



**BUILDING AUTHORITY MEETING
TUESDAY, AUGUST 28, 2007 AT 8:00 AM**

**NOVI PUBLIC LIBRARY
MEETING ROOM – 45245 W. TEN MILE ROAD**

The meeting was called to order at 8: 10 a.m.

Current Building Authority Members Present: Pamela Antil, Larry Czekaj, John Hines (arrived 8:25 a.m.), Kathy Smith-Roy, Mark Sturing

Future Expanded Building Authority Members Present: Rob Hayes (New), Mary Ellen Mulcrone (New), Clay Pearson (Replaces Antil), Steve Rumble (Replaces Hines)

Others Present: Thomas R. Schultz, Bob Cutler, Barb Rutkowski, Joel Dion, David Asker, Greg Van Kirk, Melissa Place

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

1. Overview of Building Authority responsibilities per State statutes (Schultz)

Mr. Schultz began by explaining City Council has delegated bond expenditure responsibilities to the Building Authority through the resolution approved at their August 13, 2007 meeting. The change in the Building Authority membership will be published and become effective October 30, 2007. The Building Authority Members are a designee on behalf of the City Council with the Building Authority being the authoritative body to execute documents. Mr. Sturing asked if the Building Authority will be issuing the bonds if the bond is approved in November. Mr. Schultz confirmed the City will issue the bonds. Ms. Smith-Roy interjected the bonds are general obligation bonds not revenue bonds as were issued for the Ice Arena and Meadowbrook Commons. Mr. Czekaj asked with this direction, where does this leave the Library Board? Mr. Schultz commented the Library Board function is as an advisory body along with and Library staff. The Library Board will continue to be informed but the final determination, for the project is with City Council now delegated to the Building Authority since the City is obligating the bonds.

2. Overview of process and responsibilities including City Council delegation of authority for expenditure of \$16 million bond proceeds if approved by voters (Pearson)

Mr. Pearson reiterated the approval of the resolution by City Council at their August 13, 2007 meeting along with the confirmation that the changes in Building Authority Members will be effective October 30, 2007. The resolution supports the continued open communication and that City Council has outlined the framework of a process to award a construction firm and project manager. This discussion is to bring people up to speed. Library Board and staff have done

preliminary work for pre-qualifications for architectural firms. Mr. Schultz commented there has been no legal review on the final project or legal documents drafted to date. Mr. Pearson said everyone involved will make recommendations. The Building Authority will not make technical decisions because the Library Board and staff will be deferred to as the operating expertise. We want to be ready to start construction in 2008 if at all possible.

3. New Novi Public Library Projected Project timeline and process (Plante & Moran)

Mr. Van Kirk started the discussion by referring to the Novi Library Program Review 2006 assembled by Plante & Moran in April 2006. This document outlines project perimeters.

Mr. Van Kirk distributed a draft evaluation of architects submitting to the RFP. Mr. Czekaj commented the document prepared by Plante & Moran is a good synopsis of the timeline and choices related to construction and project management. Mr. Van Kirk said the typical timeframe from architectural selection to construction completion is 24-36 months. The subject of architectural firm pricing has not been addressed.

Mr. Sturing asked about soil borings. Mr. Van Kirk answered that the soil boring and groundwater survey samples were all clean. These are important factors to make sure the foundation is built on normal footings so as to not incur hidden costs during construction. Mr. Asker mentioned there were 13 borings done and nothing jumped out at this time. Mr. Hines asked how deep were the borings? Mr. Van Kirk mentioned 6 to 25 feet with the average being 13 feet. Mr. Czekaj interjected that the Library Board has been in communication with the Novi Community Schools regarding boundary issues and have a positive relationship. Mr. Sturing commented the Library Board approved \$50,000 in "seed money" for things such as soil borings with the approval of the Building Authority. Mr. Czekaj clarified this was with the final approval of the Library Board.

Mr. Sturing asked for timelines for the architectural design, City plan process review, construction, and interior finish. Mr. Van Kirk commented that it takes on average 6 to 9 months to prepare architectural drawings for plan submitted and reviewed. The process can take more or less depending on how the architectural firm receives input from the Library Board and staff and how frequently in the process. Mr. Czekaj asked 9 months for final site plan approval? Mr. Van Kirk indicated it was dependent upon variables such as the type of construction oversight and project management that is chosen such as construction manager contractor (CMC), construction manager agency (CMA), or general contractor (GC). There are pros and cons to each of the management types but typically sees CMC or general contractor as the best choice for these types of municipal projects. Mr. Czekaj asked what Mr. Van Kirk prefers. Mr. Van Kirk replied general contractor if the client has time.

Mr. Cutler mentioned his experience is that some contractors will favor certain firms and that usually is not good for the project. There needs to be a project engineer overseeing the library construction. Mr. Schultz asked at what point does the Building Authority make the determination of what type of management contractor? Mr. Van Kirk said it is important to determine the type of contractor arrangement before an architectural contract is awarded. This is important for the architect to know. Mr. Schultz commented the first major decision should be a CMC, CMA, or general contractor. Mr. Van Kirk said the need for a method of how to get the project done such as delivery methods which depends of the City approval process and their possible ability to waive items. Mr. Czekaj said as a matter of record, the last two Building Authority projects there were no waivers nor was it expected. The Building Authority has always been treated as all other private and public developments. Mr. Schultz asked if it is a tight site. Mr. Van Kirk mentioned there are areas such as staging, parking, and relation to the school property to be considered over the likely 18 months construction period with the total project projected at 30 months. The interior finish

depends on the amount of wiring, cabling, etc. needed as determined by the Library Board and staff.

Mr. Pearson asked if there are other things that need to be accomplished. Mr. Van Kirk said an architectural firm should be selected before the November election to move quickly if the bond passes along with a project manager to get started the day after the election. Mr. Schultz asked what the fee would be for a general contractor and project owner. Mr. Van Kirk said 1.8% of the project. The project manager proposal should be less than 12% for all professional project fees outside of the general contractor. Mr. Sturing asked if 2% is included for bond counsel. Ms. Smith-Roy and Mr. Van Kirk both replied no.

4. Discussion of process for architectural work and selection. (Plante & Moran)

Mr. Van Kirk distributed a draft of the QBS spreadsheet for the architectural firms as a synopsis of the selection criteria ratings. Mr. Czekaj asked when the criteria spreadsheet was to be firmed up. This information is required to make sure the data is accurate before interviewing. Mr. Schultz asked if this data was for preliminary drawings. Mr. Czekaj answered it is part of the process to pick firms. Mr. Van Kirk explained these perimeters are averages of the ratings as a guide in the QBS ranking system. Plante & Moran was hired to help secure the best architect. Mr. Pearson commented this data is a start for the architectural selection with the possible use of some of the \$50,000 to get ready for the phase 1 approach of the programming. Mr. Czekaj agreed. Mr. Van Kirk pointed out the total ratings were based on a possible five points for each category and that Plante & Moran would be reviewing these numbers very closely.

5. Next steps and meeting schedule

Mr. Pearson commented how much time is needed to get a firm review of the ratings. Mr. Van Kirk answered plus or minus seven days. It was determined the next meeting is to be scheduled for Thursday, September 6, 2007 at 8 a.m. at the Novi Public Library. Mr. Czekaj mentioned that the Novi Community Schools would allow the City to use the staging area of the parking lot which will later be a single entry for the Library and the high school.

Motion made by Smith-Roy, seconded by Hines; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 9:21 a.m.

Approved September 6, 2007