



BUILDING AUTHORITY

CITY OF NOVI

Building Authority Meeting

Thursday, May 28, 2009 | 8 A.M.

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

Meeting was called to order at 8:03 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Larry Czekaj, Julie Farkas, Clay Pearson (arrived 8:08 a.m.), Steve Rumples, Kathy Smith-Roy, Mark Sturing

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rob Hayes

OTHERS PRESENT: Barb Rutkowski, Joel Dion, Melissa Place

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the April 30, 2009 meeting minutes as presented (Pearson absent).

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

1. Security and Safety Study

Ms. Farkas explained City Manager Clay Pearson requested the Police Department become involved with reviewing the Library building security measures. Detective Todd Anger performed an evaluation and made subsequent recommendations of adding half swinging doors at each of the circulation desk areas to deter people from roaming behind the counter, and the use of security cameras at the drive up window and book deposit as the main locations. Mr. Dwayne Henderson commented there is a meeting scheduled for June 2nd for access point for security. Mr. Rumples asked if the recommendation is to install a camera at all the locations noted, which seems excessive.

Mr. Sturing asked if the Civic Center Campus has any cameras. Ms. Farkas commented there are six cameras in the current Library construction plan, and based on the report she would recommend the addition of 3-4 more. The thought is to be able to monitor the meeting room if art pieces are on display. Ms. Farkas said the laptops will be tagged in addition to holding the individual's drivers license until returned. Mr. Czekaj asked for an example of an area library that has cameras. Ms. Farkas said the Redford Township has 20 cameras. Mr. Henderson said the West Bloomfield Library had 56 to handle over 106,000 square feet on one floor. Mr. Czekaj asked for a written response from the architect and consultants. Mr.

Pearson said cameras are a cheap security and an easy way to monitor. Mr. Czekaj said the camera does not stop someone inclined to steal or damage but can be used to prosecute.

Mr. Henderson explained the technology system will support up to 100 cameras with a 30 day retention cycle. The estimated cost for a unit is \$225 for Ethernet cable and \$335 for the camera. Mr. Czekaj asked if more conduit is needed. Mr. Henderson said one. Mr. Czekaj said only hardware costs. Mr. Henderson said that is correct. Mr. Sturing asked what is budgeted. Is this a CIP improvement? Can this eliminate a part-time staffer to do other tasks? How are the cameras monitored? Mr. Henderson explained it takes very little time to monitor. Mr. Rumble said there are already a number of cameras outside by the high school, and it is an inexpensive security system. Mr. Henderson will have a recommendation next meeting.

2. Change Order No. 2 to The Dailey Company in the amount of \$19,243.

Ms. Smith-Roy commented the change order has been approved by Ms. Farkas, Mr. Carl Adams and BEI. Mr. Sturing will approve but architectural omissions, contractual omissions and upgrades are not mentioned. How did they come about? Ms. Smith-Roy explained that change order requests under \$5,000 can be approved by Ms. Farkas and Mr. Adams. All change orders are provided to the Building Authority. What about the limestone for the curb, said Mr. Rumble? Mr. Adams said the cost for this item was split. Mr. Czekaj asked how it was decided to change to solid plastic toilet stalls. Ms. Farkas said it was steel, and the alternative is the black plastic since it does not scratch.

Mr. Czekaj commented design change order requests will come to the Building Authority. Mr. Pearson asked when we saw drawings did we know wood or plastic? Mr. Czekaj said the intent of the \$5,000 is to have the change order in the field. As an example, the changing of red to white oak should be a Building Authority change. Ms. Smith-Roy confirmed in the future all design changes will come to the Building Authority. Mr. Czekaj asked why the addition of a pit ladder? Mr. Danko explained the subcontractor was told the State inspector is requiring. Mr. Adams is working on site with the contractors to look at and see costs that are appropriate for the hourly rates and equipment used. Mr. Czekaj appreciated the effort and will look for a change order request in the future, if there is a design change. Mr. Sturing will support the change order as presented. However, he is skeptical of "unforeseen conditions". Mr. Danko said The Dailey Company bid is based on the contract documents. The miscellaneous steel for the west curtain wall which will hold up the roof structural steel needs to be ordered. There needs to be a system in place to keep the project moving.

Mr. Czekaj asked if items number 1, 2, and 6 are design changes? Mr. Adams responded yes. Mr. Czekaj then asked why design changes, such as white oak is on the list. Mr. Blair said the white was more compatible. Mr. Czekaj said that is a design change. It should not be on the list. The Building Authority should go to Diamond and Schmitt on the door colors. What else is different? Ms. Farkas said the carpet color has changed. The colors are now warmer.

Motion by Sturing, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve Change Order No. 2 to The Dailey Company in the amount of \$19,243.

3. Change Order No. 4 to BEI in the amount of \$4,000 (fiber optics).

Mr. Henderson explained the conduits and pathways are not fiber optics but cable for electrical. Mr. Danko explained there are no drawings for Fuerst Park, Novi High School, and Library to the Civic Center. The Dailey Company installed the line but no documents showed the pathway. Mr. Sturing said there was not design plan? Ms. Smith-Roy commented a bid alternate was for the fiber optics to go from the Library to the Civic Center. BEI never considered to the Civic Center. Ms. Smith-Roy said as part of a May 2008 meeting, it was discussed as an alternate and not an addendum from the Library to the Civic Center. She agrees for the need for a change for the work from the Library to Fuerst Park. Mr. Sturing asked if the \$4,000 request is for drawings between the Library and Civic Center and Fuerst and the Library? Mr. Blair said from the property lines. Mr. Czekaj suggested deferring to Ms. Smith-Roy to work through the details. Mr. Sturing does not understand the Fuerst and high school connection.

Ms. Smith-Roy commented there needs to be additional direction because the design from the Library to the Civic Center were in the construction bid documents as an alternate.

Motion by Sturing, seconded by Farkas; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve Change Order No. 4 to BEI in the amount of \$4,000 (Fiber Optics) to complete issue and not as a notice to proceed.

Discussion

Mr. Adams added the \$4,000 is for BEI design drawings but assumes there will be more costs. Mr. Pearson clarified for construction costs.

4. Budget Amendment for Display Case for Art Tiles in the amount of \$29,543.

Ms. Smith-Roy explained the approved items were added to the construction costs based on BEI's estimate in order to proceed with the construction cost estimates. The Dailey Company provided the estimate for the art tiles which results in the need for a budget amendment in the amount of \$29,543 to move forward. Mr. Sturing appreciates receiving the numbers but what about the design costs. Ms. Farkas said no additional design costs above the original estimate. Ms. Smith-Roy explained \$8,000 is the original cost as presented by BEI. Mr. Sturing clarified that the total would be \$53,000.

Mr. Czekaj commented the Library Board should approve the art tiles. Mr. Pearson said the Building Authority should look for their recommendation. Mr. Sturing said a recommendation from the Library Board should be given with the costs approved by the Building Authority. Mr. Sturing asked if the Building Authority does not make a decision today, and the Library Board is to make a recommendation, does this interfere with the construction schedule. Mr. Danko said no, there is time. Mr. Sturing defers to the Library Board. Ms. Farkas said the Library Board will add this issue for discussion at their next meeting.

5. Update from The Dailey Company

Mr. Paul Danko said most of the steel is up. There is an issue with the steel for the curtain wall but working on a resolution and target date. Mason is on-site, working on the elevator

pit, and the roof should be on in a couple of weeks. Ms. Smith-Roy asked if any action from the Board is needed. Mr. Danko said most of the items are between \$10,000-5,000 so there should not be an issue.

6. BEI Update (color renderings)

Mr. Ron McKay said two quotations; one from the original company came in between \$800-1,000, and the other from the Steve Fritz Art Service at \$1,860 for the updated color renderings. Based on our review, lower cost, and able to due in one day, the original company is recommended for the update. Mr. Sturing said the original cost of the renderings from this company was \$5,000, correct? Mr. McKay agreed. Mr. Sturing commented the Steve Fritz Art Service would have done the renderings from scratch for a total of \$1,860. By paying another \$800-1,000 to the initial firm, the cost of the renderings is \$6,000 compared to \$1,860.

Motion by Pearson, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve funds to update color renderings for a cost of \$1,000 with a completion date of June 5, 2009.

7. Construction Update

Mr. Carl Adams said there needs to be an approval on extra steel for the west elevation as mentioned earlier. There is \$7,000 cost for the west wall for interface steel. BEI has staff on a short work four-day work week which makes it difficult to get an answer on occasion. There needs be an architectural presence once a week as the project proceeds. The fiber and power going from the electrical room to Ten Mile is estimated to cost \$20,000, but is working on lowering that cost. Mr. Danko commented Mr. Blair is working hard. The curtain wall is taking a long time and the steel is starting to catch up. Mr. Czekaj hears the comments and agrees that steps to improve are needed. Mr. McKay said the schedule is always a hard component. We are going through a lot of drawings. The amount of work to get these things through is tremendous. He requested calls come to his attention and he will distribute as needed. Mr. Danko said Mr. McKay has been helpful. Mr. Pearson is appreciative of the notice. The Building Authority would like to hear an update in a month as a follow-up regarding the youth area design.

Mr. Danko asked if Option H estimates from the subcontractors for the second floor shell can be released if costs are in budget. Ms. Smith-Roy answered the estimate is \$135,000. The work is not complete, and would like to approve if not over budget to keep the project going. Mr. Danko said there are items not within the budget, but is confident the current offsets will allow the estimate to remain within budget. Mr. Czekaj said the cost is not to exceed 5% per line item. Ms. Smith-Roy said the authorization to proceed is without a change order.

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Farkas; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To amend the budget for the second floor build out to \$135,000 and allow The Dailey Company to move forward and bring back to a future meeting.

8. Change Order Process

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Rumple; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To allow the Library Director and Construction Project Manager to approve \$10,000 non-design change orders on site and all design changes to be brought to the Building Authority.

Discussion

Mr. Sturing is not comfortable that a change order is needed for steel. Change orders should be for unforeseen/underground circumstances. Mr. Czekaj asked why more steel? Mr. Danko explained the design by BEI had connection points on deck but needs lacing and a combination of other things. Mr. Blair said BEI has modified the drawings. Mr. Rumple supports the motion to move forward. He supports Mr. Adams because he knows he is questioning what is happening on site. He can evaluate and bring our attention to items if necessary. He is doing a great job.

Ms. Smith-Roy mentioned the need for the RFP for the RFID system. Mr. Henderson responded the Library Network is putting out a RFP with certain specifications. Is network willing to standardize one for price savings, said Ms. Smith-Roy. Mr. Henderson answered they are reviewing and looking at offering one system to a number of libraries. Mr. Sturing commented they will not change specifications? Ms. Smith-Roy said the specifications should be established for any manufacturer. Mr. Sturing can wait for the consortium, and then we can put out our RFP. He was under the impression this Board would be discussing the book sorting system pros and cons. Mr. Henderson said the system will not eliminate staff positions but allows the collection to be returned to the shelf more quickly. Ms. Farkas asked about maintenance costs. Mr. Henderson said no research has been done. Mr. Sturing said the book sorting system reduces staff time to do other tasks. Mr. Henderson said yes. The system does pre-sorting of the material and pulls items that have holds. Mr. Sturing clarified the time factor savings is that staff spends less time on sorting. Mr. Rumple said it increases efficiencies from the administration stand point. Mr. Sturing mentioned the system was on the Library Board priority list yet it was ranked low and the \$200,000 is not budgeted.

Mr. Czekaj said if the Library Board believes it is good, and the Building Authority disagrees, we will not approve funding. Mr. Pearson commented the Library Board should make a recommendation. Ms. Farkas said the item is worth discussing with the Library Board. Ms. Smith-Roy requested costs, future costs, maintenance and operating costs. This was the last item on the Library Board's priority list. Mr. Sturing would like information on operating costs, efficiencies, savings and maintenance, too. Mr. Henderson said he can resubmit material the Library Board received about return on investment. Mr. Henderson said the book sorting system and RFID system work in tandem.

Mr. Pearson asked if the youth area plans have been received. Ms. Farkas said no. Architectural drawings are needed. Mr. McKay commented Mr. Blair and Ms. Farkas are close to resolving this design. We can have costs in a month. Mr. Sturing said the Library Board needs to approve a theme. Ms. Farkas said this item will be discussed at the June 17th Library Board meeting. It was decided to have the next Building Authority meeting a week later on June 25th.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS - None

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 10:24 a.m.

Minutes approved June 25, 2009