



BUILDING AUTHORITY

CITY OF NOVI

Building Authority Meeting

Thursday, June 24, 2010 | 8 A.M.

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

Meeting was called to order at 8:01 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Charles Boulard, Larry Czekaj, Clay Pearson, Kathy Smith-Roy, Mark Sturing

OTHERS ABSENT: Julie Farkas (absent/excused)

OTHERS PRESENT: Rob Hayes (non-voting), Melissa Place

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Pearson, seconded by Boulard; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the agenda as amended with the addition of 1.a Meeting Schedule.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Boulard, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the May 31, 2010 meeting minutes as presented.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

1. Construction Update

The Dailey Company commented the parking lot is on schedule for completion the middle of August. The site cleanliness looks good for tomorrow night's opening reception. There is a minor punch list for interior items. The parking lot has been cut to sub-grade and looking to install the bio-swailes the first of next week. The electrical will follow and then the curb-cut, layer of stone, followed by pavement. Mr. Larry Czekaj is pleased the timetable for the parking lot completion is on schedule.

1 a. Meeting Schedule

Ms. Kathy Smith-Roy asked for this item to be added to the agenda to determine the next meeting date. The Board concurred the next meeting will be July 8, 2010.

2. Change Order Request No. 167 – Drain Tiles – BEI credit of \$2,000

Ms. Smith-Roy said the Change Order Request No. 167 is for the installation of drain tiles along the north lawn. BEI has agreed to a \$2,000 credit against the contract amount. This will be included in the next budget update as a full amount but there will be an offsetting credit on the next BEI invoice.

3. a) Review exterior lighting alternatives, and (b) Additional screening along the west side loading dock area

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded Pearson; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve a change order to the BEI contract for the lump sum amount of \$3,000 for additional services as presented in the BEI documents.

Discussion

Exterior Lighting

The first item of discussion involved the decorative lights along Ten Mile Road. There was a previous discussion at the last meeting to move every alternating light pole to Fuerst Park, said Mr. Clay Pearson. Mr. Ron McKay explained the current conduit can handle twelve fixtures but to maintain the proper lighting, no dark areas, recommend not changing the current configuration. Mr. Pearson asked for the cost to install the additional fixtures. Can we engage BEI and The Dailey Company to do this work in the future? Mr. McKay can provide the lighting design cost estimate, but there would be the need for additional trenching and therefore The Dailey Company would need to provide the estimate. Mr. Czekaj said we would be looking at lead time and installation of pedestals. Mr. Charles Boulard confirmed we are talking about not removing any poles. Mr. Czekaj said yes. Mr. Pearson clarified the direction is to have BEI scope out what would be necessary.

Mr. Czekaj commented at the last meeting he mentioned the night lighting needs for the parking lot in terms of being the most cost effective operationally. Maybe there are alternatives, like running the three fixtures in the middle island for a set time. Do we have to have the lights on all the time? Mr. McKay explained there are four circuits which included one to the sidewalk along Ten Mile, one for the exterior of the building, and two to the parking lot and Ten Mile Road. We need to determine how these are wired, and it is better to do now since the parking lot is not poured, etc. He referred to the drawing of the parking lot distributed and said running the three in the middle makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Czekaj said there would not be any new fixtures for the lot to achieve the desired outcome. Mr. McKay said that is correct. Mr. Pearson likes the flexibility and the suggestion by Mr. Czekaj regarding the three fixtures. Mr. Mark Sturing said we are talking about the 8 or 9 lights on the sidewalk circuit. Then the nine lights in the parking lot run on two separate circuits. The three lights between the property and the one closest running along the south of the school property is one circuit so that two circuits control the nine parking lot lights.

Mr. McKay said if we can change the combinations to be six and three that would be great but a change at the panel may be required. Mr. Sturing asked how the circuits are divided. Mr. Al Blair commented Mr. Adams had spoken to the electrician regarding the one circuit to the middle fixtures. Mr. Czekaj asked if all four circuits are on separate timers. Mr. McKay said it shows four but not sure all are on separate timers. Ms. Smith-Roy mentioned The Dailey Company needs to know by middle of next week. Mr. Steve Dailey said they need to know the preference from the Building Authority. It was the consensus of the Board for The Dailey Company, BEI and the electrical firm to properly assign the circuits for optimal flexibility in operations for the lighting of the parking lot.

Screening of Loading Dock

Mr. Blair explained the proposed wall will hide the dumpster and the equipment from the park. Scheme I as presented today is at a cost of \$30,000. Scheme II is a softer alternative that shows transplanting current plantings and the installation of a hedge. After three years the hedge will be six or seven feet in height. The cost for this alternative is \$2,000-\$3,000. His preference is the hedge since the wall in Scheme I would need to be reinforced. Delivery trucks can scrap the wall with the bumpers. Mr. Rob Hayes likes the hedge. Ms. Smith-Roy is not sure either is necessary. Mr. Pearson commented something is needed. The hedge seems like a cost effective solution, and the dumpster needs to be enclosed. Mr. Boulard said his first preference is the hedge since it is more forgiving. Mr. Sturing likes the hedge as well but does not know if it necessary to move plants. Maybe the use of small pines reaching five feet would give a nice shielding. Mr. Czekaj agrees as well. However, a person does not need to turn their head very far to notice the high school has not screened their dumpsters. Mr. Pearson understands but commented the Board can lead by example.

Mr. Czekaj asked why the electrical equipment is in the dumpster area. It seems the dumpster and electric equipment should be flip-flopped so that the dump truck can navigate more easily. Mr. Blair commented that it was an operational decision to have the dumpsters as close as possible to the building.

4. Budget Update

Ms. Smith-Roy said all the purchase orders from prior meetings have been processed, and there are no is significant items to note.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS – None

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 8:44 a.m.

Minutes approved July 8, 2010