

Progress Meeting Notes

Thursday July 9, 2009

Old Town Parking Structure

Traverse City, Michigan

In Attendance:

Bryan Crough, Traverse City DDA
Rob Bacigalupi, Traverse City DDA
Gil Rupp, City of Traverse City, Auto Parking System Administrator
Ray Kendra, CWS Architects
Larry Monigold, Bayshore Engineers

Meeting Minutes –Resolved Items

- Discussed using “Uni Eco-Stone” Pavers to at west alley, to delineate alley location and provide additional pervious surface area. Russ Soyring indicated that the alley areas are not considered part of the project for impervious surface calculations therefore we will evaluate use of pervious pavers in alleys based on budget. Consideration for driveways and approaches should be considered, coordinate integration with radiant snow-melt.
- Proposed Directional Island off 8th Street to be designed in such a way to clearly indicate traffic pattern/direction. Discussed no vegetation on island and fact that is must be mountable to accommodate large truck turning radiuses. Back side of Plante Moran Building and Art’s on Woodmere offered as possible solutions to look at. Also discussed pervious unit pavers to help identify island.
- Tim requested the drawings include the City Datum Conversion for 100’-0”.
- Based on the property area excluding development parcels, alleys (as well as green areas within the alley easement) on the east and west:

S
T
C
E
E
H
T
E
A
R
C
H
I
T
E
C
T
S

Site Area: 58,854 s.f.

Building Area: 47,853 s.f.

So if all areas excluding the building area were pervious including walks, drives, etc. we would have a ratio of 81% impervious surface so we fail the standard by 1%.

Our recommendation would be to add green roofs to the towers only as well as maintaining pervious paving at all other areas we have an additional 1,441 s.f. of pervious so that brings our ration into compliance at 79%.

As an alternate bid the green roof over the ramp as an alternate for consideration which would add an additional 8923 s.f. of pervious surface bringing our ratio well below the required 80% max. The ratio including this area would be 64% so it would allow us to reduce the amount of pervious paving necessary and still keep us in range.

Also based on conversation with Russ Soyring it is our understanding that the green roof over the ramp is considered an ancillary structure similar to the stair towers therefore it would have no impact on the height calculation.

Incidentally the overall perimeter of the building is 960 l.f and the exposed roof on the east side associated with the green roof over the ramp is 144 l.f. which is only about 15% of the perimeter.

- o Design development package submitted on July 2, 2009. Reviewed items on 7-2-09 and reviewed direction proceeding forward. Based on approval from City Commission July 6, 2009 for additional services as related to roof options over ramp to top level of deck we are proceeding into Construction Documents with the following:
 1. Final bid documents shall include alternates for consideration including:
 - a. Roof over ramp to top level. (Designed to support optional green roof.)
 - b. Green roof over roof over ramp to top level.

ARCHITECTS

- c. Tower roofs designed to accommodate optional Green Roof treatment.
- d. Base bid for tower exterior to be exposed colored concrete to match concrete spandrel panels. Future option may include wrapping these elements with decorative galvanized metal panel. Reference DD Estimate line item #58.
- e. Decorative metal treatments will not be included as part of the base bid but may be added as a future option. Reference DD Estimate line item #57.
- f. Snow melt system at ground level shall be included as part of base bid. Snow melt on ramp to upper level shall be included as an alternate. Bayshore Engineering is providing additional energy modeling information as related to the yearly operational cost of the snowmelt system for consideration.
- g. Staining ceiling at ground level shall be included as part of the base bid.
- h. Green technologies (DD Estimate line item #51) are to remain in base bid. LEED Certification is still being pursued as outlined in CWS Architects summary included in the Design Development package.
- i. Include preferred utility relocation of sewer in base bid. Tim addressing alternate funding sources for work beyond required project scope.

Meeting Minutes – Action Items

1. Update regarding Hazardous Materials on Site. Otwell Mawby Phase II. Impact on Demolition of 120 Lake St. and 127 8th Street. Rob expected a proposal from Otwell Mawby as related to this work to be approved week of 7-13-09. Review schedule for completion of tasks.

S
T
A
R
T
I
N
G
A
R
C
H
I
T
E
C
T
S

2. Update on Land Purchase/Easements, Etc. Required documents are in DDA hands as related to maintaining ownership of City parcel located at the southeast corner of project boundary. City attorney and Hagerty's attorney reviewing north parcel; special meeting scheduled for 6-29-09. River's Edge covenant for northeast corner of project site should have no implications related to the design of the deck. **Approved by City Commission 7-6-09.**
3. Add alternate for improvements necessary to accommodate tie into future Hagerty Development on North Parcel. Coordinate with floor elevations and elevator. **Rich Associates incorporating considerations. Assuming minimal loading on tower based on information received from Cornerstone Architects.**
4. Final site plan approval requirements and/or presentation to City Planning Commission. **Presented information to City Planning Commission on 7-1-09. Discussed utilities, impervious surface calculations, and exterior materials and LED considerations. No exceptions taken.**
5. CWS Architects submitted LEED Summary with Design Development package. **Project is being registered under LEED 2009 New Construction. In addition to vehicle charging spaces on the first floor (3) additional spaces to be provided in the north eastcorner of second level. Ray noted that this will not be enough to comply wioth LEED credit requirements but the spaces will still be provided.**
6. CWS Architects will be detailing Photovoltaic panel options to be included as base bid as well as alternates. **Rob was going to check for potential available "Stimulus" funding sources.**
7. Summary of roof and green roof costs projections provided by Rich Associates 7-25-09. **Reccomendation to include the tower roofs as base bid to meet pervious surface requirements and bid the green roof over the ramp to the roof as an alternate.**

ARCHITECTS

8. Estimate of utility relocation costs provided as part of DD Estimate. LandTech to provided price to include topo survey in alley to Cass Street. Reviewed the title commitments for 3 of the parcels.

There aren't any easements listed in the exceptions other than an easement for Consumer's Energy.

Also have a copy of four easements in favor of Traverse City Light and Power, which look like they serve the businesses to the west.

The alley on the southerly portion of the site was vacated with retention of a utility easement. City should verify legal ramifications.

No additional new information on the utilities yet but the following information included in DD Estimate.

Consumer's Energy - no costs received. Estimate \$50,000-\$65,000 to construct steel pole. Consumer's has an easement, so relocation fees apply.

AT&T - \$12,000 to relocate. No easement evident in received title work. Unsure if retention of easement retained from alley vacation applies.

Charter - no costs received. Relocation similar to AT&T. No easement evident in received title work.

DTE Energy - no costs received. Assume no cost to cut and cap. Main exists in existing public alley.

TCL&P - no costs received. Situation similar to AT&T and Charter. A rough estimate is \$8,000 in relocation costs, if they apply. Considering they'll need a crane, and possibly some temporary power rerouting, it may be more like \$10,000 - \$15,000. The other work TCL&P has should be at no cost, since their utilities are either in the alley or don't have an easement. The transformer move should be the only item that potentially has a cost.

9. The traffic report included as part of DD submittal.

ARCHITECTS

10. LED vs. Fluorescent lighting. Narrative and recommendation provided by Bayshore Engineering. Committee met with Steve Adams (Crites Tidey – Lighting

Supplier) and Robert Gray (Manufacturer of LED product) at our regular progress meeting. Had good discussion as related to expectations of LED fixtures and how they might fit into project.

Discussed project requirement of average ground level illumination of 8 foot candles and how LED fixtures compare with other technologies. Also had discussion on fact that everyone understands LED will be the key lighting technology but that it may not deliver the value today. Mr. Gray was to provide electronic format files so Crites Tidey could run “apples to apples” analysis and photometrics. We would like to integrate locally manufactured product but there are some items that are still cause for concern identified in the following correspondence was received from Steve Adams of Crites Tidey on Friday 7-10-09.

“I have not received any .ies photometric files from Bob Gray as per discussion in the meeting yesterday. We went online to download from his website, and we found that the photometry was not from ITL (an independent test lab). Therefore, any photometry was probably done by the manufacturer, which raises issues of credibility. Further, the .ies file on his website uses a much higher lumen value than the cut sheet for the product.

This is not the only discrepancy that I observed. Mr. Gray stated emphatically that his FIXTURE (not its components) was UL listed. The cut sheet on his website states that he uses UL approved components, and that other listings are pending. Thus, the FIXTURE may not currently carry a UL listing. It would have to have a UL listing to be installed, and a hose down rating would be another step.

Mr. Gray also stated that all of his fixtures produced over 100 lumens per watt, and his own cut sheet lists 6481 lumens at 118 watts, which by my math indicates 54.92 lumens/watt. As I recall, I stated that to my knowledge, the current output of LED’s was between 50-60 lumens/watt.

ARCHITECTS

To make a long story short, I do not have in my hands credible photometry with which to run the XUS product for your evaluation. Unless data from an independent and reputable test lab can be provided, I would not be able to provide any type of report that I would trust as being accurate and repeatable.

I will have Bob Catone, the General Manager of Guth Lighting in my office on August 5th. He is what I would deem an “Expert” in LED technology, and his company is an old and reputable firm that I trust. If this issue still exists at that time, I’m sure that he would give us a sound appraisal of both technologies – he manufactures both of them.”

Although the team concurs that LED will shortly be the technology of choice, we still are standing by the original recommendation that the fluorescent fixtures be specified as the basis of design so that we may proceed with construction documents accordingly.:

Recommendation:

“From our analysis, I conclude that we would need almost triple the number of LED fixtures v. fluorescent, thus increasing the life cost by almost 5 times. Additionally, the energy level for the F54/T5 HO fluorescent fixtures is 40% less than the LED fixtures, resulting in a higher annual cost of operation. It is for these reasons that I must strongly recommend the fluorescent fixtures over the LED.”

11. Restroom location in north-east core of building approved. May be rough-in only.
12. Identify pedestrian routes on west side of structure crossing alley. Use color and/or material change to articulate locations.
13. Verify extent of irrigation. Coordinate requirements with Green Roof and LEED considerations.
14. No provisions for additional floors are being included in the design/construction documents. Additionally, the roof over the ramp to the upper level, being bid as an alternate is not being designed to accommodate vehicular loads or future expansion.
15. Parking controls meeting scheduled for 7-16-09.

ARCHITECTS

16. Considerations for interior signage. Coordinate.
17. Drawings to include staging diagrams. Bryan was to contact adjacent north and south development parcel owners to secure permission to use these parcels for staging during construction.
18. Request for unit prices to be included in specification. Coordinate.
19. Upper level needs to be secured from pedestrian traffic after hours.
20. Rough in for future attendant booth at ramp to the upper level.

ARCHITECTS