

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee was held on Tuesday, April 9, 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
Ed Moran

STAFF: John Berkich, City Manager
Walter Sullivan, Community Development Director
Jay Aldean, Public Works Director
Barney Dehl, Undersheriff
Dwight Dimit, Sheriff's Lieutenant
Bill Callahan, Chief Deputy Sheriff
Bill Naylor, Automation Services Director
Larry Nair, Building Superintendent
Fran Smith, Recording Secretary
(CPAC 4/9/96 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 Bacigalupi, Mullet, and Swirczek were absent.

AGENDA ITEMS

D-7 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE PHONE SYSTEM FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX - (1-0015.5) Bruce Fullerton, Paul Danna, and Dan Allen of DMJM - Bill Naylor - Mr. Sullivan explained that Mr. Naylor is in charge of the City's automation and phone system implementations. Mr. Naylor stressed that the fiber optic system discussed at a previous meeting is the way to go and that it will link the phone systems in the new building with the old building and will also provide a link to the computer system. He noted, because the Sheriff's functions will be split, there is a need to have both buildings equipped to have the ability to talk to each other at all times, especially in an emergency situation such as an earthquake. He provided technical information on the logistics of installation and explained why he felt it should be located underground. He also noted the approximate cost of \$60,000 and explained the details. He also commented on why he felt there would be a cost savings.

(1-0115.5) Mr. Fullerton said the budget had a \$65,000 figure for cabling the buildings. However, he noted there was no accommodation for the phones themselves and had assumed the existing telephones would be reused. He commented this would add an additional \$80,000 to the budget or deducting it from something else and said basically the only way was to deduct it from the design contingency. Mr. Sullivan said under the moving expenses - furniture, computers, and telephones, it was originally assumed it would cover the telephones but it has been determined it is only for the wiring. He noted if the expense for the phones is taken from the design contingency it would be approximately ten percent. He said an alternative would be to take it from other areas and entertained suggestions. Chairperson Sheerin commented it seems as though more and more dollars are being spent.

(1-0161.5) Mr. Fullerton reported he had updated and simplified the cost matrix. He said it had been his understanding it would be \$65,000 (\$60,000 for cabling and \$5,000 for phone lines) but now \$80,000 needs to be added making it \$145,000. He also reported they had done a cost estimate of the construction at the end of schematic design and it had been on track with the budget except they were proposing to have brick on the exterior

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 2

all the way around the courts. He added if it is decided to include that in the construction cost now they would have reduced the design contingency from 7-1/2 to 6-1/2 percent and the telephones would drop it down to having approximately six percent left. He also commented that the remaining contingency can be spent if there is something that is deemed desirable to do so. Member Honkump asked if the phone system could be pulled at the last minute if they were over budget and Mr. Fullerton said it could and that it would not impact their documentation. Mr. Naylor commented that there are other budgets that could potentially be used. He cited an example that the fiber optic cable controllers at either end could conceivably be put into the strategic plan for automation for next year. He also noted the phones could possibly be put in through the CIP process. He commented that a facility is being designed that the public will rely on and to let Nevada Bell phone lines control whether they could stay in business is a bad idea. Chairperson Sheerin said it is his inclination to go with the fiber optic idea. Mr. Naylor also said another possibility would be offsetting the cost of new equipment with the sale of the old but was not sure of the value. Chairperson Sheerin solicited comments from the Members as to whether they want to commit to the fiber optic. Member Baker said he liked the fiber optic selection as did Members Moran and Honkump. Member Honkump also said it is his feeling it is cheaper to do it up front and Member Baker felt it is essential to have proper communication. Chairperson Sheerin suggested committing to the system bearing in mind this would be an asterisk option. Mr. Danna commented that there might be a number of items for which there might or might not be funding and that the Committee may wish to prioritize them. Member Honkump then moved that the Committee take out of the contingency fund an additional of \$25,000 for the fiber optic link between the new building and the existing Sheriff's building and also asterisk a figure of \$60,000 with the idea of reviewing and prioritizing that as potentially coming out of the design contingency at the end of that process for telephones. Member Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

(1-0373.5) Mr. Sullivan said at the time the matrix was put together the utility hookup charges were not available but it is now known there will be those charges and they will be factors. He added he had canvassed the various user departments on things like how many personnel they anticipate, and the Sheriff's Department on how many inmates they feel they will have, etc. He also said the Utility Department is researching what the utility costs will be and he will provide it when he gets the information. Member Honkump felt that the public has to pay utilities and that the City should do likewise. Mr. Fullerton said when the information is available they can put it into the cost matrix.

D-5 REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF OUTSIDE REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT HVAC SYSTEMS BY WALTER KOEHLER, JR., P.E. FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED FIFTEEN HUNDRED DOLLARS - (1-0439.5) Chairperson Sheerin felt this item was a result of the under estimate of utility costs at the firehouse and that Finance Director Mary Walker had asked that this be researched. Mr. Nair reported he had discussed this with the architects and that they are not adverse to an independent review. He said he had been approached by a contractor who does energy retrofits and had been asked what the system was. He added that the contractor had said he had some ideas. Mr. Nair said he had discussed the subject with Mr. Fullerton's engineer and, because the design is still in the conceptual process, had determined now is the time to look at it to see if there is anything that could be done to achieve savings in energy bills later. He felt at the very least the result of the review would be an accurate estimate of what it would cost to run the building as it is designed with the system as it is designed. He felt this could help Ms. Walker and Mr. Berkich on what they need to budget for the cost to operate the building. He said an initial rough estimate of the cooling cost is approximately \$22,500 per year which is seven percent of the total energy budget for a building. He added that the electrical bill for a year could be \$150,000 to \$160,000. He advised what he would like from the Committee would be either a target figure for what can be expended for energy conservation measures above the existing budget for mechanical or be told that they will not spend anything. He added it was his hope that the engineer could come back with a laundry list of suggestions on energy conservation. He also noted that some things result in being more of a maintenance nightmare than they are worth in money to the City.

(1-0527.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Fullerton how they plan to manage utilities and what are their feelings on this item. Mr. Fullerton said their engineers have reviewed such things as the cost of electricity in the City, the

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 3

cost, ease of maintenance, and reliability of equipment. He felt that analyzing systems is laborious and would cost a lot of time and money. He added this would probably come down to past experience, what is known about current technologies, etc. He also advised they are open to having what they have proposed being reviewed but said they would like it to be done by a design engineer and also someone who is familiar with the operation of a system and such things as the climate. He said they don't have a problem with someone looking at their work but expressed a concern that the gentleman Mr. Nair contacted may or may not have the design expertise. He noted that most of the energy usage is in the electricity. Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Nair if he has dealt with the architects' engineer and Mr. Nair said he had but only briefly on the phone. He added that the gentleman in this item had been recommended as someone who has worked a lot with energy conservation retrofits in Nevada although he is not registered in Nevada but could work under someone else's license.

(1-0598.5) Mr. Liebert said this is called value engineering and suggested that the Committee may want to look at the bigger picture of the project before anything is constructed. He felt that the Committee may want to agendize a discussion of construction management. He added that at some point in time they might want to bring in another team to look at all these issues from a value engineering standpoint. He commented that saving money on utilities is just one and that a team would look at the design, the materials, etc. He did not feel the Committee should approve one piece at a time but rather look at it as a big picture when considering value engineering. Mr. Danna felt there should be more communication between Mr. Nair and their engineer. Mr. Nair agreed and said what he had been trying to do when he talked to the engineer was enlist some expertise because there is no mechanical engineer on the staff with the City. He had a concern that he might end up with a system that is energy efficient but hard to maintain and understand. Mr. Fullerton said they will get to a point where they can explain it better because it will be developed further. He added that the architecture gels as it goes along and that the mechanical system is too. He said until the spaces are defined it is hard for the engineer to analyze the energy usage. He commented that at the end of the design development phase the building will be set but at this point it is not quantifiable enough to make a hard analysis of one system vs. another.

(1-0685.5) Mr. Fullerton talked about the difference between an air economizer and a water economizer and said the water economizer is more expensive and saves energy relative to the air economizer. He added they are going with the air economizer at this point and that their engineer had expressed his belief that it would probably be relatively nominal. Mr. Danna said they are designing a middle of the road system and feel it is a good balance. Mr. Berkich referred to the City's experience with the problem with the cost of operating at the fire station and said from his perspective the \$1,500 would be well spent. Mr. Aldean noted the efficiency factor that was being discussed and asked if there are other designs more efficient. He then mentioned the estimation of what the utilities are going to be on a long term basis and said if the design is not to a point where it can be said a particular area of the building is going to have a certain type of equipment. He added that to compare others is a relative thing. He felt perhaps the engineers could come to the Committee with a discussion on what systems they did look at as far as ruling things out for one reason or other. He felt they could make a presentation to the Committee and that the final estimation would have to wait until the design is complete. Mr. Sullivan advised that the Committee could not take action on approving the expenditure at this meeting because the gentleman is not registered in Nevada but they could approve the concept. Chairperson Sheerin said there is no rush to make a decision because the design is not well enough along the way yet. He added that he would put this on the agenda for the next meeting. He encouraged Mr. Nair to communicate with the architects' engineer and said he would contact Ms. Walker about the funding side. He continued the item to the next meeting.

D-1 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A STATUS REPORT ABOUT THE DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS - (1-0841.5) Note - Much of this item consisted of visual reference to areas and items. The architects had brought scale models, and drawings of the project and landscape plans. Mr. Danna reported it is getting better each week. He also noted that some small changes have been made in the design. Mr. Fullerton said changes in the jail have been minor and were the result of meetings with the Sheriff's people. He added that most of what they have been working on are details on such as how the doors work, what kind of locks, and what kind of controls on the locks, etc. He said they had adjusted the footprint of the building a

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 4

little in an effort to rework the parking. He also noted they have worked with the Sheriff's Department regarding the function of the jail and felt they are in agreement with the progress being made.

(1-0901.5) Mr. Fullerton reported that on the courts building they have also made footprint changes having to do with the stairs. He also mentioned they had meetings with user groups since the last Committee meeting and are well on the way to having floor plans that everyone is happy with. He said they had made changes on the ground floor with regard to the changes Clerk-Recorder Alan Glover had indicated he wanted in his space. He commented on the second and third floors they had met with the judges on how they want their courtrooms laid out and have preliminary ideas on the judges' benches', etc. He said they have also worked with District Attorney Noel Waters on how he wants his offices and conference rooms laid out. He noted a major thing that has changed the schematic design is the screen wall enclosing equipment which was originally designed to be on the roof. He added they had determined what will best serve the building is to put this on the second and third floor levels.

(1-0961.5) Mr. Dehl was asked if he is satisfied with what is being done and he said they are progressing very satisfactorily and Mr. Liebert agreed. Mr. Danna said they would also concentrate on the entryway because from there they would start to work to the outside of the building. He added that its design and how it functions has driven a lot of the exterior. He pointed out the location and where the security equipment would be. He mentioned the view of the landscaped courtyard which is also the entry to the jail. He said they had located the childrens' room on the second floor. He explained this would be in close proximity to the waiting room. Chairperson Sheerin asked if this is related to child care. Mr. Fullerton said the area is in the program and there have been discussions about the appropriate nature of it. He added it is defined as a room where children could go and perhaps there could be some toys there. He noted it would be where the parents could watch them but it would be in a contained area where they would not be running about. Mr. Liebert felt that a down side is that there would be no supervision if the parents go into the courts and leave their children in the area. Member Honkump asked Mr. Danna if this type of thing has been designed in other courthouses and Mr. Danna said they have not done a child waiting area in a courthouse. Mr. Liebert said he has seen it in larger jails but it was in the visitation area. Mr. Danna said it is his feeling that a child waiting area would create a lot of noise.

(1-1133.5) Mr. Danna then said the primary issue with the entryway space is the view out and what has changed significantly is that the main facade of the entryway has become much more glassy and open. He also mentioned there are sun shading devices that will pick up and block out the rays from the glass but will not impede the view. He commented that the back side of the entryway will have a glaze and will be more of a frosted glass. However, the light will still come in.

(1-1171.5) Mr. Danna then talked about the ways bricks are used on the exterior. He had photos of other courthouses in the state with brick exteriors and said they are trying to maintain the same kind of character, that being a strong, solid, dignified structure. Mr. Sullivan asked about the protruding boxes shown on the roof. Mr. Fullerton said they have mechanical equipment in them. He added there is a parapet on the building but, although they would be away from the edge, they could still be seen from a distance.

(1-1393.5) Member Baker asked if the louvers on the west side of the entryway are adjustable and Mr. Fullerton said they are not. Member Baker said the west side is a problem in the fall and spring because the sunlight is so bright. Mr. Fullerton said there could be ways to eliminate the problem and one is the type of trees that will be planted which would block some of the bright light from coming in. He added that the type of glass could also help. He noted that the office space windows will have a coating and should not pose a problem. He also commented they want to maintain as much of the view to the capitol as possible. Member Honkump felt that the mature trees seem to block most of the view of the capitol. Chairperson Sheerin commented that the capitol is the major point of the axis. Mr. Allen explained why he thought the relationship of the axis to the community is a positive thing.

(1-1575.5) Mr. Fullerton noted that the model shows a dense grove of trees which would become a canopy and would give a clear view to the capitol. Mr. Danna said the type of tree he would prefer is ornamental and flowers.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 5

Mr. Allen had photos of several species and described what they look like in the fall and spring. Mr. Sullivan asked if there is any possibility of planting shade trees on the west side of the building because of the heat. Mr. Danna explained they had situated the flag poles there to try and activate that facade but they have not yet determined if they will remain at that location. He noted that the sun could be dealt with through the glass and shade but has found that people typically would rather have the view than a tree outside the window. Mr. Sullivan then pointed out some of the trees on the parking lot level and said they would eliminate the ability to look into the building. Mr. Danna said there is a big space from the trees to the edge of the building. He added when someone is in the parking lot they will sense the trees and will see the lower register of the building and see the steps in front of them.

(1-1661.5) Mr. Sullivan then commented on the exterior lights. He explained there is a residential neighborhood next to the site and expressed a concern that the lights would be too bright for the people living there. Mr. Danna explained that the lights are simple poles with a fixture on the top that gives off a glow which is more for effect than lighting the space. Frank Page asked if sodium vapor will be used on the lights to cut down on the cost of electricity and Mr. Danna said they had not gotten to that yet. Mr. Fullerton explained that the sodium vapor gives off a yellow light and said there are energy efficient lights that give off a white light. Mr. Sullivan had a concern of what the yellow would do to the color of the building and Mr. Fullerton said it would wash out all the color. He asked if the building will be dark at night or lit for safety reasons. It was agreed a minimum of lighting would probably be required.

(1-1745.5) Mr. Allen had photos of trees and mentioned the landscaping and said there is an idea for a backdrop for the parking lot to tie in with the building. He said they were considering evergreens so there there will be a year round green color. He said the main trees for the parking lot would be a Norway maple which is a good shade tree and has good fall color. He said another landscaping idea is to link the entire site with a ground cover and a hedge. He said there are no specifics yet but one consideration is a ground cover that would have some color. He added that the hedge would be a contrast to the red brick of the building and would screen the jail some. He said a good street tree for the east side of the site facing the residential side would be a black locust.

(1-1837.5) Mr. Sullivan asked if there is a possibility the sidewalk on the Roop Street side could be indented from the curb. He said he had a concern because it is a major arterial with traffic going at 35 or 45 miles per hour. He also asked if the trees on the south perimeter will be back from the fence and said he would not want to have someone climb up a tree and jump over the fence. Mr. Fullerton said the trees will be planted in the right-of-way. Mr. Allen said they have been working on what the zoning requires for trees and noted that they have satisfied the zoning.

(1-1879.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Page if the people in the neighborhood have expressed any concerns about the project. Mr. Page said there have been none. He added that they have street lights now and felt if the lights from the project are not overwhelming there should not be any problem with that.

(1-1905.5) Member Moran expressed a concern with the comments made by Mr. Nair and said it is his feeling that what is being attempted, within the confines of the budget, is having the most modern and cost effective equipment. He added he had gotten the implication it might have to be down graded to meet the qualifications of the existing building maintenance division. Mr. Sullivan felt what Mr. Nair might be alluding to is an upgrade of the equipment with the possibility of saving money. He added that the system is not a Cadillac system but will do the job. Mr. Fullerton felt that Mr. Nair is up to maintaining whatever needs to be maintained. He added that some systems are very complicated and may not be recommend for the project because they are difficult to maintain. He also said there is an advantage in having a good simple system because it is always easier to maintain.

(1-1993.5) Chairperson Sheerin said he had letters from some defense attorneys which included copies of a Federal case. The cited case made reference to prisoner contact with their attorneys. He noted there are contact and visitation rooms in the courthouse. He said he did not know if there will be cameras for surveillance but felt that

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 6

would be inappropriate. He also felt that phones between an attorney and the client would be out of place. He noted if there is contact between the attorney and client it requires a strip search afterward and that would require jail personnel time and said that would be a good reason to deny it. He asked the architects to work at not having phones in those rooms and work on not having the surveillance. Mr. Dehl said doing away with the surveillance and phones leaving only direct voice contact with each other is not a problem. No formal action was taken.

D-2 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING GRANTING UP TO \$75,000 TO THE CARSON DETOXIFICATION CENTER, INC. FOR THE PURPOSE OF MOVING THEIR EXISTING BUILDING AND BUILDING AN ADDITION THERETO AND D-3 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS ADJACENT TO THE CARSON DETOXIFICATION CENTER, INC. AND A RELEASE TO THE CARSON DETOXIFICATION CENTER, INC. OF THOSE IMPROVEMENTS - (1-2119.5) Tim Hogan, Director - Chairperson Sheerin referred to the opinion written by Paul Lipparelli of the District Attorney's office regarding the desire of the Committee to give the grant to Detox and let them proceed. He noted that the grant falls under the Davis-Bacon Act exception. He explained that Mr. Lipparelli feels this is, in effect, a public project with public monies, albeit Detox is a private organization, and believes it is necessary to be bid. He pointed out that the Detox building appears on the landscape drawings and asked Mr. Hogan to make sure it is in the right place. He advised Mr. Hogan that he needs to coordinate with his architect on the plans to make sure the building is in the right place on the site and fits in with the project as much as possible. He also said the main thing is really that the utilities can be served. He asked Mr. Sullivan if he felt it is necessary to use John Iratcabal of Purchasing for the bid procedure. Mr. Hogan said he had spoken to Purchasing and was confident they can work with him. Mr. Sullivan said he would like to be consistent and would like to use Mr. Iratcabal. Mr. Berkich said he had spoken to Mr. Lipparelli about this and, even though it is not subject to Davis-Bacon, it is using public funds. Therefore, it has to go through the Purchasing Department bid process.

(1-2231.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Hogan for an update on the project. Mr. Hogan said he had gone to his board and that the president was reluctant to commit monies until they know the \$75,000 will be forthcoming. He added he is in the process of lining up people to do drawings, house moving, getting a foundation plan done soon, and schedule these in such a manner that the money would be approved prior to that so that they could proceed in a timely manner. Mr. Hogan said he is also in the process of writing a grant. Chairperson Sheerin asked if they will do their drawings and advance after this is approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mr. Hogan confirmed they will. Chairperson Sheerin asked for Mr. Dehl's input. Mr. Dehl indicated they have solved any problems with regard to location and utilities. Chairperson Sheerin asked that Mr. Hogan share his drawings with the architects as soon as they are ready. Mr. Sullivan reported he had a discussion with the president of the Detox board during which it had been asked if the development could take care of the sidewalk, basically along Harbin Street. Mr. Fullerton reported that cost is in their budget and Mr. Sullivan recommended that the Committee proceed to approve Item D-3. Mr. Sullivan said Detox already has a special use permit and that Mr. Hogan will submit a letter and site plan to the Planning Commission explaining they are moving their facility from one block to another and that this should be on the agenda for the Board of Supervisors May 2 meeting. Member Moran moved that the Committee recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they grant to \$75,000 to the Carson Detoxification Center, Inc. for the purpose of moving their existing building and building an addition thereto. Member Honkump seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0. Member Honkump then moved that the sidewalk improvements adjacent to Detox will be paid for from the Public Safety/Courthouse Complex fund. Member Moran seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0. improvements adjacent to the Detox will be paid for from the Public Safety/Courthouse Complex fund. Member Moran seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

D-4 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT AND D-9 STATUS REPORT REGARDING A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR CLERK OF THE WORKS - (1-2419) Mr. Sullivan reported with regard to D-4 he had been approached by John Anderson who stated his client would not be able to attend this meeting and Mr. Anderson wanted to discuss this in detail at the next meeting. Chairperson Sheerin did not believe both of the categories are needed and was not sure which would be better. He solicited comment from

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 7

the architects. Mr. Fullerton said they are familiar with what construction managers do because they have worked with them in the past. He also expressed his belief that a construction manager would cost more than a clerk to the works. Chairperson Sheerin asked for clarification of the difference between a construction manager and a clerk to the works. Mr. Fullerton said a clerk to the works basically helps to administer the contract with the contractor and represents the City as a single person or group that will make sure the contractor is following the construction documents and he/she will be responsible for dealing with the issues that come up during construction. He added that construction management is more pro-active and go out and aggressively look at everything and try to improve the process along the way. He said they might also review the whole architectural drawings in an attempt to save money. He commented that they also make recommendations on something that may or may have already been discussed. Mr. Danna said it could be an issue of time and money for the City. He basically reiterated what Mr. Fullerton had said about a contract manager. He then advised that the clerk to the works is as capable of enforcing the documents as the construction manager although there is less creative opportunity in the administration of the contract. Member Honkump asked what would be a typical difference in the cost between the two. Mr. Danna was not sure but said they could find out. Member Baker felt that a contract manager would probably cost two to five times more. He also commented that the clerk to the works monitors the construction and makes sure the plans and specifications are followed. He also felt that the clerk to the works should have a day to day construction supervisory background. Mr. Aldean said he would be taking care of the administrative accounting part. Mr. Berkich said the person would work through Public Works and Mr. Aldean provided details on what his responsibilities will be. He also expressed his preference for a clerk to the works. No formal action was taken.

D-9 STATUS REPORT REGARDING REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR CLERK OF THE WORKS
- (1-2745.5) Mr. Sullivan reported he had not had the opportunity to talk to Mr. Iratcabal about this. Chairperson Sheerin continued this and item D-4 to the next meeting.

D-8 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING VIDEO ARRAIGNMENT AND SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS - (1-2783.5) Mr. Fullerton said it was their understanding that a decision between the Justice Court and the Sheriff's Office has been made that video arraignment is desirable. He added that the architects were asked for a cost estimate so that it can be presented to the Board of Supervisors. He advised that their estimate is that it would cost \$15,000-\$20,000 for equipment and this would be above the conduit cost that is already included in the project. He also said their AV consultant might ask the architects for additional funding for the design work depending on the complexity of the design work. He felt this could probably equip one of the courtrooms with a two-way video arraignment connection to the multi purpose room at the jail. He commented that the purpose of this system is to allow arraignment of the inmates without having to transport them to the courts and this would save on staffing. He said this is desirable from the point of view of operations of the jail and the courts and, for the money, is fairly simple to get a system where there is better safety. He also commented that they and their consultant support the concept that it would be worth the money and should pay itself back within a year and Mr. Dehl agreed with this. Member Honkump moved that the Committee put the design and equipment for video arraignment as an item to be considered at end of the design process for potential use of design contingency funds. Member Moran seconded the motion. Mr. Fullerton said a decision can be made at the time of bids when it will be known what money there is and add or not add the equipment. He said they or someone else could design it to include it because the infrastructure will be in their contract in any case. Motion carried 4-0.

D-6 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING EARLY CONTRACTS REGARDING THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT INVOLVING ASBESTOS REMOVAL, SOILS TESTING, WATER AND SEWER LINE IMPROVEMENTS, SHERIFF'S OFFICE IMPOUND YARD FENCING, AND DEMOLITION OF THE PAL BUILDING AND D-11 STATUS REPORT BY STAFF REGARDING THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE IMPOUND YARD AND EVIDENCE BUILDING - (1-2891.5) Mr. Sullivan felt there is not much to do on this because the Committee already took action at the last meeting to separate this out from the main contract. He added that this item was just to let the Committee know about some of the projects to be dealt with. He commented that the fencing will have to be done this summer because as the facility is being taken down a place will be needed to store evidence. He added that Mr. Aldean is

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 8

going to work with him to coordinate that project at the corporate yard. Chairperson Sheerin asked for an update on the issue of a building for evidence. Mr. Sullivan said initially the communications building near the airport had been considered but the fire department needs it for their hazardous material equipment. However, he said there is a metal building adjacent to it which Mr. Dehl had toured. Mr. Dehl said it needs some minor repairs but for a minimal cost it can be made usable. Mr. Sullivan said this is an interim solution. He added that the Capital Improvements Program is for such things and said he and Mr. Dehl can work together on submitting a proposal next year for a permanent building at the corporate yard. Mr. Dehl said he had looked at a similar building, 25' x 75', that would cost approximately \$40,000. No formal action was taken.

D-10 STATUS REPORT REGARDING ADDITIONAL SURVEYING OF PROJECT SITE BY HADDAN ENGINEERING, AND ADDITIONAL SOILS TESTING BY PEZONELLA AND ASSOCIATES, INC. - (1-2951.5) Mr. Sullivan said on the Haddan portion it was determined that additional surveying was needed for different curb cuts, elevations, etc. He added he had checked with Member Baker on it and it was agreed this needs to get started and he had approved the \$3,000 on it. Mr. Fullerton said he was not sure the survey is complete because their copy did not show all the utilities and property line dimensions and that they have requested this information. He suggested that the \$3,000 not be paid until it is received.

(1-3039.5) Mr. Sullivan then said Pezonella had done some soil studies regarding the foundation. He pointed out on the model where six test borings had been made but he felt, because it is such an expensive project, more should be made. Mr. Fullerton said Pezonella had gone down forty feet but they would recommend sixty feet. He explained the boring had been done based on the Master Plan design and the building now comes closer to Roop Street. He felt perhaps there could be a boring closer to Roop and one that goes down sixty feet. He added that they will base their structural design on the recommendations that Pezonella makes and they will base their design on the Pezonella report not on the test data. He said they were not recommending that additional borings be done but are saying it is their experience it would be a safe thing to do. He said their structural engineer said they can probably make a report based on what they have done already. Mr. Fullerton said they would defer to the expertise of Pezonella and if they are comfortable with their report. Member Baker expressed his belief that Pezonella is probably right. However, he added he would feel more comfortable with additional borings and having all the information. Member Honkump felt if Member Baker is hesitant that the testing is not meeting the normal testing criteria of the architects, then the \$2,500 for additional testing would be well spent. Chairperson Sheerin asked what the funding source would be and Mr. Sullivan said it would be from the Inspections budget. Member Baker said there was a line item for soils testing and one for surveying and the expenditures have not been anywhere near what was allocated on either one. Mr. Sullivan said he would work with Member Baker on this. Mr. Fullerton said they will present their final design development at the May 7 Committee meeting and if it is approved they will take it to the Board of Supervisors at their May 16 meeting.

(1-3279.5) At this point Mr. Fullerton said during the presentation at this meeting he had not heard any negative comments but also did not hear in the affirmative that they are going in the right direction. Member Honkump said he is happy with it. Members Moran, Baker, and Chairperson Sheerin all agreed it is coming along well. Chairperson Sheerin commented that the axis with the Capitol should be held on to and that the use of all the glass has to be balanced against the cost of utilities. He felt that all the user groups the architects have talked to are happy. Mr. Fullerton reported since the previous meeting they have been working with plans and had developed the exterior elevations and models for this meeting and had only reviewed them with the Sheriff's Department. He added that Judge Fondi had requested they leave some materials behind because he has spoken to groups who have expressed an interest in the project. He felt the drawings and pictures might be helpful to users who were not present at this meeting Chairperson Sheerin agreed this is a good idea and Mr. Fullerton said they would also leave the models. Mr. Fullerton then noted they might schedule court consultant Dan Wiley to come with them and review progress with the judges and said the architects next trip might coincide with Mr. Wiley's availability. Chairperson Sheerin commented that the childrens' waiting area is also something that has to be reviewed. No formal action was taken.

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

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the April 9, 1996 Meeting

Page 9

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

G. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING (MAY 7) - This will be prepared by Mr. Sullivan.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

H. ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business Chairperson Sheerin entertained a motion to adjourn. Member Baker moved to adjourn. Member Honkump seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0. Chairperson Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

The Minutes of the April 9, 1996 meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee

ARE SO APPROVED _____ 5/7 _____, 1996

/s/ _____
Gary Sheerin, Chairperson