siding and as it ages it will turn green and blend into the surrounding trees and foliage. The east side, which overlooks the pond, has a fair amount of glazing to maximize the beautiful views of the pond and also the amount of natural light coming into the building. Once we add this to the existing building, the depth of building is much larger with a lot of windows along the edge, lot of sunlight and some sky light in the middle of the building which will let in day light. This has a twofold advantage: Natural light, as long as direct sunlight and glare can be controlled, is one of the best lights to read in. It creates a pleasant atmosphere allowing electric lights to be turned off. The lighting in a building like this is one of the main sources of the energy lowering costs of operating this building. He anticipates the use of daylight to be an environmentally sensitive feature of the building.

Mr. Heuberger then walked the audience through the plans. A series of three plans were developed based on program requirements provided by the Library. Option B is the largest of the three plans that can fit all those things in the building. Two other smaller plans based on Option B were developed and these were discussed later on in his presentation.

Starting with the main level in Option B, he described the location of the circulation desk, the reference area, the AV department, the computers, the circulating collection, quiet study room, history room, seating along the edge, staff offices, the elevator and the grand staircase leading to the lower level.

Kevin Seaman asked him why he started with Plan B when A comes before B. Dan explained that when he was developing the schemes, he had a host of different letters, and Plan B happened to be the preferred plan and known ever after as Option B, which is the largest.

He continued to explain the layout of the lower level. The children's area is located in lower level along the east side with a collection that is twice as large as the present collection. The books are placed at a height where children can reach them. There will be a dedicated space for children's program, a gallery to hang pictures, and a community room seating 150 people with a stage and a sloped or flat floor yet to be determined. There will be another smaller multipurpose room for 50 people which can be divided mechanically into two rooms for groups of 25 people each. Levels is left pretty much the same way except for the installation of a lift for the physically challenged, and the area will be spruced up. Staff areas will be compressed and located on the west side of the building which will be used for office space, storage, some collections and Technical Services. The mechanical space is also located on that level. The public area will be separate from staff area.

Mr. Seaman asked the architect why is Option B the preferred plan and preferred by whom? His response was preferred in the sense that it is the plan that met the original intent of his assignment.

Public Comment [Lady]: Whether this scheme was the same as the previous one. Mr. Heuberger replied that the previous schemes are physically and programmatically different. Option B, the largest of the present schemes, is 13,000 sq ft more additional space which is almost a little more than half of the previous scheme which was 24,000 sq ft. Additionally, Plan C, the smaller version, is only 10,000 sq ft in additional space and is less than half of the previous scheme.

Public Comment [Barbara Zeller]: What is the mechanism involved in the sub dividable space? Dan replied that it will be a movable wall that comes down from ceiling or side walls. It's a folding wall.

Public Comment [Lady]: Inquired if there would be any additional construction to Levels? Dan's response: Levels has currently many levels in it including the audience area which is inaccessible to the physically challenged. A lift will be installed to make these areas accessible to that population.

Public Comment [Pam Marksheid]: How about reconfiguring the space by further dividing the room. Dan replied that this was possible and that the room can be divided into three separate rooms but could only be continued up to a point and then the dimension of the room becomes a problem. He will be looking at several different configurations for these spaces.

Public Comment [Lady]: Suggested adding another 50 seats because this is where most of the shows take place and not at the satellite branches. She took her son there for activities and every seat was taken. She also suggested opening up the space as much as possible for better sight line.

Mr. Heuberger continued his presentation by outlining that the problem with the mezzanine is that it has a floor to ceiling height of about seven feet which means you cannot get air under there and barely get lights. The floor is supported by the same structure holding up the book stacks, and that line of book stacks slices the existing library neatly in half. One of the main things he wants to achieve in the re-organization of this building, in addition to providing more space, is to provide more flexible space. When the library was designed 30 years ago, the planners had certain idea what a library should be at that point in time. Since then, libraries have changed. He cited an example of when the library was first constructed there was no audiovisual room. That department has now grown to be the most popular department in the library but unfortunately there is no room to put it. One of things he wants to change is to eliminate the mezzanine and remove the structure below it which is really the problem. The space would be put back in the form of a new mezzanine while keeping the new floor space open to accommodate the changing needs of the library. This requires raising the floor and the roof of the mezzanine which would be an additional 5 feet higher than at present.

Public Comment [Shirley Samansky]: If 200 people were in the building at the same time, where would the cars be parked. Mr. Heuberger said the major planning issue is parking. If the Library were built today, by code more parking spaces would be required. However, over time parking requirements and codes have changed. The project will require a variance. It is physically impossible to provide all the required parking on the site. Presently, there are 95 spots, but today the law would require 120. Option B would need 160 spaces. Where are we going to find those spots? A few can be eked out in the existing lot and outside the zoning lot itself. There are several options, all of which will require permission from the Village of Saddle Rock, either on street parking on Bayview Avenue of which there is a fair amount, or the Great Neck Water Pollution Control Water District site with whom they have had preliminary discussions for about 25 cars. Another possibility is a temporary overflow parking in the Saddle Rock parking lot. All of these are subject to negotiations and nothing has been decided. The detailed plans for all these

options are in the concept studies and are available on the library's website. Also, plans of all these options were displayed in the back of the room for public viewing.

He then showed a quick summary of what the plans are in relationship to each other. Option B showed the addition, the new roof and the mezzanine and the children's program area which were color coded on boards.

Plan C takes down the mezzanine and will not raise the roof. There will be less program area in the building resulting in more space sharing. Although tighter, it still preserves the essential functions and satisfies the original intent of their assignment.

Option A is the existing building which will be gutted. All the mechanical systems - the plumbing, electrical and lighting - will be changed and some walls moved around for efficient distribution of spaces. But in terms of differences in use of the existing building those gains will be limited because it is a much smaller building. Some repairs to outside of the building will be done - replacing the single pane glaze with double pane glaze. Repairs to the façade and soffits on the roofs will be done in all three schemes.

Public Comment [Jerry Schain]: Disputed that the numbers on the drawings in the back of the room are not the same as the numbers the architect presented. He added the square footage of the lower level, main level and the mezzanine and they did not reconcile with the architect's numbers. It seems terribly inefficient. Why so costly per square foot when not gaining much? The library you built in the Bronx is terrific and you can do better here. Is there a more cost effective way of doing it? Dan replied that Mr. Schain was wrong in his numbers. He provided the square footage of each option for the benefit of the public. Option A is 47,000 sq ft; Option B is 60,000 sq ft (addition is 13,000 sq ft) and Option C is 57,000 sq ft (addition is 10,000 sq ft). Ernesto Vela, assistant architect, was asked to go to the back of the room to show Mr. Schain where he was wrong in his numbers.

Dan continued his summary by presenting the building costs for each option:

Option A is the existing building, 47,000 sq ft will be gutted and renovated. There will be building new partitions, putting in new mechanicals, new electricals, new windows, new furniture will cost \$15 million. Both DattnerArchitect using an outside independent cost estimator and Park East did separate cost estimates and the two sets of numbers were given to the Library for comparison. There were minor differences and together they went through line by line and reconciled the numbers until they were the same. In some cases the numbers went up in some cases they went down.

Option B – large scheme would cost \$25 million to fix up existing building, build addition and fill with new furniture – hard costs for bricks and mortar of the building.

Option C – Renovation of the existing building, and smaller expansion and fill with new furniture will cost \$22.5 million.

Public Comment [Norman Rutta]: Present the costs as they are going to be! Dan replied that he was presenting the building costs first and then he will explain additional costs. The price tags for hard costs for the actual building of the three options are \$15, \$25 and \$22.5 which include furniture. The approximate soft costs for Option A and furniture are \$300 per sq ft; Option B \$385-390 per sq ft and Option C is somewhere in between.

The cost of the project as a whole is not only the hard cost of constructing the building. There are other costs that the Library and the Town will incur such as professional fees, library relocation and cost of moving books, insurance costs, financing, and environmental and traffic studies which are part of the site plan approval. All these are known as "soft costs" because they are not literally going into the building itself. He did not know at that point exactly what the soft costs are going to be. The Board is working on those estimates but he projects the cost to probably be between 20-25% of the hard costs. The final project cost will be the hard costs and the soft costs. For example, for a \$20 million budget, the total project would cost \$24 million

Public Comment [Lady]: For how long will the Library be closed and has the Board considered another place. Dan said the library will be closed for two years. Trustee Sokol also reiterated that it is too premature to rent space right now but the Board will do its very best.

Public Comment [Gentleman] The Public wants to know what the Board is doing. Empty building at corner of Allenwood and Middle Neck Road and the Board should talk to the people about renting. Trustee Greene said it will be taken under advisement but it is a minimum of one year or maybe two years before construction starts.

Public Comment [Stu Hochron]: Hard costs for Option A is \$15 million and soft costs about 25% that would bring it up to \$24-25 million. Last week when he asked how much the financing would be on top of the \$15 million, the number financing people gave was \$9 million which brings it up to \$24 million. Dan explained that the soft costs are estimated to be in the range of about 20-25% of the hard costs. Trustee Greene clarified that statement by explaining that the Bond Counsel was referring to the entire amount of interest payable over the term of the loan which is different from the soft costs as presented by the architect. The soft costs are the upfront expenses. He explained the difference by giving an analogy of purchasing a house for \$300,000. Even though you are going to pay back your mortgage and it is going to cost you interest over 20 or 30 years to pay back your mortgage, it is not considered a part of the price of the house. Whereas the broker's fees, the attorney's fees, etc, are considered a part of the house. The same concept applies and the interest is not considered a part of the initial upfront costs.

The floor was now open to comments and or questions from the Trustees followed by the public.

Trustee Eshaghoff: From listening to Board deliberations and public comments over the past several months, the Board is taking into account the public's sentiments that the

library should not be as big as the last scheme or maybe should not be as big as Option B. Personally, she is looking at the smaller plan. Plan B is not a fait accompli. The Board is thinking about other options and the public should not assume that because Plan B is more developed that is the direction in which the Board is going. Regarding temporary space, in a year from now the environment of the Old Village and downtown Great Neck will be different. There will be different vacancies and as we get closer to the one year date the Board will be looking for vacancies. As Chair of the Branch Committee, she addressed some of the Station Branch issues. We are going in an exciting direction as to new spaces but she cannot go into the specifics, but they are considering a bigger space and that will help some of the overflow from the closure of Main. We are all working very hard so our tax dollars are spent wisely. We were elected to represent all of you and you should feel confident that we are working very hard for you.

Trustee DiCamillo read a prepared statement which is attached to these Minutes.

Public Comment [Gentleman]: Wanted to know if Trustee DiCamillo had discussed her concerns with her fellow Trustees. She replied that she had but this has to be discussed in public.

Trustee Sokol, in addressing one of Trustee DiCamillo's comments, said that referendum would come first. It's virtually certain that the plans will go before the Town of North Hempstead for plan approval prior to the referendum.

Trustee Greene in responding to Trustee DiCamillo's statement, said when she put together a whole bunch of specific issues and not even getting to the issues of comparative costs with other buildings, it is specious to talk about the cost of buildings that may have been completed years or months ago under different circumstances and sites. Every building is unique, every site is unique, and every real estate is unique. This particular building was valued independently by two cost estimators and they came out on the same page. If you are saying you do not like these designs because these designs lead to these costs, it is fine. The issue of different buildings can be looked at and should be compared but the emphasis should be on comparing apples and apples and not apples and oranges. Also, if a building was completed two to three years ago, there was until very recently a 1% per month inflationary cost. He then asked for the architect and the construction manager to address specific issues of Trustee DiCamillo's statement as traffic aisles, parking safety, borings, and too much glass.

Mr. Heuberger, speaking of collapsing walls, said that one of the things this project will be doing is fixing many of the things on the site which are not part of the building including the retaining wall along the parking lot which is in a poor state of repair. The structural engineer looked at the wall, and valued different ways of fixing it. One is a temporary fix which might last for 5 years or much longer. The other was to tear down and rebuild the wall which will cost more but it will last longer. That is one of the many things that go into the final costs of the project. So it is not right to compare one project with another. Our building is not particularly expensive. Good quality construction is

expensive. It is not the cheapest building he could come up with, and he does not want to design the cheapest building because cheap buildings don't last. This is a public institution and once completed will require relatively little maintenance. It is located in a fairly challenging environment, near the ocean and a lot of salt in the air. We have addressed the issue of spending money on superfluous things and we have come up with a program in the smallest possible envelope and efficient building

The Library is very dense in terms of the furniture and things that go in and when compared to other libraries, one of the remarkable things about this library is the extent of the collection for a small town, very large collection. Not growing the collection as part of this project but we are rearranging and not wasting space in the building.

Boring issue – The architect encouraged everyone to read the report. There have been concerns regarding the soundness of the building and they have no intentions of building an unsound building. Plans are in the concept stage at this point. There were existing borings done at the site in 2003 and no reason to believe site is geologically much different in 2009. Those borings were used to do conceptual design of what the foundation will be. When the actual foundations are designed, more borings will be done because the law requires it and because the architect wants to get the borings exactly where they are going to need them. His drawings illustrate conceptually what these new footings and foundations would be like. There will be a footing near the pond. The water table is high and therefore the footings will be on piles. We have different options of which types of piles to use. And this will be answered after further studies are done.

Parking lot safety – He has heard at a previous meeting that the parking lot was dangerous. All parking lots are inherently not the safest place in the world but there is nothing that he has heard that there is something particularly dangerous in this lot. There is one issue which is dangerous specific to this parking lot is that the sanitation truck goes on a random zigzag path to the lower level parking lot where the trash is located. With no room to turn around, the truck reverses 500 ft and then makes several maneuvers to exit the lot. In the new design, the trash will be located in a new area of the parking lot which is not visible but closer to the entrance where the sanitation truck makes u turn around the traffic circle, picks up the garbage and leaves. So safety is a concern. It is true that the lot does not meet the current municipal code standards but it is not dangerous. Standards change over time and vary from municipality to municipality.

Too much glass – Part of the reason for the glass is to take advantage of the magnificent views of the pond and secondly to minimize the use of electric lights in the building and save energy. Glass used today is more energy efficient and although a fair amount of glass is on one side of the building, half of the building has no windows whatsoever. If it was a regular building with all four sides exposed, it would be an average building with a fair amount of glass.

Operating cost of new building – You are dealing with mechanical plant that is so old and probably was poorly conceived at design. At time of design, it was the idea that fresh air

could be supplied through the space above the ceiling tiles without metal ducts. Over time the little holes in the tiles through which the air was supposed to flow have clogged with dust and the system is not well balanced and inefficient. Energy savings of 25-30% are not out of the question. The Bronx Library, designed by DattnerArchitect, is the first LEED Certified public building in New York City and it got a very high rating. Whether designed as LEED Certified building or simply as very environmentally responsible building, the new building will be doing many of the same things. In the Bronx Library for example they save 20% above the current energy code.

Trustee Greene: What about the criticism that you factor in too much soft costs? It should be 10%? We were asked to give an estimate and that's what we did. The Board has to collect information as to what the soft costs are going to be. These are all knowable costs e.g, the cost of location. You can see what the cost might be of a two-year lease on a building on Northern Boulevard or wherever for relocation. The professional fees are more or less known.

Trustee Greene asked if value engineering is a way of maintaining the same structure but save money. He asked if he could apply value engineering to say \$22.5 million to save some money and how much? Dan explained that value engineering is getting more value for your dollar. It can happen in several ways – we might be able to shrink the building, reassess the program in ways that don't impact the library function but result in a smaller building, might have several competing mechanical systems at different prices or maybe able to simplify certain features of the system that give same thing but at a more economical cost., or substitute some of the materials at a lower cost. The building is bigger with more space to be heated and cooled, so some of the savings may have to given back. Nevertheless we may be at the break even point or slightly ahead because the existing building is at such poor performance.

Public Comments [Stu Hochron]: Based on this year's \$200,000 budgeted for heating/electricity, 25% savings is \$50,000. Based on his calculations, it would take 20 years to save \$1 million on this \$15 million investment based on new elements proposed. Is it worth it? Trustee Pizer, in addressing Mr. Hochron, reiterated that the reason for these meetings is that the Board has to make some decisions. They understand. Plan B is very large and expensive, but his argument is specious. He did not buy his co-op because he had to pay 'x' amount of interest over the years but because of what was the best loan to take to reduce those costs. So that is the kind of decision making process the Board is involved in. It is important for Great Neck to have an environmentally sensitive library that reduces its carbon footprint that helps its children and grandchildren and great grandchildren and the whole community to have a better place to be. Those are the decisions the Board will initially make but the final decision rests with the public. For those who do not have grandchildren as yet, it will be a decision they will make and will factor into whether or not the initial payment above what they are paying for the library is worth it.

Trustee Kaplan: Thanked everyone for coming. We represent you and are elected by you. We are trying hard to do our job. The building is 40 years old. If we don't take care of it now we will be sorry down the road and will have to pay a greater amount of money at that time. We are trying to give you a plan that is best suited for this community. But ultimately it is your decision to pass this referendum or not.

Trustee Solomon: As trustees we are working to come up with a good decision. As members of this community we will be affected by this decision just like you will be. During the construction period we understand your concern of not having a library and programs for those two years. It is a big concern of ours. We have to decide what we want to do and how to do it. At this point we are talking about what to do. Although the library will close, the programs will continue without interruption somewhere, somehow.

Trustee Sokol assured the audience that the trustees have not yet decided on a plan and they will not be repeating the errors of the past. We will be seeking support of the key people in the community to make this happen.

Trustee DiCamillo wanted to make certain everyone understands what she was asking for when she asked for an operating budget – it is the recurring budget for additional staff, additional landscape, additional air conditioning and heating and any other costs related to the larger building. She does not think there will be much cost saving.

Public Comment [Gentleman]: Increasing aging population and in all fairness the library should make provisions for the special needs of this population. How are the Board's plans consonant with these goals? Dan said in several ways: first of all, they are making the building accessible – the bathroom and mezzanine are not code compliant as to access. Better lighting and more meeting room spaces will enrich programs that seniors find attractive. Library space will not be designed for single use. Seniors use library mostly during the weekday hours during the day and it will be used by other population as most spaces can be shared.

Public Comment [Lady]: Lives in Atria and does not drive. Any provisions made by the library for transportation? Trustee Pizer said that the Atria has a van but this is something that will be explored at another time.

Frank Messano, Construction Manager, following up on Trustee DiCamillo's question said that he worked on two of the libraries she talked about, Syosset Public Library and another one and he will dig up all the construction costs, the soft costs and put together a report for the Board for the next meeting. He will also adjust the cost to factor in inflation. We are carrying a contingency budget – 10% for design and 5% for construction – in the budget. It would be lax to reduce these contingencies now and then later have to increase. \$300 per sq ft for new addition and renovation construction for 40,000 sq ft. is not uncommon. Right now construction costs for a new school building run about \$350 per sq ft.

Trustee Greene: Choosing one of the three designs is a collaborative process that also includes members of leadership positions in the community, adjoining villages and particularly Mayor Samansky, whom he publicly thanked. No one individual will have greater input than the other in the decision process. Secondly, on the matter of the environmental issue, the Board should move forward with the approvals before the referendum based on advice from counsel and the architect. The Environmental Consultant had stated that she needs a plan to begin her work. We are not prepared to endorse a plan at the moment.

At this point Trustee Greene motioned for the environmental consultant to move forward with her work.

Upon motion by Andrew Greene, seconded by Varda Solomon, it was,

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees authorize the environmental consultant to begin the process of environmental approvals utilizing Plan C which is the smaller addition proposed by the architect and that by such direction the Board of Trustees does not endorse that plan to the exclusion of any other possible plans.

Trustee DiCamillo stated that she would like the Board to formally adopt a plan and give the architect a budget in order to move forward. Trustee Greene informed her that the Board is on the verge of adopting a plan hopefully in November. It is very wise since we spent the money on the architect and the environmental consultant and we want to move forward with this plan for a referendum; and we want to put it to the Board before we get the referendum that we start the lengthy process of environmental approvals at this time. Since inflation will kick in sometime in the future, it will end up costing more money to build this project. The consultant also said that the plan can be modified later on if necessary. We are using the smaller in order to move forward with the environmental issues. It would waste the public's money not to do it.

Trustee Pizer: She cannot adopt Plan C at this time but is interested in a modification of Plan C, maybe a possible Plan D. if Plan C is used as a starting point for the SEQRA process we can get smaller but not bigger.

Trustee Solomon supported Plan C for the purpose of the environmental consultant to move forward but she was not willing to make a decision until after the November 10th meeting at Parkville. The Board pledged themselves to three meetings and she would like to hear from all segments of the community before making that decision. Some of the trustees came out and agreed with Trustee Solomon's sentiments regarding this. Trustee DiCamillo said the Parkville meeting is November 10th only two weeks away and she does not understand what two weeks is going to matter. She strongly feels that the Board should adopt a plan, present a budget and move forward.

Public Comments [Norman Rutta]: Sounds like the Board is eliminating a plan. Timing of vote is incorrect since you have not heard the comments from Parkville residents and as a Board you have not chosen a plan.

Mayor Samansky: He understands the zeal to move forward with certain aspects of a plan or environmental work but many issues are involved in the environmental and zoning work which goes beyond the footprint of the building. That includes parking. No decision reached; no agreement among the villages and the Town with respect to any plan and any parking conditions. There is still talk about parking at the Sewer District site which he thought was not going to happen. If that is not the case, then that would put him in a position that if the environment and zoning issues come up before a resolution of all the issues are made, he will have to object because one of things he objected to is parking at the Sewer District. He suggested for the Board to hold off until after the Parkville meeting and together decide on a plan then you can really move forward. Trustee Greene replied that there is no guarantee the Board will reach a consensus at the November meeting. It could be another month or so before we reach an agreement. The consensus is that the costs attached to Plan B are quite lofty and the height of the building might be objectionable to some members of the community. Have a better chance of going forward with the smaller plan and that is why he is proposing to utilize Plan C, not as final but a tentative plan. He assured the Mayor that he does not have to be concerned about parking at the Sewer District site because it is not going in that direction.

Public Comments [Barbara Zeller]: It is clear that the motion made way for the environmental study to be done; not losing anything in doing it but it is a step to move forward.

Public Comment [Gentleman]: Option A does not require environmental approval if remaining in the existing footprint. Kim Gennaro replied that every action taken by the Board needs environmental approval.

Trustee DiCamillo: Board should consider how the people of Parkville might feel. They may not understand the concept of this resolution and it will appear that a vote was taken on the plan without having input from that particular community that has not had the benefit of this meeting. Trustee Greene said the Board meetings are Great Neck wide meetings and any inference to that effect is contrary to the wording of the motion; it does not represent an endorsement of any particular plan.

Trustee Pizer: Many of these issues have to happen concurrently and not consecutively. The largest thing that has to happen is the SEQRA process which takes longer than the zoning process and the Town. She suggested starting with the one taking the longest rather than have all issues pending.

Public Comments [Ralene Adler]: Under the environmental consultant's contract for \$22,000 is the obtaining of a letter of Non Jurisdiction. The full SEQRA review is not under current contract. Submitting Plan C may require full SEQRA review which is not

under current contract, and if that is not the plan you want, you may be wasting more money. Wait two weeks and do it properly!

Kim Gennaro: Our contract includes the full SEQRA review and not just coordination with the DEC. the Board is giving authority to start collecting data. Applications will not be filed until a plan has been approved by the Board.

Mayor Samansky: If you are going to start collection of data about some construction on the site, a motion and a plan are not needed since an application is not being filed. He suggested that the environmental consultant request direction from the Board to start collecting data. Ms. Gennaro said that traffic and parking are affected by the size of the building and she will not start that aspect until she receives a plan from the Board.

Harold Lutz: From traffic standpoint, he will collect traffic data from the existing library in order to have a base of traffic and demand that the existing facility generates but he cannot add any projected demand until the proposed size is known. He asked the Board to consider the parking lot options – A, B and C which are not necessarily tied to options A, B and C of the building. So he would need a decision on which parking schemes to review. If the Board should choose Option C for the building, he could still collect existing data which would not negatively impact on a decision that the Board would make two weeks later. No motion was needed to collect data so the environmental consultant and the traffic engineer will be moving forward in collecting data. Therefore, the motion on the table was withdrawn by Trustee Greene and he directed the environmental consultant to start collecting data.

OPEN TIME

Public Comments [Dana Epifan]: Thanked the Board for hearing the public. She hoped that future children will appreciate all the decisions made and she hopes it will be a frugal one. Raising salary of Library Director who's been here only half a year. Think clearly!

Public Comments [Jean Pierce]: Referring to the FAQ handout, she wanted to know how the Library will meet Town parking requirements if the sewer district site cannot be used. Handout said 'few if any trees' will be cut down while one of the parking options calls for 23 trees to be removed. Library closed during construction is misleading – not 'likely' but it is going to be closed. Would there be a green building, the answer is no! How will new building look? Maybe you should go to Kings Point Village Hall, it has copper roof and it has not weathered. What is the life expectancy of the new building? Why can't you use same furniture? Where will the 75 staff members work during three years of construction? The Board should first decide how much the taxpayers can afford and then tell the architect. Station Branch lease expiring and possibility of branch moving and rent increase – where will the money come from? She suggested doing Plan A and use a part of the money to buy a building for the Station Branch.

Public Comments [David Werber]: Programming of this building was based on materials going back to 10 years ago; radical changes in technology and how information is obtained. The architect's numbers are arbitrary instead of based on current study in terms of true needs. Surprised of selective use of adherence to codes for parking. You decide it is not necessary for environmental and ADA standards. H looked at the plans and the differences are not that significant but he wished there were more choices with significant differences. He suggested that the architects come up with something more creative. Based on the numbers, the cost per sq ft for the new addition in Plan B and Plan C works out to approximately \$800 per sq ft when compared to \$278 per sq ft for renovating the existing building, which is very expensive. True up to date space study based on the standards of today where most people are using Kindle and not using books, should be taken into consideration.

Public Comments [Stu Hochron]: How much spent since 1996 to develop all the plans, architect fees, and environmental consultants to date? Trustee Greene asked the Business Manager to have that answer for the November 10th meeting. Mr. Hochron said that it appears that to proceed with a \$15 million plan, the tax increase for an average \$1 million home would be \$50 or \$95 a year. How much will it cost in additional taxes to pay rent increase for Station? Trustee Eshaghoff replied that there is the possibility of increasing the size of Station in the same shopping center. The rent is being negotiated. The last version of what we were thinking about was half the price being paid now. So we went from paying half to might be paying a little more. Mr. Hochron contended that the people in the Plaza are not informed of what is going on.

Trustee Pizer: stated that the library is the only taxing venue in Great Neck that has not increased taxes for the last four years and the Board is looking to still save money and not increase taxes.

Public Comments [Pam Marksheid]: Thanked the Board and appreciated the information provided. She thanked Trustee Eshaghoff personally for moving ahead as it is very important to the residents of the Plaza to keep the Station Branch where it is currently. Are there plans for the employees of the Main Library during the renovation when the library is closed? Do you intend to use LED lighting which is being installed in Buckingham Place to save money? Dan replied in the affirmative. Will some of the materials currently in Main be sent to the branches for storage? If it does not work out with Station Branch, is it possible to have a separate meeting to discuss what's going on with location of the Station Branch. The Library Director plans on consulting with other libraries that have gone through this to see what collections they have kept available to the public. She will be talking to her library staff and see what kind of materials people are requesting and what is the most desired by patrons. The branches probably will not have a lot of room and a temporary location will be needed to have that core collection available to the public. On the matter of staffing, the descending order of importance will be looked into and layoffs will start with the part-timers because there won't be space to keep everyone. This is a fairly common practice when a library goes through a renovation.

Public Comments [Michael Currie]: (1) You listed various items that would be part of the soft costs which would be 20-25% of the actual cost. The listing given does not depend on which plan is chosen so the percentage of the cost is unknown. Dan replied that the soft costs are just a range to have some idea but it will be less for the cheaper building and higher for the expensive building. The actual soft costs will not remain a mystery forever but will be determined by the Board. You will actually get a number. It could be less than the 20-25% range. (2) There are two choices about redoing the retaining wall on side of pond, which one is in budget? Architect replied that it is the most expensive. (3) Borings to be done closer to when doing the plans but can open the same sort of Pandora box as going to the Town and listening to all zoning problems. I do not think that should be held off because that can make a major change in all three costs because it is common to all three plans. The architect informed him that he used borings that were done in 2003 to do his concept design. But upon moving forward to the design stage, he will do supplemental borings which are required by Law. It is not prudent to spend money now. (4) Suggested a two-tier parking to get out of the problem as an alternate to on street parking and using the Sewer District. Dan stated that below ground parking is very expensive. (5) At last week's meeting, the furnishings were part of the soft costs but now the architect is saying that they are a part of the hard costs. Dan replied that they are a part of the hard costs, and that there must have been a misunderstanding.

Public Comments [Norman Rutta]: Want to know money is going to be spent very judiciously.

Public Comments [Paul Shapiro]: Are solar panels considered at all? The use of LED lighting to light the entire building. Dan replied that there are a few solar panels in the project. Senior parking is a flight of stairs to the main entrance and a long walk to get to the street level. It must be close to any ramp that is being done and should be beyond code requirement.

Public Comments [Jean Pierce]: Not getting 25 spaces at Water Authority. Trustee Greene responded that it is an option that is still on the table. It is not correct to say we are not getting it. What is determined is that we are looking at other options and are not pursuing the Sewer District site at this time Are you removing the trees? Trustee Greene replied that there are three options for the parking lot, removing three, nine or 23 trees and a decision has not yet been made. What is the life expectancy of the new building? Dan replied that it is difficult to project; maybe for 50 years but it needs to be maintained along the way.

Public Comments [Paul Shapiro]: If building is gutted, consideration of putting a tap hats on the building and structurally supporting the roof in a way that the tap hats could be extended in the future

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 10:40 p.m., Trustee DiCamillo moved and Trustee Solomon seconded for the Board to go into executive session to discuss the Library Director's contract and salary for 2010. The Board returned to open session at 10:50 p.m.

The Personnel Committee had met and recommended that the Board adopt a \$5,000 raise for Library Director.

On motion by Andrew Greene and seconded by Marietta DiCamillo, it was

RESOLVED that effective January 1, 2010, the President is authorized to sign an amended contract increasing the salary of the Director Jane Marino, from its present level to \$125,000 per annum.

Vote: Yes 7 – (DiCamillo, Eshaghoff, Greene, Kaplan, Pizer, Sokol, Soloom)
Motion carried unanimously

Trustee Kaplan thanked everyone for coming and for doing a wonderful job. Special thanks went to the architects, who had already left, to Trustee Eshaghoff for the wonderful job done and also to Mayor Samansky.

On motion by Varda Solomon and seconded by Josie Pizer, the meeting was adjourned at 10:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Eshaghoff
Secretary of the Board of Trustees