



# BUILDING AUTHORITY

CITY OF NOVI

Building Authority Meeting

Thursday, January 10, 2008 | 9:30 A.M.

Activities Room | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile Road

Meeting was called to order at 9:34 a.m.

**Members Present:** Larry Czekaj (arrived 9:37 a.m.), Julie Farkas, Rob Hayes, Clay Pearson, Steve Rumple, Kathy Smith-Roy (arrived 9:35 a.m.), Mark Sturing

**Others Present:** Mary Ellen Mulcrone, Joel Dion, Melissa Place

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Sturing suggested the order of the items be changed. The suggested was to have the RFP item be #1, and then the review of Project Management matrix as #2, item #3 would be the revised project schedule and modification of contract, #4 would be the delivery method, and #5 would be the schematics review.

**Motion by Sturing, seconded by Rumple; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the agenda with proposed changes. (Czekaj and Smith-Roy absent)**

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Motion by Pearson, seconded by Rumple; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the December 20, 2007 minutes as presented. (Czekaj)**

## PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

### 1. Authorization to Issue RFP for Interior Functional Planning Consultant

Ms. Farkas began the discussion by explaining a consultant firm is needed to make sure a timely project element encompasses the FFE work with technology people and consultants. Mr. Sturing asked if there were any comments for Mr. Kittides. Mr. Kittides commented that BEI is capable of providing this service, and would like to compete for the award. Mr. Sturing would like to have this service on the team. He agrees there needs to be an interior person earlier in the process. Better to hire now than later. He has one issue with the RFP presented, which asks for 10 similar projects. He believes this is a high number for a firm to provide when asking for specific library work in the time period mentioned. He suggested it be changed to five similar projects. The consensus of the group was to change the similar projects to five.

Mr. Czekaj asked if the budget would be the same. Mr. Kittides said with the FFE package there would be no additional costs. Mr. Pearson mentioned in the project schedule on page 3, Phase II, item 1, part C gives the opportunity to tie into a task of interior consultant. Ms. Farkas said an interior person would help to pick out a free-flow floor plan. This position would give input before the project gets too deep into the building and planning process. Mr. Czekaj asked what happens

if this person does not agree with Diamond and Schmitt? Ms. Farkas replied that Diamond and Schmitt, herself and this consultant would talk before the final design.

Mr. Pearson referred item 4 regarding CAD drawings. Ms. Farkas believes this charge is built into the costs. Ms. Smith-Roy commented BEI provided CAD drawings. Mr. Sturing clarified the interior portion on CAD that BEI provided does not show dimensions of chairs, shelves, etc. only the area where chairs, shelves tables, etc. would be placed. Ms. Smith-Roy commented she and Julie will work together to format the RFP and will include other standard language like the insurance component. Ms. Farkas clarified this is an interior and FFE person. Mr. Sturing sees the proposal as either a budget focus or consulting only. Mr. Czekaj said or as a not to exceed basis or hire on a flat fee percentage. Ms. Smith-Roy said the RFP needs to be reworded to give a better understanding of scope. Mr. Pearson said we need to explain what we are looking for with this RFP. Mr. Czekaj asked if we want to make sure the drawings are conducive to what will work with an interior layout. Why hire now for a person to buy furniture? Mr. Sturing and Ms. Farkas commented their perspective is to have this person on board now. Mr. Rumble asked who works with the interior planning person. Mr. Czeakj answered the consultant would report daily to Ms. Farkas. Mr. Schmitt interjected that Diamond and Schmitt is responsible for code compliance so they would certainly be involved in discussions. Mr. Rumble wanted clarification so that the Community Development Department is aware that walls, etc. will not be moved without review and approval of the department. Mr. Sturing concluded that a revised RFP will be brought back at the next meeting. Ms. Smith-Roy said the RFP will have clarification by adding more language.

## **2. Review of Project Management For Library Construction**

The document was reviewed. There were no changes.

### **3. A. Review and Approval of Revised Project Schedule – summary of key dates/deliverables**

#### **B. Approval of Modification #1 with BEI Associates for contract time**

**Motion by Sturing, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the Revised Project Schedule and Modification #1 to the contract.**

### **4. Process to decide project delivery method (General Contractor, Construction Manager, or Design/Build).**

Item was postponed to the January 17, 2008 Building Authority meeting.

## **5. Schematics Review – BEI Associates/Diamond and Schmitt**

Mr. Don Schmitt and Ms. Sydney Browne of Diamond and Schmitt presented schematics review. Mr. Schmitt opened the presentation by explaining there are 800 parking spaces in a quarter mile radius of the library site. There are 77 more spaces at the high school than required by ordinance.

Mr. Hayes commented there is a possible use of a storm water pond located at the back of Ella Mae Power Park. Also, there may be a need of a pre-treatment requirement before emptying into the pond.

## **Site Option A**

### **Option 1**

The option identifies an independent road access. The consensus between engineering and Diamond and Schmitt was to improve the walking connections between the sites.

### **Option 2**

The option identifies a shared road access (east) with longer routes on Ten Mile Road. There are no changes to the high school parking lot but there is the removal of the road between the library site and high school parking lot.

### **Option 3**

The option identifies a shared road access (west). This option allows a vehicle to navigate between the library and high school without going on a surface road.

### **Option 4**

The option identifies a shared access across the site. This was the preferred option of the City's traffic engineer. Mr. Rumble asked if there is a need for a timing change for the signal at Ten Mile Road. Mr. Hayes responded that Oakland County is responsible for the signal. There may be some flexibility of the timing but it is programmed with the signals along Ten Mile Road at Taft and Novi Roads. Ms. Browne said the cost of construction and maintenance of roads needs to be discussed with the school. Mr. Sturing needed clarification that this option shows that the high school primary entrance would be moved, and this is the preferred recommendation of the City's traffic engineer. Ms. Browne confirmed. Mr. Pearson commented this may not be the best option for material drop-off.

## **Discussion**

Mr. Kittides commented there needs to be coordination between the school and the City. The access point has not been decided. The library can be designed without making a decision on traffic flow. Mr. Czekaj said no matter the location the schools will be looking for the library to cover the cost. Mr. Rumble interjected that curb cuts are major discussions and site plans are affected so it is critical that the staff is informed. Mr. Schmitt iterated that the options shown are based on the City's traffic engineer. Ms. Browne clarified that there could be a slight change by only a few feet since the options show the access slightly to the west of the current access. Mr. Rumble commented there is a chance it may affect the review time of the plans.

Mr. Schmitt commented their desire is to have direction as to a one or two floor option. Many people were approached for their comments regarding the various options.

### **Option 1**

This is a ground floor plan with 50,000 square feet on the first floor and 7,000 on the second with the entrance to the building to the east. The option shows the circulation area and site lines in three directions. The other staff area gives site to the youth area and a café. There is also a glass enclosed computer room. There is an elevator and stairs to access the second floor. There is a kitchen upstairs that supports the auditorium. There is office space for the Director, Assistant Director, IT staff, etc. The roof has raised areas to give natural light instead of skylights which can leak. Ms. Mulcrone likes a one floor option but has concern about noise level. Mr. Schmitt said there is no wall between the youth and adult areas but there is a wall created by shelves

which serves as a buffer. In addition, the ceiling and carpet materials help with the reduction of sound.

Ms. Farkas does not want the circulation desk staff to be the 'watchdog' for the majority of the library. This is the charge of the Reference Librarian. She would like to see the reference desk be moved out of the current area to the floor. Mr. Schmitt commented the plan is flexible so that can be reviewed.

## **Option 2**

Mr. Schmitt explained this is a ground floor plan. There are two floors. The first floor has a café, meeting rooms for a capacity of 200, restrooms, circulation desk, stairs, elevators, staff desks, and children's space. The second floor is the remainder of the collections and an enclosed youth space. Mr. Sturing said the capacity of the two meeting areas is a total of 200. Ms. Farkas said yes. Mr. Czekaj commented the trend is to have a vending machine café. Ms. Farkas said a great alternative is a vending machine-based cafe.

Mr. Schmitt said there are options for expansion. A wing might be good for meeting rooms, as an example. Mr. Czekaj asked for Mr. Schmitt's opinion as to a one or two floor building. Mr. Schmitt replied there are pros and cons to either plan. Ms. Farkas likes a one floor plan but if two floors are decided she would like more public space on the first floor. Mr. Kittides commented their desire is to have a decision today for either one or two floors. Ms. Browne reviewed Mr. Pearson's criteria from the previous meeting and the two floor option came out ahead of a one floor plan. However, either a one or two floor building will give presence along Ten Mile Road.

Mr. Pearson likes two floors. Mr. Sturing said options to build-out or options with Fuerst Farm both have appeal with the two-floor option. Mr. Pearson said two floors bring a presence along Ten Mile Road. Mr. Hayes likes two floors. The infrastructure is reduced with two floors, and it preserves green space. Mr. Rumble likes two floors which gives the possibility of expansion. Ms. Smith-Roy sees the advantages of one floor but two floors are more practical. Ms. Farkas said two floors can work but a lot of program planning needs to be considered in order for the flow to be successful. Mr. Sturing asked if additional staffing would be necessary. Ms. Farkas said it might. Mr. Czekaj likes the two floors.

**Motion by Pearson, seconded by Rumble; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To direct Diamond and Schmitt to develop a two floor option, and work with staff to define architectural features.**

## **AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

Mr. Bob Cutler likes two floors. In addition, he would like to see the children's and youth area to be on one floor.

Ms. Vicki McLean commented adults want quiet but overlap happens. Seniors typically do not want to go upstairs.

Mr. Jim McLean said adult collections are usually on the first floor.

Ms. Kathy Mutch likes the two floors. She would like to see the reference desk on one floor and the circulation desk area located in an island in the middle of the first floor.

Mr. Ramesh Verma likes two floors. He asked Mr. Schmitt if there is a storage area. Mr. Schmitt answered there is some storage.

**Motion by Sturing, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 12:20 p.m.**

**Minutes approved January 24, 2008**