



BUILDING AUTHORITY

CITY OF NOVI

Building Authority Meeting

Thursday, March 20, 2008 | 8 A.M.

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile Road

Meeting was called to order at 8:07 a.m.

Members Present: Larry Czekaj, Julie Farkas, Rob Hayes (arrived 8:39 a.m.),
Clay Pearson, Steve Rumble, Kathy Smith-Roy, Mark Sturing

Others Present: Mary Ellen Mulcrone, Barb Rutkowski, Melissa Place

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Farkas; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the agenda with addition of item 5. Furniture, Fixture, and Equipment Contract Update. (Hayes absent)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Sturing, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the minutes of February 28, 2008 as amended, February 21, 2008, March 5, 2008, March 5, 2008 Joint, and March 6, 2008 as presented.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

1. Approval of schematic for interior of Library

Ms. Browne opened the discussion for ways to take area out of the building to reduce the square footage. There are two options for consideration. Option A is to take 5 feet off the west wall. Option B is to take 2 feet from the west wall, 18 inches in the middle, and 18 inches from the east side. Some concerns with taking the space out of the east side, may be problematic. Diamond and Schmitt think it can be done but are recommending the reduction be from the west side of the building. Mr. Czekaj asked for an explanation. Ms. Browne said the loss of 18 inches would be felt on the east end and not the west. The east area already is tight in terms of space. Mr. Schmitt concurred the impact will be great on the east side. Ms. Farkas asked if handicap access will be affected. Ms. Browne said no.

Ms. Smith-Roy asked if the middle section reduction can be added to the east and west reduction? Ms. Browne said 12% is staff work space and any additional reduction would make it tighter so the west is much more forgiving. The option of moving the sorting area for more public use area on the north side might be an option. The general layout is consistent with a few minor shifts starting to settle down. Mr. Czekaj inquired about the two-story to a single in the meeting area. He asked if the \$30,000 savings can be used towards making that useable space. Mr. Schmitt commented the 55,000 square feet needs to be firm. The total space needs to stay for cost savings. His concern is that there is less flexibility over time. Mr. Sturing commented a two floor building is cheaper to build because one roof, foundation, etc. The addition of a second floor above the auditorium involves drywall and mechanical. Mr. Czekaj said adding a second floor above the auditorium should not cost \$200 per square foot. Mr. Schmitt commented to build space above the meeting room involves lifting the perimeter walls, adding a floor, electrical, heating, etc. Mr. Czekaj said in other words, the plan can be cut back by 5 feet and call it a day. Mr. Schmitt said that is a fair comment.

Ms. Farkas is more confident with the square footage reduction after reviewing the collection. Mr. Czekaj asked if by moving the seating closer to the shelves there is no loss of shelving space. Ms. Browne said yes. Mr. Schmitt commented the reduction of 5 ft. on the west wall maintains the good elements of the plan. The recommendation is to reduce the west wall by 5 feet for less impact on programming, and while providing some relief on the capital costs. Mr. Sturing commented if the 5 feet is removed from the west wall, can the ceiling of the auditorium be constructed to add space at a later date, or as a second story shell. Mr. Schmitt said they would look at that as an option.

Mr. Czekaj clarified the reduction of 2,000 square feet does not reduce programming. Ms. Browne referred to the reduction list reviewed by Ms. Farkas. Mr. Pearson said it is important to make a determination now on the square footage before reviewing the list. Mr. Sturing said space reduction should be the last choice. Ms. Farkas is comfortable with the square footage based on review of the collection. Mr. Sturing said it will not cut the collection? Ms. Farkas confirmed she is comfortable with the reduction off the west side and that the collections will not be impacted.

Motion by Rumple, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the schematic design reflecting the reduction of 2,000 square feet from the west wall for a total 55,000 square foot building. (Hayes absent)

Motion by Pearson, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the interior schematic design as illustrated to this date.

2. Update on review and recommendation to award Technology Consultant Services

Ms. Farkas commented the review team met on March 4 to assess four proposals. She referred to material distributed to the Board Members and commented the top scoring firms were recommended for an interview. The two firms asked to interview were Barton Malow and Fanning-Howey. The review team held the interviews on March 13, 2008. The recommendation of the review team is for Fanning-Howey to provide technology consultant services. Mr. Sturing would like an explanation of the "anticipated hours" discrepancy in the proposals. Ms. Farkas deferred to Mr. Rob Petty who explained Fanning-Howey gave a detailed level analysis.

Motion by Sturing, seconded by Pearson, CARRIED: To agree with the review team's recommendation and based on legal review of the contract with Fanning-Howey to provide Technology Consultant Services.

Yeas: Farkas, Hayes, Pearson, Rumple, Smith-Roy, Sturing Nays: Czekaj

Discussion

Mr. Czekaj commented 990 hours is 22 ½ weeks or 4 months of billable time. He is concerned with overlap. The BEI/Diamond and Schmitt proposal included some technology work. His suggestion is to include a not-to-exceed amount in the contract. Ms. Farkas asked Mr. Petty if the hours seem inflated. Mr. Petty said no because they will have people on site, with operational experience to work with staff and will be attending meetings. There is a large amount of complex equipment that needs to be integrated into the building structure and operations. Ms. Rutkowski commented they will provide expertise with work stations, servers, phone system, and security.

Mr. Czekaj mentioned BEI/Diamond and Schmitt are in place. Maybe the Library Board should authorize half of the project cost. What is BEI/Diamond and Schmitt's perspective? Mr. Kittides said there is a lot of technology to consider and clearly it is a separate piece. Mr. Czekaj said BEI will incorporate this discipline. Mr. Schmitt explained they will work in unison with Fanning-Howey. However, Diamond and Schmitt does not manage the work, and the technology consultant will do

their own drawings. Ms. Farkas commented Mr. Kittides had reviewed the Request for Proposal document.

3. Approval of project schedule update provided by BEI/Diamond and Schmitt

Mr. Sturing said under the March 6, 2008 comment section, it should reflect schematics approved and revised based on costs. What are the other changes? Mr. Kittides said the change will be noted on the next version of the schedule. There is a change with the preliminary site plans being moved forward to the April 30th Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Sturing commented the period to design and review design seems unrealistic to the time for preparation of bids for the contractor. Mr. Hayes said five weeks is reasonable.

Mr. Rumble commented it is not ideal to start a project in November. The schedule delay of five weeks is significant to the time frames proposed. Mr. Pearson asked if there was any way to submit preliminaries on April 24? Mr. Kittides said work needs to be done with utilities and landscaping. They cannot produce quality contract documents in four or five weeks. Mr. Czekaj asked what has taken place since March 6? The only thing changed is 5 feet off the west wall. BEI/Diamond and Schmitt has had two weeks to do work. Does the plan need to go to the Planning Commission? Can we make the April 16 Planning Commission meeting? Mr. Rumble answered it would not be possible to meet the April 16 meeting. Mr. Sturing said the Building Authority needs to see what happens at the April 30 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Czekaj stressed the importance to make the April 3 date for preliminary site plan submission. Mr. Schmitt agrees.

Mr. Rumble asked what happens if construction does not start until next spring? Mr. Czekaj said the idea was to have the option to start construction before the winter months. Mr. Rumble just wanted to know if the window of opportunity for construction beginning late fall was closing. Mr. Sturing commented, he agrees with the schedule up to May 1, but dates need to be reviewed post May 1. He would like to see the project start this fall, and reiterated the plans are to be on the Planning Commission agenda on April 30, and the Board will move forward from there.

4. Discussion of Project cost reduction options

Ms. Farkas began the discussion by asking that the second elevator and generator be bid alternates. Mr. Czekaj said he would suggest a bid package of \$1.4 million or 30% reduction now and the remaining at a later time. Mr. Pearson said if the generator is a bid alternate, the wiring needs to be done now so that it is ready to go at a later date. Mr. Sturing agrees.

Mr. Kittides explained some items in the proposed list lend themselves as bid alternates. Mr. Schmitt commented the building envelop has been fixed and agreed some items on the list can be bid as alternates. Mr. Pearson asked what would affect the schedule? Can the curved wall be changed weeks from now?

Ms. Smith-Roy said it is to the City's advantage to look at the cost savings list. The City will have additions later. She has five items for bid alternates and six items to take off the list. Mr. Czekaj asked for discussion. Mr. Schmitt said an elevator cannot be a bid alternate. Keep the shaft and bid both elevators. Ms. Farkas mentioned that further reduction in meeting room glass and long with the west wall may be an option. Mr. Hayes commented there may be some cost savings with the storm water. Mr. Kittides said they will look at the bio-swales. Mr. Rumble suggested a fund-raising campaign such as brick pavers for the terrace to defer cost.

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Pearson; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the deletion of the following items for a cost savings of \$109,000 and as amended by Sturing and Farkas.

- **delete 2 story youth reading room \$80,000**
- **delete separate children's patio \$15,000**
- **reduce extent of glass on west wall \$11,000**
- **reduce extent of glass at 200 seat meeting room \$3,000**

Discussion

Mr. Czekaj likes the glass along the west wall. Ms. Browne said there is less glass on the west wall on the second floor and there are blinds except in the children's area. Mr. Ruple commented the use of plantings will reduce sun along the west side. Mr. Sturing said the cost is \$105,000 for all other areas to operate. Ms. Browne said only along the west wall and meeting area. Mr. Czekaj asked what if all the blinds were eliminated. Ms. Browne commented the savings would not be the entire \$105,000. Is this something the Board wants us to review? Mr. Sturing would like clarification. Ms. Smith-Roy explained the blinds are for areas that have been recommended. Mr. Czekaj commented there may be heating and cooling situations. BEI will help with the bid package.

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Hayes; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the deletion of the following items for a cost savings of \$145,000:

- **Remove 2nd floor male washroom \$15,000**
- **Radiant heating at children's areas floor slab \$32,000**
- **Emergency generator \$80,000**
- **Receiving dock flat paved: delete dock leveler \$18,000;**

And approve the following items to be considered as bid alternates, or to seek other options:

- **After-hours roll-down security grilles \$42,000**
- **Cistern for roof storm runoff/landscape irrigation \$142,000**
- **Well drilling/installation as alternate to item above**
- **Green roof**
- **50% of motorized blinds along west windows**
- **Site eliminations (traditional vs. bioswale)**
- **Brick paver fund raising program vs. concrete**
- **Single elevator options (if any)**
- **Ask FF&E Consultant to review millwork and built-in shelving items for other alternatives**

As amended by Smith-Roy and Sturing.

Discussion

There was continued discussion regarding cost reductions. Mr. Schmitt suggested the generator could be purchased in the future as suggested in earlier discussions by installing the necessary wiring now. Mr. Hayes clarified that the generator would be for emergency functions such as technology systems back-up and emergency lighting. Mr. Czekaj said the Board has done their due diligence to reduce the project cost.

5. Furniture, Fixture, and Equipment contract update.

Ms. Farkas commented Library Design has been working with Library staff. The City Attorney's office is currently reviewing the contract.

Discussion

Mr. Hayes said the Engineering Department has received the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, and the site is clean. Mr. Czekaj asked for clarification that no Phase II is required. Mr. Hayes commented the report does not include interior. Mr. Schmitt said interior is needed. A hazardous materials report needs to be provided to the contractors. Mr. Hayes will obtain quotes and proceed.

Audience Comments

Mary Ellen Mulcrone is disappointed with some of comments because she feels decisions were made on appearance and not function.

Motion by Sturing, seconded by Farkas; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 10:13 a.m.

Minutes approved April 17, 2008