



**BUILDING AUTHORITY MEETING
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2007 AT 8:00 AM**

**NOVI CIVIC CENTER
ACTIVITIES ROOM – 45175 W. TEN MILE ROAD**

Meeting was called to order at 8:05 a.m.

Current Building Authority Members: Pamela Antil, Larry Czekaj, John Hines, Kathy Smith-Roy, Mark Sturing

Future Expanded Building Authority Members: Rob Hayes arrived at 8:12 a.m. (New), Mary Ellen Mulcrone (New), Clay Pearson (Replaces Antil), Steve Rumble (Replaces Hines)

Others Present: Thomas R. Schultz, Barb Rutkowski, Margi Karp-Opperer, Greg Van Kirk, David Asker, Melissa Place

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Smith-Roy, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the agenda as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion made by Smith-Roy, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the September 6, 2007 minutes as presented.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

- 1. Continued discussion of architectural firms with possible action, direction, negotiation of contract or future interview steps.**

Mr. Czekaj opened discussion by summarizing the September 13 interviews were kept to 60 minutes per firm. At the close of the interviews, it was decided that if any member of the interview board had questions or comments they wished to have asked or clarified be forwarded to Mr. Asker for follow up.

Mr. Asker began by giving a synopsis of the process for the selection of the firms to interview. There was a pre-qualified meeting in which 20 firms showed interest and 16 firms attended. The 16 firms were reduced to 6 firms based on their proposals and four were interviewed. Mr. Asker commented questions were received by the interview panel and were asked of all four firms. All firms did a nice job and are qualified.

Mr. Van Kirk clarified some plans will include technology or cabling or the firm will subcontract another company to put in wiring. Mr. Sturing commented we must hire some other consultant to do technology and furniture? Mr. Van Kirk said as an example BEI is saying what system do you want/need? The opportunity for BEI or another

consultant to do design different is by negotiating within the scope of work of the BEI contract.

Another question was to confirm whether the bids included or did not include some construction administration. Mr. Asker commented each firm is doing what the RFP asked them to do. The architectural role is to do what is in the specifications and make sure that it is done in the field without someone in the field every day. Construction administrator must ensure the building is being built as specifications require.

The final question was what contractor and delivery methods will they use. Mr. Asker commented only Fanning Howey used a construction manager. Mr. Van Kirk said once the process is started there is no backing up. Mr. Czekaj suggested all to put down their fourth firm on paper and the most written firm is eliminated. A written tally was performed as to the person's least favorite. Mr. Asker tallied the poll and subsequently, Fanning Howey was eliminated.

Mr. Pearson commented Neumann Smith does not include technology. What is the cost of technology for this project. Mr. Asker said anywhere between \$30,000-\$50,000. Mr. Czekaj said we would be looking for an additional \$30,000 with Neumann Smith. Mr. Asker explained Neumann Smith is a design firm which will include technology in the plans but the actual design will be by another firm. Mr. Czekaj said than there would be additional money added to the proposal. If you take \$40,000 as the additional cost you are looking at a total of \$1,015,000 for the project. BEI's cost is \$906,000, and Neumann Smith \$1,015,000. Mr. Van Kirk said you are looking at 10% difference between the top and bottom firms. Mr. Czekaj commented all the firms would do a good job but we need to decide at what cost.

Mr. Van Kirk explained BEI is a bigger firm, French, and Neumann Smith own firms in the community. BEI is in Toronto and may have new ideas. Do you want to work with someone you feel most comfortable with – nice to have them around the corner. BEI typically has a higher cost but now there are rough times within the design/construction business. Mr. Pearson commented BEI has never worked on a project together even though they have bid on four other projects. They are heavy on engineering but may not be strong on interior or programming.

Mr. Asker said BEI is impressive. Ms. Antil said they are world-renowned company but the programming piece did not come through. Ms. Smith-Roy said they talked about programming at the beginning of their presentation. Mr. Czekaj commented BEI put dollars in site planning because it does not look like a cookie-cutter appearance. Mr. Hayes asked if comments would be made with a Toronto based firm. How responsive will the firm be if they are not close to the Novi area. Mr. Asker commented they are doing work in Windsor so they are in the area at times. Mr. Czekaj mentioned that French has their design member in Minneapolis and Neumann Smith in Texas. A point also to consider is that French and Neumann Smith are using an outside firm, Peter Basso Associates, for mechanical which BEI is not said Mr. Van Kirk. Mr. Hines said BEI did not include Novi elements like the other firms. Mr. Sturing said the highest point system is not always the highest cost. BEI has the most to lose. He would like the BEI team to come back to ask them what is their concept.

Mr. Czekaj said there are always biases when using an out of community firm. Mr. Van Kirk said the standard of care for French outlined a very aggressive number which says they are comfortable with the drawings. Mr. Czekaj said that could be a negotiation point. Mr. Van Kirk said yes. Mr. Sturing said we are not talking about a huge amount of money between the firms. The next phase of the discussion was listing the advantages and disadvantages to each firm. The results are as follows:

Neumann Smith Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages

- Local
- On-site once a week
- Hit the ground running
- Very responsive design
- Programming
- Close to vision statement
- Librarian presence as consultant

Disadvantages

- Cost
- On-site costs
- Warren library control points
- Mechanical, electrical weak

BEI and Diamond & Schmitt Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages

- In-house engineering
- Worldwide
- Green building

Disadvantages

- Big on engineering; little on architecture
- Novi design

French Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages

- Solid firm
- Staffing needs
- MS & R approach
- Stated 80% of cost is staffing

Disadvantages

- Project Manager never spoke
- Long-time on site planning

Mr. Czekaj commented Neumann Smith did not do their homework because maybe we will not share a driveway with the high school. BEI never got a bid out of four previous

bids. Ms. Mulcrone commented there is a clear difference between fees. Mr. Czekaj supports BEI and would like them to come back. Mr. Van Kirk said are you saying that French is no longer being considered. The group concurred. Mr. Czekaj supports BEI and would like them to come back. Mr. Van Kirk commented maybe bring back two firms. Mr. Pearson commented it sounds like we are ready to close the deal. We are asking the architectural and design team to prove that they are capable of providing a great design.

Motion made by Antil, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED: To bring BEI and Diamond & Schmitt back to discuss architectural design.

Yeas: Antil, Czekaj, Smith-Roy, Sturing Nays: Hines

Discussion

Mr. Czekaj commented if the group is not happy we can go back to Neumann Smith to answer any questions we might have unanswered. Mr. Czekaj commented both firms are more than capable so why do we want to interview. Mr. Sturing said it will give him a comfort level. Mr. Pearson said it will be a good forum for clarification on items. Ms. Smith-Roy concurred.

2. Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 27, 2007 at 8:00 a.m. for the purpose of continued discussion with BEI and Diamond & Schmitt for architectural purposes for the proposed Novi Public Library.

Motion made by Smith-Roy, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 9:43 a.m.

Minutes approved November 1, 2007