### CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes of the October 15, 1996 Special Meeting

Page 1

A special meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee was held on Tuesday, October 15, 1996 in the Administrative Complex Conference Room #59, 2621 Northgate Lane, Carson City, NV at 5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Gary Sheerin

Richard Baker Kevin Honkump Jennie Lopiccolo Craig Mullet

**STAFF:** Jay Aldean, Public Works Director

Walter Sullivan, Community Development Director

Barney Dehl, Undersheriff

Dwight Dimit, Sheriff's Lieutenant

Katherine McLaughlin, Recording Secretary

(CAPS 10/15/96 1-0000.5)

**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 proceedings 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** - Chairperson Sheerin called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Members Moran and Swirczek were absent.

#### **AGENDA ITEMS**

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT INCLUDING INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR COLOR SCHEMES AND BUILDING MATERIALS AND BUDGET RELATED MATTERS - (1-0009.5) Bruce Fullerton, DMJM - Mr. Fullerton reported they had met earlier in the day with neighbors of the project, newspaper reporters, representatives of the Sheriff's Department, the Justice Court, District Court, and interior designer Karen Abowd. He said he had made a presentation on the exterior and interior colors. He noted there generally were no exceptions taken to the exterior materials. He added that on the interior materials there was agreement on issues where there had not been at previous presentations. He noted that the issues which had been contested were wood and carpet color. He said they had come with a range of wood color from an unstained light color to a stained dark color and the consensus was that the light color was preferred for use in the public concourse. He added that in the courts they liked the idea of a darker wood but felt the sample he had brought was too dark and would like something in between, maybe in the teak range. He said in terms of carpet he had brought some samples and had talked about options of ranges beyond the samples; however, he said there was one sample most of the participants seemed to like and agreed it could be the carpet for the public areas. He said based on that he could develop some options for carpeting in the office areas which would be a less expensive version. He said they had also talked about some vinyl tile that could be used in the ground floor payment concourse, the Clerk-Recorder, Election, and Marriage areas. He noted there was some concern that it might have a pinkish color in the wrong king of light so it would have to be tested under the lighting that will be used in those areas.

(1-0081.5) Mr. Fullerton also showed samples of brick colors and styles and explained where they would be placed on the building. He also talked about the types of glass, clear and frosted, that could be used. He had a photo of another project they had done and noted that they had brought the exterior concrete paving into the inside at the entrance which gave it a nice effect and it was an inexpensive way to get a durable weather resistant finish on the floor of the entry. He added they were proposing to do the same thing with this project. He said what he was looking for was general concurrence as that which came about at the meetings earlier in the day so they could proceed.

#### CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes of the October 15, 1996 Special Meeting Page 2

- (1-0219.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked Ms. Abowd for her comment on the color scheme presented. She said she did not have a problem with it and gave her reasons. She noted there had been discussion about having different colored carpet in different offices but cautioned that would be a budget issue because the price is better on rolls as opposed to cut yardage. She said she preferred continuity of the colors. She also suggested the possibility of putting some bulletproof glass on the first floor.
- (1-0271.5) At this point Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Fullerton what type of action he anticipated from the Committee. Mr. Fullerton said the only thing that was impacting their production of documents is the tile in the bathrooms and the concrete floor. He added that documents on both need to be drawn. He added they they would shortly be submitting a set for plan check. He said they would also be doing a cost estimate and felt it would be helpful to come out of this meeting with a decision on that. He commented that if the Committee has a disagreement with the direction on the materials agreed upon at the meetings earlier he needed to know it at this meeting. However, if the Committee accepts the decisions made earlier then he felt his direction is clear. Discussion ensued on how much tile would be used, where it would be used, the size, and the quality. The type of concrete in the entry was also discussed. The discussion turned to the idea of the bulletproof glass, the various types, the cost, and whether it would be feasible to use it.
- (1-0487.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked if what Mr. Fullerton had presented at this meeting was acceptable to those who had attended the other meetings today. Mr. Fullerton said there had been a clear direction it was acceptable. Chairperson Sheerin said he was looking for a motion to advise the architects that the Committee approves the color scheme as presented by Mr. Fullerton today and that they approve the tile in the bathrooms to a higher level and that they approve the concrete floor in the entry. Mr. Fullerton said that was acceptable an suggested adding "with minor direction given." Member Honkump said "so moved". Member Mullet seconded the motion. The recording secretary asked if the words "the architects will look at tile and medium colored wood" were part of the motion and Chairperson Sheerin said they were. Motion carried 5-0.
- (1-0561.5) At this point Mr. Fullerton said he needed to report that in terms of their schedule he believed that they would be submitting for plan check a little later than October 22 given where they are with their documents. He added his feeling that it would be some time the week of October 28.
- C-2 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REVIEW OF CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT/CLERK OF THE WORKS CONTRACT FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT WITH VANIR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT, INC. (1-0601.5) Gordon Graham of Vanir Bruce Fullerton of DMJM Dan Carne, local representative for DMJM Chairperson Sheerin said Vanir had been asked to prepare their initial contract and it came in at \$635,000. He added that the Sub-Committee had some problems with that in that the budget provides for \$150,000 for a Clerk of the Works and they realized they would have to have more than a Clerk of the Works but it is still a budgetary problem. He added that they had suggested to Ken Harms of Vanir that he bifurcate the contract into two pieces, one would be preconstruction, and the other would be post construction. He said a reason for the bifurcation would be to see if there really are a lot of savings that the construction management people can come up with which might help the Committee pay for the balance of their contract.
- (1-0631.5) Chairperson Sheerin added that Vanir had come back with a proposal that did bifurcate it and it is \$110,000. He said the Committee had reviewed the things Vanir wanted to do for the \$110,000 with an eye toward cutting out some of them they did not feel were necessary and letting them come back with a third proposal. He noted the proposal had come in today and the Members had been provided with copies. He said the issue is Vanir's basic services and said that they had revised those services to \$87,760. He reminded the Committee that they had wanted Vanir to do value engineering immediately because that is the place where they felt they could get the biggest potential savings. He also said Vanir had been given the go ahead to start working on that and have done a lot of work so far. He expressed his hope that the Committee could come to some kind of an arrangement whereby they could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that the contract can be approved and that the work can continue. He said the next Board meeting would be October 17 and said he would

## CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes of the October 15, 1996 Special Meeting

Page 3

be there to tell them what transpired at this meeting.

(1-0687.5) Mr. Aldean said Mr. Graham was at the meeting representing Vanir. He added that Mr. Graham has been working on the cost saving issues and will now represent the contract issues too. He noted that Mr. Graham would like to present the cost saving ideas to the Committee so that they could either give him direction as to continuing in the areas he is proposing for cost savings that will impact the architect fee because there may be some re-designing in some of the areas. He said some issues are large and have a potential high dollar savings. He felt the Committee should give Vanir direction to proceed with investigating areas to see if they make feasible cost savings to the project. He said he had talked with Mr. Harms today and in previous proposals from them they had included a cost estimate of the hours for the project. Mr. Graham said they started out before they were selected as the construction management company by reviewing information and in so doing they had an eye to several things such as a constructability review, what other sheriffs' departments like, and cost savings they felt would not adversely impact the facility regarding scope or quality changes. He added what they have come to is to try to lock in on some areas they felt they could go after and not hurt the facility quality wise. He said they have since talked to the architects, the Sheriff's Department, and with Mr. Aldean. He added that one of the four areas they want to look at for cost savings is possibly lightening up the courthouse structure to see if it can be made more of a steel frame building than a four inch brick 12" block steel frame. He said this would be similar to a steel frame building like the Legislative Building. He added this would not be a less safe building. He said the next issue is the type of construction. He noted the building has been named a Type 1 construction throughout and provided details as to what this meant. He said now that things are more fixed what they feel would be a lot of cost savings potential is to use the Code as needed, nothing less nothing more. He said the jail, for example, can be built to Type 2 fire resistant requirements which is a step down from Type 1 but it does not mean it is any less safe. He explained it is all non-combustible construction and all fire sprinkled but is less rigorous than Type 1. He said the courthouse could probably be a Type 2. He emphasized it would not be any less safe and said now that the Committee knows that is has maybe Type 1 construction throughout is not needed. He said the things the Code primarily looks to for type of construction is who is occupying it, how they are occupying it, and how close it is to other buildings.

(1-0865.5) Mr. Graham then said another thing is the HVAC system in the jail part of the facility. He noted if that can be changed to a different type of system such as a direct-indirect evaporative cooling system with forced air. He said it is a very good system and is much more sophisticated than a swamp cooler system. He said it would also allow for heat recovery and lets more to get done cheaper with less maintenance and energy costs. He provided details on how this works and said it would only be for the jail portion of the facility. He then said another area to look at is the possibility of using skylights in the day rooms and are talking to the Sheriff's Department about it to see if this would cause a security problem and if it would meet standards. He said this could be recommended for long term energy cost savings because the lights would not have to be run all day long in the inmate area.

(1-0981.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked about the lightening of the building and Mr. Fullerton confirmed that the integrity of the building would not be a problem. Mr. Fullerton said Vanir had faxed ahead their list of items and had then met with DMJM. He added that DMJM's structural engineer and Vanir's mechanical engineers had been at the meeting with Mr. Graham. He said Vanir has been very good in working with DMJM before presenting anything to the Committee. He said DMJM's structural engineers feel that the system they have with the block walls provide lateral seismic support is the most rigid system, especially in a building with a brick veneer which will move the least. He added they feel that is good value for the money. He said the other extreme would be to do all the work with a steel frame which he noted have performed badly in the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes. He said it came down to the quality of welds and something that is incredibly dependent on craftsmanship. He said if they were doing a high rise building they would have no choice but to do something like a monoframe but in a low building like this they have the opportunity to use technologies like the block walls that stiffen the building and said they feel more comfortable in providing a building that will last and live through seismic events and not have any drift. He also said by being there the block provides substrate for the brick. He felt at this point it is desirable that it be of solid backing for the brick as opposed to the metal frame which moves

#### CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes of the October 15, 1996 Special Meeting Page 4

more and is of lower quality. However, he noted perhaps in considering the cost the Committee may choose to have the lower quality and be comfortable with it. He said DMJM feels they have given the Committee a building that is not extravagant but is better quality. He said they have 12" block which is hefty and they, in house, have questioned whether the 12" block is needed and in engineering analysis they could possibly go with an 8" block which would save a lot in material costs. He provided details on what this would include.

(1-1091.5) Mr. Fullerton then said the stepdown from a Type 1 to a Type 2 fire rated building is a relatively minor step but a jail cannot be less than a Type 2. He noted that DMJM has interpreted areas in the courthouse which are the kitchen and spaces which inmates inhabit are Type I-3 occupancy. Therefore, they would say they don't think they would be allowed to make the courthouse building less than a Type 2 fire rated based on the fact that there is a jail facility. He did not feel a Type 2 would stand up quite as well in a catastrophic fire as a Type 1 and everyone could be evacuated safely. He also noted that in a Type 2 building the setbacks all around the building would have to be maintained.

(1-1145.5) Mr. Fullerton referred to the HVAC system and said they had been given clear direction that the Committee wanted a central plant and they had not questioned it. He added that what was being proposed now is a hybrid system in the inmate area. He said they are not necessarily against it but their engineers question the idea of less maintenance. He added their impression is that this kind of equipment is typically high in maintenance and uses a lot of water which is expensive. He noted the other issue is the comfort level and said his engineers wanted research into whether a building of this size and in this climate could be heated comfortably with this particular type of equipment. He noted since the early Master Plan stage his engineers wanted a comfort level for the inmates and they have been assuming this since then. Chairperson Sheerin felt that the comfort level was meant for the guards not the inmates. Mr. Graham felt this is reasonable concern and said if they felt their proposal was in any way inhumane they would not propose it. He noted in the Hollister facility the old style cooler system was not satisfactory but there is a new system at Mariposa which is. Mr. Graham felt that homes have gas furnace forced air and said it is the same system they are proposing for the jail except it recovers 75 percent of the heat and provided details on how it works.

(1-1320.5) Chairperson Sheerin next wanted to discuss the skylight suggestion. Mr. Fullerton said there was a redundancy on the fuel for the heating of the jail based on a request from the City that they have gas outages so DMJM has the ability to take diesel fuel out of the emergency generator and said there is a very big premium paid for that. He said he wanted to go on record that they do not currently have budget problems. Member Mullet cited his plant as an example and said Sierra Pacific Power will go through a facility and provide, at no charge, an energy audit that results in the most energy efficient lighting system, heating, air conditioning, etc. He felt there could be an opportunity here to get them on board now. Mr. Graham felt that was a good idea and suggested asking them to provide that service as soon as possible. Mr. Fullerton there is also an issue on ACA standards for light and something that needs to be reviewed with the Sheriff's Office. He noted that Vanir had asked if they can eliminate cell windows and said that is something they have been going back and forth on because there is a question how much they can comply with the standards. He noted if the windows on the outside were eliminated there would be a need to have more light in the day rooms and that could be done through skylights. He suggested that none of these things are in any way thought out enough at this point for anyone to be asked to make a decision. He there is going to be an issue of DMJM spending some time in order to be able to present some of these items. He said the first decision is it worth doing it and what will it cost to do it. Mr. Graham said the problem is on the designers because they are the ones most impacted. He felt that the sequence is to decide what changes to go with, make one more pass with staff, and then decide how much and how it will take to do it. Mr. Fullerton said if they are directed to come up with new designs based on these directions they can do that but but he would have to talk to his people to see how fast they can turn this around.

Mr. Aldean said the Committee voted to do some sort of value engineering analysis. He added that they also knew the analysis was being done at a time that was not opportune and that it would have been better to have the analysis done earlier. He added that his department would support any reasonable quest for additional design services from DMJM because this does cost. He commented that in how the contractor would be handled the only

#### CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes of the October 15, 1996 Special Meeting Page 5

thing that would amount to cost savings would be looking at the design and maybe reducing some of the performance of the building as long as the reduction was not at a level that would cause a disfunction to the need. He felt that in order to save some money it seems the direction has been to spend some. He said from a staff standpoint he could not see how the City could not compensate the designers for that additional work. He felt for the Committee's benefit there ought to be some further work done on some cost estimation and expressed his belief that maybe that could be divided between DMJM and Vanir if they can work together on that. He commented that some ranges could be ascribed to the different areas and based upon those ranges, as long as they were conservative enough, they could be brought back within a short period of time. He added he did not mean a complete re-design but felt that some ballpark numbers could be developed. He said the Committee could then review them and give new direction.

(1-1625.5) Member Baker said he did not quite agree with Mr. Graham's statement that is is in the design team's court now. He felt it is Vanir's responsibility to tell the Committee what costs they are talking about. Mr. Graham said until the architects decide on a selection of systems they cannot put a number to it. Member Baker asked for an estimate and Mr. Graham stated his feeling that the savings would be a \$2 to \$3 per square foot reduction. He noted if they go with the skylight the electrical bills would be cheaper. He also felt that the best thing to do would be to get Sierra Pacific and Southwest Gas to provide their services.

(1-1681.5) Chairperson Sheerin returned to the subject of lightening up the building. He asked what kind of savings there would be if the Committee went with Mr. Graham's idea. Mr. Graham said generally if they go from a 12" block to an 8" inch block he would expect to go to a \$2 per square foot less per wall area. He explained how he felt this would work and cited the Legislative Building as an example. Mr. Fullerton said they are providing the City with a building that is solid and said DMJM could stand by their design in terms of quality. He added that DMJM can stand by their design in terms of quality and felt that the City could possibly spend less money on a building which would be servicable and would stand up well over time. He felt they have brought it in under budget and have accommodated the desired program. He added they are also sympathetic with the fact that if the City can spend less money on it and choose to they will have money to spend on other things. Member Baker agreed with Mr. Fullerton and believed they had gotten the correct direction from the Committee on the type of building they wanted and that they did not want something inferior. He also felt that the suggestions made by Mr. Graham had cheapened it somewhat but not to the point that it is a problem. He felt that the Committee wanted to know and hear if Vanir's suggestions are of enough significant savings to continue investigating. Member Honkump felt if the Committee does not take the time to allow Vanir to do this then there are no savings. He added that because the Committee had made the decision they wanted a construction manager they cannot now say Vanir can't have the time, coordination, and added cost to the architect because they knew it was coming. Mr. Graham felt there is a side benefit on a high profile project like this that are scrutinized by the public. He added that should criticisms come up again the Committee will have a defensible position. Member Mullet commented that Finance Director Mary Walker had said the Committee needs to slow the project down because they do not want to go out to bid until March or April depending on construction costs and the market at that time. Member Lopiccolo wanted to know how the DMJM and Vanir teams will be working together. Mr. Fullerton said he would go back to his engineers to find out what it will take to get the re-design information to Vanir and then get back to the Committee. Mr. Fullerton said if there is a budget problem they might not have the option of staying with a system that is more expensive. He felt if the City would like to get his documents for plan check and if the major systems are changed it is their decision to possibly delay the plan check. Mr. Aldean said his staff would have to make that call and provide DMJM with whatever time is necessary.

(1-1955.5) Chairperson Sheerin said the Committee had to concern themselves with the proposed contract for Vanir. He noted the copies the Members had which spell out what Vanir is to do for the \$87,760. Discussion ensued on the estimated savings Vanir anticipates with possibly lightening the building, the skylights, etc. Mr. Aldean commented that he liked the concept of letting Vanir have a chance and did not believe a clerk of the works would get the Committee the building from the overall standpoint. He added his belief that the building cost could easily increase to \$23 or \$24 million and did not feel a clerk of the works could prevent that. He noted if Vanir is going to perform then a good test is a contract that will allow them to work with the architects on

## CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes of the October 15, 1996 Special Meeting

Page 6

designs. He also said during construction if they are still construction managers for the project they will have to work closely with the architects in re-designing things. He felt as long as he and the Committee are directing these people and watch the budget they can come up with something that will take it to the bid documents and then allow the Committee to continue their recommendation of furthering the contract to the construction phase. Member Mullet then moved that the Committee accept the contract, up to this point at \$87,760 not to exceed, and to the point of construction contracts and that they present this contract to the Board of Supervisors on Thursday.

Motion carried 4-1. (Member Honkump voted naye.)

(1-2309.5) At this point Mr. Fullerton reiterated he would have to go back to his staff to see how fast they can respond to construction mechanical and other issues. He added that will determine how fast Vanir can get back to the Committee. Mr. Sullivan suggested holding off getting a timetable from DMJM until all this is done and then everyone would have an idea of what the revised time schedule will be and how it plays in with the overall time schedule. Mr. Graham asked who would take the lead. Mr. Fullerton felt it was logical for DMJM to continue doing their cost estimate as they are contracted to do and they would still be responsible for their cost. He added Vanir would be asked to review the DMJM cost estimate. He said if Vanir is proposing cost changes then they would be responsible for making cost estimates. He commented that something DMJM needs to do is show what the virtues are of their design and what are those of the proposed design. Chairperson Sheerin said if it is going to call more for the architects the \$87,760 figure would have to be included somehow.

- **D.** Committee Member Reports (Non-Action Item) None.
- E. Report from Project Architect (Non-Action Item) See above.
- F. Report from Staff (Non-Action Item) None.
- **G.** Agenda Items for Future Capital Projects Advisory Committee Meeting Discussion clarified that, because of the work the engineers need to do, the next feasible date for a meeting would be November 4 at 5:30 p.m. in this room.
- **B. PUBLIC COMMENT** None.
- **H. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Member Baker moved to approve the Minutes of the August 20, September 12, and October 2, 1996 meetings. Member Honkump seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.
- **I. ADJOURNMENT** Member moved to adjourn. Member seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0. Chairperson Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

The Minutes of the October 15, 1996 meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee

# CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes of the October 15, 1996 Special Meeting Page 7

ARE SO APPROVED	, 1996
Gary Sheerin, Chairperson	<del></del>