

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee was held on Monday, June 10, 1996 in the Community Center Bonanza Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, NV at 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Gary Sheerin
Jenny Bacigalupi
Richard Baker
Kevin Honkump
Ed Moran
Craig Mullet

STAFF: John Berkich, City Manager
Michael Fondi, District Court Judge
Noel Waters, District Attorney
Roby Willis, Justice of the Peace
Alan Glover, Clerk-Recorder
Walter Sullivan, Community Development Director
Jay Aldean, Public Works Director
John Iratcabel, Deputy Director, Purchasing
Barney Dehl, Undersheriff
Colleen Glover, Chief Deputy District Court Clerk
Bill Callahan, Chief Deputy Sheriff
Bill Milligan, Court Administrator
Dwight Dimit, Sheriff's Lieutenant
Katherine McLaughlin, Recording Secretary
(CPAC 6/10/96 1-0000)

NOTE - Unless otherwise indicated each item was introduced by Chairperson Sheerin. Individuals speaking are identified following the heading of each item. A tape recording of these items is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM - Chairperson Sheerin called the meeting to order at 5:42 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

AGENDA ITEMS

D-2 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT - (1-0024) Mr. Waters noted he had been asked to do research on whether the construction management contract with a guaranteed maximum price provision was legal in Nevada. He reported it is legal and cited what had happened with a 1977 hospital addition as an example. He also said the price of a project is the responsibility of the construction manager once there has been an agreed upon budget or price. He also commented that the requirement would be that there be public bidding for the services of the construction manager.

(1-0179) Chairperson Sheerin asked for confirmation if the Committee decided to do the guaranteed construction management they could put in qualifications. Mr. Waters they are part of the Local Government Purchasing Act. He noted that qualifications, financial standing, skills, etc. and that price is included somewhere. Chairperson Sheerin asked if the lowest bid must be accepted even though the proposer does not have some of the other qualifications. Mr. Waters said the statute provides for the selection of lowest responsible and responsive bidder. He explained if the City decided not to go with the low bid they need to be prepared to make findings to justify the decision.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 2

(1-0285) Member Honkump asked when consideration is given to whether the low bidder is responsible and responsive would construction management with experience be involved or would a general contractor for building the project automatically be considered qualified to manage the construction of the project. Mr. Waters said that would depend on the nature of the proposal. He felt that the draft RFP provided by the Purchasing Department pretty well spells out what is being sought.

(1-0350) At this point Chairperson Sheerin asked for the Committee's input as far as a construction management fixed fee. Member Baker said he somewhat liked the idea of a guaranteed fixed price but was not interested in a construction manager without it because he felt it duplicates things the Committee already has. Member Moran said was against construction management. Member Honkump echoed Member Baker's comment. Member Mullet said he was interested and that he liked the idea that perhaps there is a way for the Committee to get them to do that. Member Bacigalupi said she liked the idea of a fixed fee and Chairperson Sheerin said Member Baker echoed his sentiment.

(1-0400) Chairperson Sheerin asked for a status of where the RFP stands. Mr. Iratcabal asked if criteria could be established by the City to set the guaranteed maximum set price and then make a selection on qualifications. Mr. Waters said it was his understanding that the guaranteed maximum price is not necessarily set by budget figures but is something that is deliverable and something that is arrived at during consultation among the owner, the architect, the construction manager, and is essentially negotiated.

(1-0497) Mr. Aldean felt if the construction manager has the option to substitute lesser quality or a lesser standard of materials in order for the project to come in at budget there is an issue that needs to be resolved. He said he did not believe specifications are ever written tight enough to defer that kind of a problem. Mr. Fullerton said before a guaranteed maximum price is agreed upon there is negotiation whereby each entity can work to agree what is going to be in the project for the money. He added it was his understanding that the money is a given amount and the negotiation revolves around what will be received for that money. He provided details of what is included in the negotiations.

(1-0633) John Anderson asked if there is a construction management firm would a Clerk of the Works be needed and Chairperson Sheerin said no and that it has to be one or the other. Member Baker said he was not sure of that and felt there should be both. He added there would still be an inspector on the job to make sure the project is built according to the plans and specifications. Chairperson Sheerin felt what the Committee wants to do is instruct Mr. Iratcabal to start work on the RFP for this. He added his belief that it will take a good team to do it. He felt it should be ready in time for the next one or two meetings. He remarked that Mr. Iratcabal would be the focal point and that he should be given help on it. Mr. Fullerton asked what would be the earliest date a construction manager could be involved in the project. Chairperson Sheerin noted that the RFP has to be developed and submitted and felt it should be within sixty to ninety days. Mr. Anderson expressed his feeling that a construction could work with the architects so that it can be done quicker and not have to be something that takes as much time as going out for the low bid. He felt the process should be a team effort and that is the key to construction management and felt that is why the Committee does not need a clerk of the works. Chairperson Sheerin said the Committee was going to get the budget down before it goes out because they cannot wait three or months for something else to happen. Member Mullet noted that Mr. Waters had been asked to contact with the Board of Architects and asked what he had learned. Mr. Waters said based on the research he had done he did not see there was a problem. No formal action was taken.

D-1 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT AND OTHER BUDGET RELATED MATTERS - (1-0815) Chairperson Sheerin said the project was basically \$1.4 million dollars over budget. He asked if any Member had items to add to the existing list of 35. He it was his intent that the Committee should first go through each item with each user group who would have to decide whether they wanted to cut or not. He also noted if there were dissenting votes on cuts then the item would stay in but should there be agreement, the item would go. The second round would be just the Committee voting.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 3

(1-0871) Mr. Fullerton provided copies of a matrix the architects had developed and said the architects had gone through the project and made a list of some things that are qualitative, i.e. changing finishes or the quality of systems. He added in some cases they had cut back to where they started where quality had been added. He then said there were other instances where they had made recommendations for things where area or quality can be taken out that would result in something less than what was originally in the Master Plan. He provided an extensive explanation of the figures they had developed and some things they felt could be reduced or eliminated.

(1-1301) Chairperson Sheerin asked if the sewer grinder mentioned at an earlier meeting was included. Mr. Fullerton said it was now out because there are traps and screens in the plumbing on the inside at the point where material is put into the drain and that these prevent items from getting in. He confirmed for Chairperson Sheerin that the emergency generator is in and is something which is required by code and that a jail typically would have and it would not be an option. He also confirmed for Chairperson Sheerin that the telephone system was not included in the figures although the conduit was. Member Bacigalupi asked about the figure originally budgeted for furniture, moving expenses, etc. Mr. Fullerton provided the figures and said there were also figures for such things as insurance, inspections, the professional fees for the architects, fees for the clerk of the works, asbestos remediation for the PAL building, the evidence yard, and that these added up to approximately \$2 million. He also confirmed that the funding pledged for the Detox center was included. Member Honkump said he would like to add landscaping and irrigation as things to be looked at.

(1-1579) Chairperson Sheerin then asked for suggestions on each item. The first was a portion of a fence to deter trespassing. Mr. Fullerton noted if it was deleted or left in was not a big item. Mr. Dehl commented it would depend on what kind of windows are to be put in. Mr. Fullerton explained the type of glass that will be used and that it will not be something that would be easy to break. No one indicated a desire to leave Item 1, the portion of fence, and Chairperson Sheerin deleted it from the list.

(1-1745) Item 2 was the sidewalk on the east half of Second Street and the south half of Harbin Street. Mr. Sullivan commented that without a sidewalk the public would be wandering about the property and it was agreed this was a minor expense and should be left in.

(1-1775) Item 3 was to delete most of the sallyport roof. Mr. Fullerton said ideally the plan was to cover the entire area which was a fairly big roof. He noted the size had been changed and that the rest of the sallyport would be covered with a chain link for security purposes and that there would not be deicing in that area. It was agreed to retain the deicing.

(1-1845) Item 4 was to delete the low fence at the east side of the public parking lot. Mr. Dehl said this was something the Sheriff's Department would give up and it was deleted.

(1-1871) Item 5 was to delete the cabinetry in the jail medical area. Mr. Fullerton explained this was intended to be part of FF&E. This was deleted.

((1-1915) Item 6 was to delete lavatory counter tops at restrooms and use porcelain hung lavatories. Mr. Fullerton said presently all restrooms and the locker room for the Sheriff has counters with lay in formica sinks. He felt it is important that the locker room or have a counter or shelves could be installed. It was agreed that all the counter tops could be deleted. Mr. Fullerton also explained that the judges' restrooms and the jury restrooms would contain a wall hung sink and a toilet and that there would not be a cabinet. Item 6 was deleted.

(2-2020) Item 7 was to change non-permanent screening panels to corrugated metal. Mr. Fullerton said there were some mechanical equipment screening walls on the roof of the building and the facing materials at the top and around the mechanical equipment area which is a plaster on foam system. He commented that there are cheaper ways to do a screen wall. Item 7 was deleted.

(1-2159) Item 8 was to change brick to EIFS (exterior insulating foam system) Mr. Fullerton said it was his

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 4

understanding everyone wanted the brick. He explained the difference in cost for brick vs. a durable EIFS insulating finish and said the EIFS looks like stucco. Member Bacigalupi objected to deleting this.

(1-2241) Item 9 was to delete celestial skylights on the third floor concourse. Mr. Fullerton explained that these would basically light the entry wall and confirmed this would be the corridor that is almost all windows. He also mentioned how the light can be controlled and reflected in. This was deleted.

(1-2360) Item 10 was to delete all the carpet from the jail. All floor except the wet areas could be sealed concrete and that carpet and vinyl tiled areas could be added later. Mr. Dehl said they would like to retain the carpet because of the noise factor in the dorms. This was not deleted.

(1-2383) Item 11 was to delete vinyl tile from jail non-secure areas. Mr. Dehl agreed to give up the tile. This was deleted.

(1-2397) Item 12 was to delete terrazzo flooring at the concourses and replace it with porcelain ceramic tile. Mr. Fullerton commented that airport concourses are currently mostly porcelain ceramic tile and that the Committee can realize a big saving by going to it. This was deleted.

(1-2485) Item 13 was to reduce the ceramic tile at restrooms to wainscot on wet walls only. Mr. Fullerton said their cost estimator had priced the ceramic walls from floor to ceiling in each bathroom. This was deleted.

(1-2540) Item 14 was to change the ceiling at the first floor concourse from gypsum board to acoustic tile. Mr. Fullerton said they had designed the concourse with gypsum board was because, in terms of shaping the ceiling, it cannot be done using acoustical tile. However, on the ground floor he said they could put in an acoustical tile ceiling but leave the other two floors with the hard ceiling. This was deleted.

(1-2615) Item 15 was to delete wood paneling at concourses. Mr. Fullerton said, rather than panel the entire courtrooms, they had put a small amount on the outside of them. He said they had put it on the list because the cost for complete paneling would be approximately \$100,000. Discussion ensued later on this item.

(1-2669) Items 16 through 21. This had to do with rooftop units and Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Fullerton to explain. Mr. Fullerton said they had asked their mechanical, electrical, structural, and plumbing engineers for things they might recommend as value engineering options. He noted that currently there is a cooling tower, chillers, and air handling units. He provided details on how these work. He commented that these had been discussed with the user groups who had indicated that is what they wanted. He also said these are energy efficient, have long life, and good maintenance performance. He noted they had put this out as an option as to whether a lesser quality system should be substituted because of the cost savings. He also explained how various areas could be affected.

Chairperson Sheerin asked about the alternate fuel capacity. Mr. Fullerton said it had been brought to the attention that the City has experienced more than one major gas outage and if one should happen in the winter it could cost them the ability to heat the jail. He added they had been asked to put into the central plant the capability of having the boilers that heat the air also heat the water that heats the air. He noted that these could use diesel fuel as an alternate and said it is now in the cost estimate. He felt this could be deleted and yet keep the central plant. Chairperson Sheerin said he would come back to these items later.

(1-3075) Item 22 had to do with electrical and was to delete separate metering in the courts jail which would mean one meter for the entire project. However, he commented on how the expenses could be pro-rated for each department. There were no objections and this was deleted.

(1-3081) Item 23 related to video arraignment and the equipment that would be needed. Mr. Dehl commented that hauling prisoners up to the courts is manpower intensive and ties up the judges. Chairperson Sheerin direct this be left in.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 5

(1-3185) Item 24 was to reduce the courthouse on the south side by eight inches resulting in a reduction of 460 square feet. Member Bacigalupi that Items 25, 26 and 27 are related and could be combined. Mr. Fullerton explained that the south side would be easy to do although the judges' offices and those of the attorneys might feel it. He noted that reducing it on the north side by four inches could be done with no problem. He said that they could take some footage from the courthouse at the center but the courtrooms, the clerk, the District Attorney, and court recorder would have to be shrunk in order to do that but it would not be too noticeable. He also said if the space was removed from one level it would have to be removed from all three levels. He said the west side of the courthouse would basically have five feet taken off. He felt that could be accomplished with a sharing by all the departments. At this point Mr. Fullerton said that some of the suites such as Clerk to the Board and Records Management are in the building partly because they can be moved out to allow for future growth. He noted that this would allow District Attorney, the District Court, and the Clerk-Recorder could grow. Justice of the Peace Willis expressed his belief that the Clerk to the Board should be with the Board of Supervisors at City Hall. Mr. Berkich commented there could be a potential for that if a second and/or third floor should be added to the City Hall building. Mr. Glover commented that moving some records off site could free up some space for the Recording Secretaries. However, he did not feel this would free up space for a future courtroom. Mr. Fullerton said some of the suites are tight now and that the District Court Clerk on the third floor is bigger than programmed; however, an additional employee has been added. He felt that Items 24 through 27 could be taken without anyone being moved around in the building or impacted seriously. There were no objections to reducing the square footage discussed above.

(2-0225) Item 28 was to reduce the courthouse at the west side by five feet. Chairperson Sheerin asked what impact this would have. Mr. Fullerton felt on the ground floor in the Clerk-Recorder's office it could be absorbed without too much pain. On the second floor he said the District Attorney's office could not absorb it so some of their offices would have to be turned or configured differently. He also described how the Justice Court suite would either have to be squeezed or shifted down the hall a few feet and probably both of these options would be utilized. He noted that this would cause the Clerk to the Board would absorb most of this change. He said court consultant Dan Wiley had suggested the Clerk to the Board might be better off on the ground floor where the public can make contact more easily. He noted on the third floor the Court Clerk can absorb most of the five foot cut and still be within the program. Member Bacigalupi asked if any of these cuts would jeopardize a future fifth courtroom. Mr. Fullerton explained that Records Management could use the area until the courtroom was needed at which time Records Management could be moved somewhere off site. Chairperson Sheerin asked what the basement of the jail would be used for. Mr. Dehl said it could be for equipment that has only intermittent use. He also asked Mr. Glover if people would be in the basement eight hours a day. Mr. Glover said yes in the case of Records Management and Clerk to the Board but it would not be used for storage of election equipment. He added it would cost money to construct some type of a building to store it in but it would be cheaper than this. Mr. Fullerton commented that in Items 24 through 27 he was basically talking about trimming the program to where it should be. Objections were voiced against cutting footage and this remained in the matrix.

(2-0549) Item 31 related to reducing the jail by 750 square feet. Mr. Dehl commented that the jail is already minimum size with minimum staffing. He did not feel it could be cut further. Mr. Fullerton explained how they had designed the cell area and said they would be closer to the control room. However, there were the same number of cells and the day room would become smaller. Mr. Dehl did not feel the \$30,000 saving would be worth it because the bigger the day room is the better it is because it would help to avoid conflict. This stayed in the matrix.

(2-0675) Item 32 was about cutting the inmate work release area. Mr. Dehl objected to the cut. He explained this was a building that would house up to forty people, would have no staff, and would be cheap housing. He expressed his belief that this area would never have to be added to in the future. Mr. Fullerton commented that they had been asked to design and include this area as an add/alternate and if it were pulled out it would not compromise the overall design. He noted it is relatively inexpensive structure per bed cost compared to the rest of the jail. Chairperson Sheerin commented this would probably be kept as an add/alternate.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 6

(2-0767) Item 33 was to reduce the jail south housing unit by four cells. Mr. Fullerton explained this idea was to eliminate an upper and lower cells on the east and west ends of the unit. He added that the entire south edge of the jail would move north by about seven and a half feet. He said they had estimated the savings realized by eliminating those cells would be \$190,000. Mr. Dehl commented that they are already at bare minimum and this was not eliminated.

(2-0875) Item 36 was to eliminate the deicing pipes. This stayed in the matrix.

(2-0883) Item 37 was to downgrade the elevators. This had to do with using a lesser quality of materials. There were no objections to the downgrade.

(2-0920) Item 38 related to the design for seismic zone four as opposed to zone three. Mr. Fullerton said the building is now designed to withstand lateral forces that would occur in zone four which is a fairly active seismic zone. He added that the area in the City where the project will be built is a zone three. However, he said zone four is quite close and it would be aborderline. He noted that their engineer had said he would not recommend changing this and it remained in the matrix.

(2-0957) Item 39 was about the emergency generator. Chairperson Sheerin asked if this is different from the emergency/alternate fuel subject discussed earlier. Mr. Fullerton described the unit and said it is worth approximately \$11,000 and that it would keep the regular generator running for 48 hours before it would have to be refilled. The purpose would be to keep the lights on, the inmates housed, and the kitchen operable. Mr. Dehl felt this is an important item and said they could not run the jail without a backup. This stayed in the matrix.

(2-1027) Landscaping - The total cost was \$181,619. Mr. Sullivan noted that most of the trees were oversize and could be replaced by smaller ones that would grow. It was also noted there could also be a fewer number and in the front pavilion area that number could probably be reduced by one third. He added that the same could apply for the parking lot area. He also commented that some of the surfacing materials could be reduced along with the irrigation. He said the number of shrubs and vines could be reduced. He commented that the estimated savings for these changes would be approximately \$40,000. Mr. Fullerton said with the existing landscaping plan they are barely meeting the point system and Mr. Sullivan explained how he could deal with that. Chairperson Sheerin asked if the entry quad will still have glass on both sides and Mr. Fullerton said it would and described the configuration. These changes were agreed to.

(2-1219) Member Bacigalupi asked about the seven percent general conditions shown on the total page. Mr. Fullerton provided an extensive explanation on how they had arrived at the figures and what they represented. Discussion ensued during which he responded to questions from the Committee and staff on the subject. At this point the Committee reviewed the savings on each item. The total was \$546,460. They also discussed the cost of other items not being considered for cutting.

(2-1825) Mr. Aldean referred to the chillers discussed earlier and expressed his belief that going from a central chiller to individual systems would not be a good idea and explained why he felt that way. Member Mullet asked if the two alternate fuel capabilities could be combined. Mr. Fullerton said the boiler that heats the water to heat the air requires a special piece of equipment that allows it to run on diesel or gas. He added that pumps are also required to get the diesel from the tank up to the boilers and pipes and it is a \$40,000 add.

(2-1935) Chairperson Sheerin referred to Item 20 with regard to alternate fuel and asked if there were objections. There were none and it was removed.

(2-1993) He also asked if there were objections to removing Item 21 which was to reduce return air duct work in the court building. None were voiced and it was removed.

(2-2005) Member Honkump returned to the subject of the wood paneling discussed in Item 15 and said he would

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 7

rather delete cosmetics than function. Discussion indicated a desire to delete trees if necessary. Honkump stated he did not want to cut jail cells for paneling. Member Bacigalupi asked what kind of wood was being considered. Mr. Fullerton said it would be amigrat or maple and, although they are not high end costwise, they are nice. He also explained where the paneling would be located. It was noted that the paneling would cost \$40.00 per foot. Member Mullet stepped from the room at 8:08 p.m. and returned at 8:10 p.m. A quorum was still present.

(2-2210) Chairperson Sheerin felt that this was at a point where the jail and court people can lobby one way or the other. Member Honkump moved that the Committee delete the wood paneling at the concourses. Member Moran seconded the motion. Mr. Fullerton suggested that the Committee not delete the entire amount but rather leave some money for something different at those locations. Motion carried 5-1. (Member Bacigalupi voted naye.)

(2-2301) Member Bacigalupi asked if the Committee wanted to add the video arraignment at \$23,000. Chairperson Sheerin said he had a concern about this. He explained that the Sheriff's Office was cut down to bare bones and adding the video system would increase their work load. Discussion ensued on how the arraignment works.

(2-2610) Mr. Waters expressed a concern that there was still more than \$700,000 to go to reach the budget. He cited several other cuts and said there would still be \$200,000 to go. He suggested asking the Board Supervisors why they are keeping \$250,000 per year of ad valorem taxes. He felt that more cutting would do major harm to the program envisioned by everyone involved. He noted they could find themselves arguing with other entities as to which program is more important - the jail or the courthouse. He reiterated his desire to have the Committee approach the Board on the \$250,000. Chairperson Sheerin said the Committee had already been to the Board several times. Member Bacigalupi said each time they go to the Board the figure gets bigger. Member Mullet agreed with her statement. Judge Fondi remarked about his conversations with Finance Director Mary Walker where she had detailed what is in the bank and how much it will generate in interest over the next fifteen years and that it will adequately fund a bond issue and that this would add up to \$19 million dollars. He expressed a concern that the Sheriff's Department and the courts were being cut and concurred with Mr. Waters' earlier comments. He did not see how even one cell can be cut from the jail and how footage can be cut from the courthouse. He also commented that the project is being planned for now rather than a number of years in the future.

(2-2887) Chairperson Sheerin noted that \$667,000 still needs to be cut and said the remaining items to be considered are mechanical, courtroom size, and jail beds. He expressed his feeling that none of the Members have a desire to cut them. He asked Mr. Fullerton if the size is kept would a lesser quality make up the shortage. Mr. Fullerton said if such things as finishes were involved he did not think it would. However, he noted if such things as quality of mechanical systems were being considered, then he felt it could. Mr. Berkich commented that Ms. Walker's projections are conservative and felt that those projections can and probably will change. He also noted that the Board has rejected requests for the yearly \$250,000 tax revenue. He felt that they would not have an appetite to revisit the subject.

(2-3201) Member Honkump said the Committee has an obligation to cut the project to fit the budget. However, he felt they perhaps could indicate to the Board that they do not feel some of the cuts are the smart thing to do. He added his belief that the only way to get to the budget is to maximize cuts to the mechanicals. He also felt the Work Release needs to be cut, the video arraignment, the brick, and then go to the Board telling them that is the best that can be done. Chairperson Sheerin said he did not have a problem with the cuts that had been made so far. Member Honkump did not have a problem either but said the goal is only half way accomplished. Member Moran felt it is cut as much as possible now and that the Committee should go to the Board. He reported he has received complaints from the public relating to the ordinance passed and a resolution adopted which outlined the priority of what was to be funded by the sales tax. The top priorities were the jail, the courthouse, and if any funds were left over they were to be spent on a new administrative building. He commented that the cost of the bank building has already escalated to \$650,000 over what had originally been stated. He felt the Committee should tell the Board that they have gone as far as they can and ask them for direction.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 8

(2-3417) Member Baker felt that cutting the five feet from the courthouse building could easily be done because the architects had stated they could make it work. He said the Work Release has always been something that is desirable if the funding was available. He agreed with the Sheriff's people it is desperately needed but can be an alternative. He did not want to give up the brick now because he felt the Committee would never get it back.

(2-3561) Chairperson Sheerin noted that the Committee had been given a job and a budget by the Board. He added that the Committee is not necessarily doing that job by going back asking for more money. However, on the other hand, he said if the Committee wants to build something decent for the City are they going to make the cuts or will the Board. Member Honkump felt that the Committee needs to get down to the number on the board and then take it to the Board with the statement they have discomfort with some of the cuts. He also felt the Board would like the idea of putting the brick and paneling back on. Mr. Fullerton said the Board was expecting a jail with 106 beds, Work Release as an add/option, and a courthouse as done by Dan Wiley. He felt that no matter what the Committee and the architects do they have to tell the Board they had not gotten what they had said they would present. Judge Fondi felt that the architects and the Committee can only make educated estimates on what can be done relative to what was asked of them. Member Honkump noted that Work Release had always been included in the design and would be built if there were funds available. He also commented on the brick, paneling, and video arraignment and said the program and budget requirements can be met but some things would have to be reluctantly done in order to get there. He added he would be more comfortable going to the Board with numbers that would meet the program but saying there could be problems later on. He felt this might have a more favorable reception with respect to the outcome rather than saying it could not be done.

(3-0220) Chairperson Sheerin went to the second list. Member Honkump referred to the brick in Item 8 at a cost of \$89,500, the Work Release in Item 32 at \$290,000, video arraignment in Item 23 at \$23,000, Item 28 was the five feet reduction of the courts area at \$107,250, landscaping at \$30,000, and Item 10 which was the carpet in the jail at \$19,270. Member Bacigalupi wanted to reduce Item 31, in the north housing unit, by 750 square feet which did not reduce the number of cells but rather the day room on that side. This would be \$31,000. Discussion ensued on the possibility of cutting the design contingency by one half of a percent. The standards for day room size were also discussed. Mr. Dehl commented if they are not big enough there is always the possibility of an inmate filing a suit. Mr. Fullerton explained that this should not be a problem because it is actually bigger than what the program calls for. These reductions added up to \$589,020 leaving approximately \$78,000 left to cut.

(3-0647) At this point Mr. Fullerton talked about the central cooling plant and suggested locating it on the roof of the courthouse. He said this would involve some expensive piping but the cost of the enclosure might be less than currently designed. He felt this might save between \$50,000 and \$100,000. However, he said would have to consult with a structural and a mechanical engineer. Member Mullet asked if the structure could carry the weight of the unit Mr. Fullerton said some of the columns would have to be upgraded. (Member Bacigalupi left the meeting at 9:00 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

(2-0787) Chairperson Sheerin then said if the design contingency was cut it would be approximately \$80,000 added to the \$589,020 put them on budget. He added that the Committee's next job it to get it to the Board as soon as possible and suggested having a joint meeting. Mr. Fullerton reported that their cost estimator has said he can also look for some value engineering options. He also commented if the architects and the Committee can come up with something that could add up to \$50,000 or so it can be added to the list before the meeting.

(2-0885) Mr. Dehl asked about the security cameras and Mr. Fullerton said they had consulted their security company and had come up with a revised number. He added this had saved approximately \$40,000 and that the cameras are already out.

(2-0923) Chairperson Sheerin felt that the worst thing that had been cut was the 750 square feet from the jail and said it should be the first thing to be put back in if funding becomes available. He also commented that Mary Walker should be encouraged to look at her numbers again and Member Honkump felt she could update the sales tax figure.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 9

(2-1071) Chairperson Sheerin asked if the architects will be put on hold for a time. Mr. Fullerton said the Committee had directed them to make the changes in the first round. He added that the brick on the second list puts them on hold until they know the answer. He said they can continue working on the carpet problem, the video arraignment, the five feet off the courthouse, and the five feet off the jail. He said the sooner they know about the area changes and the brick the better because they do not want to delay their timetable.

(2-1169) Discussion ensued on a possible date for the joint meeting with the Board and it was decided to meet on June 27. Mr. Sullivan indicated that Ms. Walker would be back from vacation on June 25 and should be able to provide the Committee with the updated sales tax figures before the meeting. No formal action was taken.

D-5 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING EXTENSION OF CONTRACT FOR DENNIS LIEBERT AND DAN WILEY FOR JAIL AND COURTHOUSE SERVICES - (2-1209)

Chairperson Sheerin said this was a proposed fee for transition services. Member Baker felt that an updated proposal should be sought. He added he would like to keep Mr. Liebert on because he has been a big help to the Committee and felt he can continue to be. Chairperson Sheerin asked for input from Mr. Dehl who said he believed Mr. Liebert can be of some value but felt Mr. Liebert should submit a proposal of what he expects to do. Mr. Sullivan said Mr. Liebert owes the Committee one more trip. He felt it would be advantageous to him, if he wants the next phase, to meet with Member Baker and the Sheriff's people to come up with a new scope of work and costs. Member Baker felt it should be kept to a minimum but enough to keep him involved. Mr. Dehl said they had already cut the scope of work as it relates to the transition, policies, and procedures but felt that Mr. Liebert could continue to be of some help. No formal action was taken.

E. COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS (NON-ACTION) - None.

F. REPORT FROM STAFF (NON-ACTION) - None.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

G. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING - Discussed earlier.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None.

H. ADJOURNMENT - Member Baker moved to adjourn. Member Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

The Minutes of the June 10, 1996 meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee

ARE SO APPROVED _____ 7/30 _____, 1996

/s/ _____
Gary Sheerin, Chairperson

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the June 10, 1996 Meeting

Page 10