BUILDING AUTHORITY



CITY OF NOVI Building Authority Meeting Thursday, January 21, 2010 | 8 A.M. Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center |45175 W. Ten Mile Road

Meeting was called to order at 8:02 a.m.

Members Present: Charles Boulard, Larry Czekaj, Julie Farkas, Rob Hayes, Clay Pearson (arrived 8:03 a.m.), Kathy Smith-Roy (arrived 8:06 a.m.), Mark Sturing

Others Present: Barb Rutkowski, Melissa Place

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Farkas, seconded by Boulard; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the agenda as presented. (Pearson & Smith-Roy absent).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. December 3, 2009 meeting

Motion by Farkas, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the December 3, 2009 minutes as presented. (Pearson & Smith-Roy absent)

2. December 17, 2009 meeting

Motion by Farkas, seconded by Hayes; CARRED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the December 17, 2009 minutes as presented. (Pearson & Smith-Roy absent)

3. January 7, 2010 meeting

Motion by Farkas; seconded by Boulard; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the January 7, 2010 minutes as presented. (Smith-Roy absent)

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

1. Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment Proposal Recommendation

Mr. Chris deBear opened the discussion by stating the plan includes recycling of furniture and storage within the new Library. Mr. Larry Czekaj asked if the Library can get everything new with these bids and specifications. Mr. deBear answered yes. The recommendation is to go with new pieces along with using existing shelves for storage. Ms. Julie Farkas is comfortable with the recommendations presented. Mr. deBear explained the bid can, and does range in some areas, that is because factories can be contacted and bids reflect mark-ups. Mr. Charles Boulard asked if a company could make substitutions. Mr. deBear is looking for

equals and not substitutions. Mr. Rob Hayes said as long as it meets specifications. Mr. deBear said yes.

Mr. deBear brought to the Board's attention that one company is asking for a 10% deposit. He does not see this as a deterrent. Mr. Clay Pearson asked how the products will be dropped off to meet the schedule. Mr. deBear explained the furniture and fixtures will arrive at various times such as some pieces in March while others later because of fabrics. The best scenario is not to have workers in the building but believes the project is running ahead of schedule so the punch list might even be completed. Mr. Mark Sturing is comfortable with the samples since the staff has been shown and approves. If the furniture or shelving is not being used in some capacity what happens to it? Mr. deBear answered the pieces will be put on BidNet. Mr. Boulard commented on the \$8,000 contingency. Mr. deBear is comfortable with the amount.

Mr. deBear said the bid for signage is ready to go. There is the possibility the cost could be less than estimated. Ms. Farkas is working on finalizing wording for all signage.

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Farkas; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the recommendations as presented by Library Design for Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment.

2. Budget Update

• Memo/discussion regarding Library bonds/estimated millage rate

Ms. Smith-Roy mentioned this item needs Board action and will be brought to the February 18, 2010 meeting.

• Change Order No. 13 in the amount of \$53,158

Motion by Sturing, seconded by Farkas; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve Change Order No. 13 for the amount of \$53,158 with adjustments to be determined if savings would have occurred.

Discussion

The 'to be determined' items were briefly explained. There were several items that need further resolution which will be discussed between Ms. Smith-Roy and Mr. Adams. Mr. Sturing commented it appeared there may be significant costs relating to design issues. For example, he asked if the plans called for hand dryers, but no power. Mr. Danko responded yes, the power was missing from the drawings. Ms. Smith-Roy accepted the amendment to the motion to research items identified as design issues.

• Revised Pay Estimate No. 12

Ms. Smith-Roy commented there was an adjustment for a mathematical error, and the revised estimate was included in the packet.

• Discussion of open items including phenolic panels (east and north elevation)

The smart panels have already been approved, correct, asked Mr. Czekaj? Mr. Danko answered yes for \$12,000. Ms. Smith-Roy will identify date additional \$4,000 (for total of \$12,000) was discussed by the Building Authority. Mr. Sturing commented these panels could be paid for by the technology budget. Ms. Smith-Roy agrees.

One of the open items that needs Board action involves the phenolic panels, said Mr. Danko. Inquiries have been made about painting the emulsions and were told it is not a good idea since the paint would eventually peel and fade.

Mr. Czekaj mentioned the color has grown on him, and the idea to wait and see the more completed look with the canopy and landscaping. Mr. Sturing commented the panel is not pleasing and would rather see windows. Mr. Boulard asked if the panels will fade and then not be able to be matched. Mr. Danko does not know the answer. Ms. Farkas said negative comments are being made about the yellow color, and she would like the darker panel or windows. Mr. Pearson does not have a problem with the color. Ms. Smith-Roy agrees. Mr. Sturing said the east elevation may have a different appearance once the canopy and landscaping is installed.

Mr. Danko said the door sensors should be between \$800-\$1,600, which will shut the doors but allow a person to still be able to exit.

Motion by Farkas, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the door sensors for the not-to-exceed amount of \$900.

There is an auto sliding window for the drive-up window which is 6 square feet. It is difficult to open and close so the recommendation is to change this window to a smaller 4' by 2' automatic window for the cost of \$4,953.

Motion by Farkas, seconded by Hayes; NO ACTION: To approve the replacement of drive-up window with an automatic sliding window.

Discussion

How much of the estimate is for the electrical connection since it was not to be an automated window, asked Mr. Sturing? Ms. Smith-Roy would like to look at a smaller non-automated window. The consensus was to look for other alternatives.

Mr. Dwayne Henderson explained the door change to the sorting room is a heavy fire-rated door that has to stay closed at all times. It is hard to move the book bin out the door so an option is to install a sensor to automatically open. Ms. Smith-Roy said the cost can come out of the technology budget.

Mr. Henderson said the LCD in the youth area is to be added as part of the technology budget. Ms. Smith-Roy asked to wait for action by the Building Authority until the technology bids come back.

Mr. Adams said there should have been frost foundations for the patio doors. He was told by BEI that these foundations were not needed. Mr. Hayes commented the patio is to be used year round. Mr. Adams will work with BEI about installing the necessary footings.

There is a need for a window infill in the teen room, said Ms. Farkas. The room is not enclosed on the second floor and there is a 22" gap that needs to be filled. Ms. Smith-Roy asked for costs.

The irrigation injection system price needs to be revised, which likely will be reduced, commented Mr. Danko. Mr. Czekaj asked if the Library will irrigate the Fuerst Park. Mr. Ron McKay said not at this time but maybe in the future.

Ms. Smith-Roy mentioned the donations are handled by the Library staff/Library Board.

3. Technology Update

Mr. Henderson explained a pre-bid meeting is scheduled for this afternoon. There are several alternates included in the bid packages. The target is to conduct interviews February 5th-8th. Mr. Pearson asked when the bids went out? Ms. Smith-Roy responded two on Friday and two on Tuesday. Mr. Henderson said January 4th was the scheduled date. The Purchasing Department received the bids on December 10^{th,} and there was a tight window for the Library staff to test alternative solutions. Mr. Pearson asked why the bids went out so late? Mr. Henderson responded to make sure all was ready and in order. Ms. Smith-Roy interjected the bid form was not clear to make a determination for the bidders or this Board. Mr. Henderson said the bid forms were a challenge.

Mr. Pearson asked if the delivery of all materials and coordination of installation will be a challenge? Mr. Henderson said the Library staff will handle within the delivery dates specified in the bids. Mr. Pearson asked if the substantial completion date is the same or reduced? Mr. Henderson said the dates did not change. Ms. Smith-Roy said dates were changed. Mr. Pearson commented the FF&E bid was complete and thorough. The technology component has been hard to get information; incomplete documents were submitted, and hard to reach people. Ms. Farkas commented the network may not be done in March and will be burden on Library staff. Ms. Smith-Roy said everyone will work on getting the best products/solutions, and several items changed, and neither the City staff nor the Building Authority was notified until the bid specifications were received. For example, the number of individual work stations which were previously included in the Library operating budget were added to the Building Authority technology bid, and several of the quantities increased, the workstations went from 130 units to 185 units. We know the operating revenue that will be generated from the Library special millage and millage rates for the future bond payments have changed as a result of the decline in taxable value which should be a consideration of the Building Authority in awarding the technology bids. In addition, some of the products have a limited useful life, and to pay for these items over the 20-year bond issue should also be a consideration.

Mr. Sturing commented there are time sensitive issues and suggested meetings of February 11 and February 18 with the technology bid on the February 11 agenda. The Board Members concurred. Mr. Henderson continued that the ability to hold live televised Library Board meetings at the new Library is included in the bid package solutions. SWOCC would be provided a portable cart and camera which is included in the bids.

4. Construction Update

Substantial completion date

Mr. Danko explained the millwork is done on the second floor and about 80% on the first floor. The lobby tile and backsplash tile is completed in the kitchen. The slate is in at the fireplace. The stair rail parts will be in today. The acoustic panels are being installed. The second floor carpet is started and working on finishes. The race car frame will be starting today. The substantial completion date is targeted for early February and then on to the punch list items.

Mr. Czekaj asked about the meeting room light fixtures and the second floor storage room, which needs blinds on the window to match the others. What about electrical on the patio? Mr. Adams answered the electrical needs to be added.

Mr. Blair expressed concern that no action was taken for the drive-up window. A manual operated window is not much less in cost. Mr. Sturing is sympathetic but is concerned about costs. What will it look like from the outside? He does not feel comfortable moving forward without more information. It may look fine since the focal point is the canopy. Mr. Czekaj said costs are needed. Mr. Adams said there is about a \$900 difference between manual and automatic. Ms. Farkas said the window will be manned with a person since it is in the sorting room. Mr. Czekaj wants to look at a manual option. Ms. Farkas reiterated the window has to be smaller for a person to open. Mr. Sturing said if it is only \$1,000 more for an automatic, he is fine. Mr. Danko initially spoke to a contractor who brought forward a couple of options but BEI did not agree with the options. Mr. Boulard commented the purpose of the window has not changed. The sill has been reduced and now possibly the window. Ms. Smith-Roy said the purpose of the window has been known from the beginning, and that it would be opened and closed for the passing of materials. Mr. Danko will look for sites that have drive-up windows and will share findings with the Board. Mr. Pearson said engineering should have been open to the idea of an automatic window or a smaller window. Mr. Hayes concurs that engineering should have been done. Mr. Czekaj asked that the information gathered about the windows be emailed to the Board Members for an unofficial vote that will be brought for an official vote at the February 11, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Adams said the location of address numbers needs to be decided along with the size and color. Finally, the café tenant was given notice in November that information was needed by Oakland County. The County notified him that the paperwork was just received the previous week.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS – None

Motion by Pearson, seconded by Farkas; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 10:04 a.m.

Minutes approved February 11, 2010