

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee was held on Thursday, March 7, 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
Craig Mullet
Ron Swirczek

STAFF: John Berkich, City Manager
Walter Sullivan, Community Development Director
Jay Aldean, Public Works Director
Barney Dehl, Undersheriff
Dwight Dimit, Sheriff's Lieutenant
Fran Smith, Recording Secretary
(CPAC 3/7/96 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 5:40 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Members Bacigalupi and Moran were absent.

AGENDA ITEMS

D-1 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A STATUS REPORT ABOUT THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN AND DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASES OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX - (1-0015.5) Bruce Fullerton, DMJM - Dan Carne, local representative for DMJM - Mr. Fullerton said they are proceeding with their design development. He noted they are now in a phase where they are working on the schematic design and becoming rigorous about the structural, mechanical, and other systems. He added they are doing a lot of work in-house and, because of this, they have had less interaction with the user groups. However, they recently had a meeting with the Sheriff's people, Member Baker, and a representative from the Security Lock Company. He reported they had covered a lot of issues on locking, detention, and electronics for intercoms and control. He said one result of the meeting was a desire that the Sheriff's Department make a decision on whether they prefer electronic or pneumatic locks on all doors in the jail. He added this is something that will impact how they detail the project and they would like a decision before the end of design development.

(1-0045.5) Mr. Fullerton said the difference is that the electronic system has been around longer. It is a system where the locks are all in place until power is applied for unlocking. He explained that the pneumatic system is that instead of running 110 volt power to all the locks a tube is run with air in it to the lock and this is state of the art and had become accepted in new construction. Chairperson Sheerin asked about the cost for each. Mr. Fullerton said they are comparable. He said there could be a concern in that bad installation would jeopardize pneumatic locks more than a bad installation of electronic locks.

(1-0073.5) Mr. Fullerton then said with regard to the courts they are trying to come up with the most efficient way of having steel columns in combination with concrete block shear walls to resist the lateral movement of the seismic zone. He added they are also working on what the windows will look like on the exterior because of their size and location. He noted that these things have caused them to not yet send plans to the user groups and the courts because the building itself is somewhat in flux. He expressed his belief they will complete these in a week and send plans to the user groups. Chairperson Sheerin asked if the architects are still on a timetable and Mr.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 2

Fullerton said they are on schedule and will stay that way as long as they get timely input from the user groups. Chairperson Sheerin commented that the Committee will back up the user groups in whatever they want except if they start asking for more than is in the budget. Mr. Fullerton said the only exception to that has been the de-icing system to the pavement but have been able to cover that. He added they are proposing some brick on the exterior of the building although their original Master Plan budget had a cheaper stucco system. He noted they had done a detailed price study on the brick at the end of schematic design. He said it indicated it was a little over their budget but things are still loose enough it could mean it is in budget.

(1-0127.5) Chairperson Sheerin said in recent meetings there had been a desire to take some money out of contingency and use it for something else. He noted that the Board of Supervisors had been part of that process but he did not feel this should happen unless there is a lot of Major Project Review associated with it. Mr. Fullerton said the architects do cost estimating based on their best guess of the market at the time of going to bid which he felt is unsure knowledge at best. Therefore, they would never go into the bidding process with no contingency. He added the contract gives them an amount to be over but he felt the Committee might still ask them to re-design something if they are over budget. He noted that is tied to their original construction cost estimate, not to their original construction cost estimate plus the design contingency. He said they will be doing some cost studying in a couple of weeks and when they do their presentation on interim design development for the Committee on April 11 they will advise if they think they are within budget or not. He also commented if they come to the Committee and say the building is over budget they can discuss whether it is best to change the building or to approve the higher budget. He mentioned at the end of design development they are scheduled to make a presentation to the Committee and the Board. He added if they are over budget at that time they will so advise and the Committee can ascertain a choice of direction. He emphasized at this point they are not aiming at anything but the original construction budget. He reiterated what had been said about the brick being higher than the stucco and that is why they had brought it up. He then said in their current drawings they have more landscaping and fencing than originally planned but did not feel they are major cost items.

(1-0189.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Berkich for input who noted that as ground breaking nears there will be a transition from Mr. Sullivan's purview to Mr. Aldean's area of responsibility for project management on a day to day basis. He also mentioned having discussed with the Sheriff the need to construct an evidence building and that some money needs to be budgeted for it. He did not feel it would be very expensive but encouraged the Committee to consider it carefully. He also noted it needs to be planned and sited at the Corporate Yard prior to demolition of the existing building at the Sheriff's facility. He also noted it needs to be in a fenced and secured area.

(1-0267.5) Chairperson Sheerin returned to the subject of transition from planning to construction and expressed a desire that Mr. Sullivan continue to be involved in some respect. Mr. Berkich expressed his belief that as ground breaking approaches the intensity of the Committee's work will lessen with meetings occurring less frequently. Mr. Fullerton said they will be spending time working with the user groups and will also send plans to the judges, the Clerk-Recorder, the District Attorney, and Mr. Dehl and hoped to have their feedback by fax or phone as soon as possible. He also noted that they will also be keeping Mr. Liebert and Mr. Wiley advised as to their progress. He advised they will come back on March 28 to spend a day with user groups reviewing what has been accomplished in recent weeks. He believed by April 11 when they present their interim design that everyone should be satisfied with what has been done to date. Judge Griffin commented that the architects, with input from the Committee, have designed the jail intelligently and that it will not be staff intensive.

(1-0437.5) Mr. Fullerton then expressed his belief that the jail is at a point where the issue of locks and a couple of other things can be resolved. He said that on the courthouse their structural engineers are working on designing the most efficient structural system and are not changing what it will look like. He explained, with input from the users, they have been able to adjust some area sizes. He also noted when the schematic design had been presented it will be indicated as being in budget but in order for it to be exactly on budget something has to change and had determined the use of brick was the problem. He said the next big deadline was the design development presentation to the Committee on May 7. They are also scheduled to make an interim presentation on April 9. No

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 3

formal action was taken.

D-2 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT ASPECTS OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX INCLUDING CLERK OF THE WORKS AND SPECIAL INSPECTION FUNCTIONS - (1-0573.5) Chairperson Sheerin said when the project gets into the construction phase the Committee will be using the expertise of Public Works instead of Community Development. Mr. Sullivan explained that construction management of projects has always been handled by Public Works or the Parks Department depending on the nature of the projects. However, he felt he could continue being a liaison person. He mentioned the Clerk of the Works and said he would like to start advertising and put out an RFP for this as soon as possible. He added that respondents need to plan on at least an 18 month schedule. He emphasized the need for haste on the RFP because if it is late qualified people will already be planned out for other work. Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Aldean for his thoughts on the transition and Mr. Aldean did not feel it would be difficult and said his department would take the plans through completion. He noted they would make sure all the administrative controls are in place at least two months before the actual ground breaking. He said once the documents and plans are ready they can take over. He also felt the Clerk of the Works should come on board in September or October and that entity will be working on the review of plans and specifications. He noted that Public Works will work with the Committee but the Committee will be making the major decisions. Member Baker felt the Clerk of the Works needs to be someone with a construction background and cited the success with this on the new fire station project. Chairperson Sheerin concurred that the RFP process should be started right away. Member Mullet agreed and felt that the person should be up to speed before ground breaking. Mr. Fullerton confirmed he had been in a Major Project Review and said he would like to continue meeting with the participants. Chairperson Sheerin reiterated the previously stated emphasis that ground breaking needs to happen this year. Mr. Aldean assured the Committee that his department is committed to making sure it does. No formal action was taken.

D-3 DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING THE TELEPHONE SYSTEM IN THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX - (1-0749.5) Mr. Sullivan said it had recently come to his attention that the development cost matrix there included a \$65,000 item for phones but found it was only for the wiring system, but not the phones themselves. He reported that Automation Director Bill Naylor advised there is no funding for new phones. He said one option would be to move the existing phones to the new building. He also mentioned the possibility of using the Capital Improvement process for which major projects such as this qualify. He explained the process by which the Committee could put in a request for the estimated cost of \$60,000 for phones for both the jail and courthouse. He also suggested perhaps some funds could be taken from other areas and cited landscaping as an example.

(1-0793.5) Chairperson Sheerin then mentioned in the past the Committee had indicated their desire that the electronics in the complex be a first class system with the capacity to be upgraded in the future. He asked how this would fit in with the phones. Mr. Fullerton said within the cost of building the jail the construction budget includes the electronic connections from central control to all the doors. He added that the courthouse has built in cable trays. He noted he had spoken to Mr. Naylor about the option of the cable trays vs. conduit and Mr. Naylor had indicated either could work. He also reported that his engineers are proposing the cable trays as the best alternative and that this would allow whatever is needed now and in the future. He also said there is a soft cost in the budget which is for running the cables in the trays but is not something the architects would include in the bid documents. He noted that the City would have the installation done by another contractor. He said when they did the cost matrix the \$65,000 for cabling it presumed there would not be fiber optics in the building. However, the area where fiber optics were recommended was the connection from the back of the building to the existing Sheriff's building and the dispatch area. He said they had been aware of the cost for new phones but it was their understanding at the time that the money would come out of another budget which was why they had not included it in the matrix. Mr. Naylor said in the current telephone project there are no plans to upgrade the courthouse. He explained that the judges and district courts are on an AT&T partner system. He said the plan is to take old AT&T partner phones out of the Utility Department and bump up the judges system. He said these phones are about seven years old and would give them something of an upgrade until they get into the new building. He said that

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 4

District Attorney's equipment is only four years old but is no longer state of the art. He did not believe it is desirable to carry these two older systems into the new building. He then explained the technical aspects of installing various types of communication equipment and Mr. Fullerton pointed out their locations on the drawing of the project. Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Naylor to work with Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Naylor to write a report because this is something that was not considered previously. He felt this should be documented and the Committee could then make a decision on how they want to proceed. Mr. Fullerton confirmed for Member Honkump that the total would be \$60,000 for new phone equipment and \$24,000 for fiber optics. Member Mullet asked if video arraignment is still in the plan. Mr. Fullerton said there will be conduit in place which would allow cameras to be installed in the multi-purpose room or set it up to have a connection from the holding cell back to the courtroom. Mr. Dehl said the department believes in video arraignment because it saves a lot of movement of inmates to and from the jail. He also mentioned Judge Griffin's desire to have it and explained the reasons why. Member Honkump felt that the basic system of two cameras and two screens would not be that expensive. Chairperson Sheerin felt that the Committee needs cost figures for this system. Member Mullet believed it is important to discuss the VA system now. Mr. Fullerton said the architects can coordinate this part of the project with the judges and the Sheriff. Member Baker said there is a design contingency fund for which this sort of thing can qualify. Mr. Fullerton noted that the architects have a design contingency in their contract allowing for some leeway but felt they do not want to spend their cushion. Chairperson Sheerin reiterated his desire to have a report on the telephone problem at the next meeting. Mr. Carne said the the program includes the potential to add video arraignment in the future. He felt if the Committee wants to add it there is a need to have some meetings between the Sheriff and the judges to determine how they would want the system to work. Mr. Fullerton said they have a consultant working on this and suggested that DMJM and the consultant could offer their services for the design but an additional fees would be involved. Mr. Carne said if the Committee wants VA to be operative when the doors open then Dennis Liebert and Dan Wiley, along with the judges and Mr. Dehl, have more work to do because it is not part of the program. Chairperson Sheerin expressed his disappointment that the VA system had not been considered before. Mr. Dehl said their plan had been that they wanted the space for the VA but it did not necessarily mean they wanted it the day the doors open. Chairperson Sheerin said if it is determined VA is needed then cost estimates have to be determined as soon as possible so that the Committee can make a decision. Mr. Dehl felt he could provide a reasonably accurate figure within a week. No formal action was taken.

D-5 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING EVIDENCE BUILDING WITH SHERIFF'S OFFICE STORAGE YARD - (1-1251.5) Mr. Sullivan provided a memo from Mr. Dehl with regard to their need for a building. The memo outlined their requirements for the size and interior needs. Mr. Sullivan said that an area of approximately two acres in the Corporate Yard had been identified as a site. He added that when the budget had been studied \$20,000 had been put in for fencing, an alarm system, and lighting. He emphasized the need to get started on this by summer so that when it is completed the demolition of the PAL building can start. Mr. Dehl said they currently store an average of three vehicles and that they have a need to retain them in the case of homicide or traffic accidents and that they need an enclosed area for them. He felt with this building there would be a savings and explained that they pay \$750 per year for storage of records and additional savings could be realized if they could temporarily store their 400 boxes of records in the building. Member Honkump felt that the building would basically be constructed of steel, would be non-insulated, would have a cement floor, and felt it could be built for approximately \$.20 per square foot. Mr. Dehl said they are looking for a 2400 square foot building where the Sheriff's personnel might have to work for several hours at a time and that it would need some heating, lights, and bathroom facilities. Mr. Sullivan suggested part of the old firehouse could be used for record storage after the Clerk-Recorder moves into the new building. Member Honkump did not think it is wise to pay for storage for a couple of years because the building will be needed eventually anyway. Mr. Dehl said they had hoped to use the PAL building longer but that part of the project is going quicker than they had anticipated. Mr. Fullerton reported he had researched this and the cost estimate for a cheap basic building was approximately \$100,000. Mr. Sullivan said there is also the possibility of getting one shot funding from the Capital Improvement Program. Mr. Aldean mentioned priorities and felt if doing something is imperative and funding cannot be located elsewhere it would probably be given a higher priority by CIP. Chairperson Sheerin felt the question is whether the \$100,000 can be taken from the contingency. He also expressed a desire to have the cost estimate sheet constantly updated so that the Committee will know where they

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 5

are at any time. Discussion ensued on other City owned buildings that might be available for storage. Mr. Aldean said his department has been using a building at Fire Station II for Communications but it will be vacant when they move into the sewer building in the next couple of months. Chairperson Sheerin suggested that Mr. Dehl, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Aldean, City Manager Berkich, and Purchasing Director Moreto have a meeting to discuss the use of the building for evidence storage. No formal action was taken.

D-4 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING FINANCING ALTERNATIVES FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX - Chairperson Sheerin said he had asked that this be on each agenda in the event someone has any additional information or suggestions.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Member Honkump moved to approve the Minutes of the October 5, 1995 meeting. Member Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Member Honkump moved to approve the Minutes of the January 25, 1996 meeting. Member Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Member Honkump moved to approve the Minutes of the February 8, 1996 meeting. Member Swirczek seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

F. REPORT FROM STAFF (NON-ACTION ITEM) - (1-1827.5) Mr. Sullivan said he and Mr. Fullerton had discussed the demolition of the PAL building. Mr. Fullerton said they first estimated the timetable for the Public Safety/Courthouse complex at approximately 18 months. He added this was based on the presumption that the site was ready to build on. He felt that clearing the site should probably be started before putting the major project out to bid so that the 18 month schedule can be met. He said the demolition process is not currently built into their planning and mentioned the necessity of having a bid process to have a contractor accomplish the demolition. He also felt the rerouting of the sewer line on Pratt Street should get started as soon as possible. He mentioned that the problem with the leaking gas tank at the PAL building also needs to be resolved. Mr. Sullivan said the remediation project has already started and that the tank itself has been removed. Member Swirczek asked about a timetable for the demolition and Mr. Fullerton said it depends on how long the remediation takes. He also said he could research from his end how long it would take to get it ready to put out to bid and then the City needs to advise how long the bidding process would take.

(1-2073.5) At this point Mr. Fullerton asked that the architects be given direction on the issue of security between the jail and the courthouse. He said there is a point where the security in the courtrooms is controlled by the bailiffs and where it is controlled at the jail by the Sheriff. He felt there needs to be a clear understanding of how that takes place. He said the Sheriff's Department had indicated where they want their control to end and where it can be handed over to the bailiffs. He believed there is also a need to meet with the judges to determine how they perceive their security system. Mr. Dehl said he will arrange a meeting between the Sheriff's people and the judges within a week.

H. ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business Chairperson Sheerin entertained a motion to adjourn. Member Honkump moved to adjourn. Member Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

The Minutes of the March 7, 1996 meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee

ARE SO APPROVED _____ 5/7 _____, 1996

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 6

/s/

Gary Sheerin, Chairperson