



# BUILDING AUTHORITY

CITY OF NOVI

Building Authority Meeting

Thursday, November 6, 2008 | 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, Steve Rumble, Kathy Smith-Roy, Mark Sturing

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Rob Hayes

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Kristin Kolb, Melissa Place

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**Motion by Rumble, seconded by Farkas; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the agenda with addition as 2. Existing Library Landscaping.**

## PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

### 1. Consideration of construction contract award for new Library

Mr. Czekaj opened the meeting by stating the purpose of the meeting is to consider the construction contract award.

**Motion by Farkas, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the bid submitted by The Dailey Company, for a total base bid amount of \$9,886,900, plus Alternates #2, #4, #5, #6 and #7 for an additional \$269,000, for a total of \$10,135,900, This award shall be subject to the City Finance Director and City Attorney working with representatives of The Dailey Company to finalize all necessary contract documents and execution of same by the chair of the Building Authority, and subject to The Dailey Company providing the required bonds and insurance as per the bid specifications and any addenda.**

## Discussion

Mr. Pearson said the Building Authority has the authority to review and award the major contracts. It is the charge of the Building Authority to award the library project construction award to a qualified bidder. The information will be shared with the City Council, and it is at the discretion of City Council as to whether the subject is up for discussion. Mr. Czekaj asked if this statement should be included in the motion. Ms. Kolb said it is not needed. Mr. Czekaj clarified the Building Authority can enter into a contract with The Dailey Company, and it stands unless City Council intercedes. Ms. Kolb said that is correct.

Mr. Pearson said the disqualified bidder was present at the previous meeting. Is this the appropriate time to explain how the bids were evaluated? Mr. Czekaj asked if the agenda should be amended to include as a discussion item? Mr. Sturing is comfortable with discussing at this time. Ms. Kolb explained nine bids were received and one was incomplete. Legal reviewed the bid documents, and it was confirmed the language was clear that bidders were to submit Parts A & B. This fact was mentioned in the mandatory pre-bid meeting as well. A representative of the firm that submitted the incomplete bid stated at a previous meeting that there was confusion with an addendum. However, this firm did not contact the City for clarification. The City has a broad spectrum to review bids, and the one in question was insufficient. Ms. Smith-Roy concurs. If the City opened up for negotiations there would be a time delay, and unfair to the other eight firms that submitted their sealed bids by the date. No other bidders misunderstood, and the company disqualified did not include any information for the incomplete section. Mr. Rumble concurs with the previous speakers and wants to keep the process pure. Ms. Farkas concurs, too. Mr. Sturing agrees and would be concerned if we re-opened the process. The City might not see the same numbers in three months. Mr. Czekaj asked if the disqualified contractor was in attendance at the pre-bid meeting? Ms. Smith-Roy said yes. Mr. Czekaj mentioned the bid time was extended for one week so the company had opportunities to comment and ask questions. He supports to move forward.

Mr. Pearson commented due diligence has been conducted on The Dailey Company. References have been checked, and the Building Authority met with The Dailey Company on November 3<sup>rd</sup> and demonstrated a good understanding of the project and schedule. Previously he had no knowledge of the company but they presented themselves well. Mr. Sturing favors the motion for all the reasons stated by Mr. Pearson. He liked the extension of time for alternates so the total disruption of the site works better with the high school. Ms. Farkas had a question regarding the fiber optic for Addendum No. 6. Is the number included in The Dailey Company bid? Mr. Sturing said yes. There is \$8,500 for the fiber optic and \$18,000 for the conduit. Mr. Czekaj supports for the same reasons stated.

## **2. Existing Library Landscaping**

Mr. Czekaj added this item to discuss the loss of trees to ask the City Forester to look at the site to determine if some of the trees can be transplanted or saved. Ms. Farkas said some preliminary discussions have occurred and some of the trees are too old to save. However, the discussions and review are on-going.

## **AUDIENCE COMMENTS – None**

**Motion by Farkas, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 8:18 a.m.**

**Minutes approved January 8, 2009**