



# BUILDING AUTHORITY

CITY OF NOVI

Building Authority Meeting

Thursday, January 17, 2008 | 8 A.M.

Activities Room | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile Road

Meeting was called to order at 8:04 a.m.

**Members Present:** Julie Farkas, Rob Hayes, Clay Pearson (arrived 8:25 a.m.), Steve Rumble, Kathy Smith-Roy, Mark Sturing

**Members Absent:** Larry Czekaj

**Others Present:** Mary Ellen Mulcrone, Melissa Place

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

## PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

### 1. Authorization to Issue RFP for Interior Functional Planning Consultant to provide furniture, fixture, and loose equipment

Ms. Farkas opened the discussion with several changes regarding dates. A few other changes included the work to prepare from review, remove the reference to CAD drawings, and change the word design so that professional only is used. Mr. Sturing is not sure if he likes the proposal to be as detailed. Mr. Rumble asked how the City would receive notices of changes to interior design. Ms. Farkas said she and the consultant would work with the architect who would communicate with the City on any changes. Ms. Smith-Roy commented approval of the RFP is needed.

**Motion by Farkas, seconded by Rumble; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the RFP with proposed changes. (Pearson absent)**

### 2. Process to decide project delivery method (General Contractor, Construction Manager, or Design/Build). Material provided last week.

Mr. Sturing suggested the architect needs clear direction. We have to tell the architect by January 31, 2008 which delivery method will be used. Mr. Sturing commented that Mr. Czekaj prefers a General Contractor. Mr. Hayes commented General Contractor is his preference. Ms. Farkas likes a Construction Manager since she is most familiar with this type of method. Ms. Smith-Roy has worked with all types, but given the structure of the group and type of construction, she believes a General Contractor would work best.

Mr. Rumples agrees that a General Contractor is his preference. He does not see this as a large project to have a Construction Manager. Mr. Sturing favors a General Contractor. Some reasons have already been stated but another is that if the project extends past the timeframe, it tends to lean towards a General Contractor, who can make decisions with the architect. Mr. Verma asked if Plante & Moran has been hired as manager. Mr. Sturing said no. Mr. Verma asked who will supervise the site. Mr. Hayes interjected that there is a small amount of money set aside for civil engineering inspections. \$40,000 could employ an inspector. Mr. Sturing capsulated that the Building Authority either can supervise or hire a supervisor to overlook the project. (Mr. Pearson arrived.) Mr. Pearson says it seems a General Contractor appears to be the choice. Mr. Pearson commented a General Contractor option may take more time; typically a Construction manager allows for better scheduling with a project on a tight timeframe.

**Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Hayes; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To employ a General Contractor as method of delivery.**

### **3. Next meeting scheduled for January 24, 2008**

Mr. Sturing commented there has been a suggestion to move the meetings to the Council Chambers. The consensus was to move the meetings to the Council Chambers.

#### **Miscellaneous**

Mr. Pearson commented McKenna Associates, Incorporated will be presented to City Council at their January 22, 2008 meeting for engagement to develop a master plan for Fuerst Farm property. If City Council approved the services of McKenna, a final report is expected at the end of February.

**Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 8:33 a.m.**

**Minutes approved January 24, 2008**