

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee was held on Tuesday, May 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
Jenny Bacigalupi
Kevin Honkump
Ed Moran
Craig Mullet

STAFF: Walter Sullivan, Community Development Director
Jay Aldean, Public Works Director
Barney Dehl, Undersheriff
Bill Callahan, Chief Deputy Sheriff
Fran Smith, Recording Secretary
(CPAC 5/7/96 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 5:42 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Member Swirczek was absent.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

AGENDA ITEMS

D-1 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS
- (1-0009.5) Bruce Fullerton, DMJM - Dan Carne, DMJM local representative of DMJM - Chairperson Sheerin reported that the architects had requested a meeting with the Committee on May 30 after meeting with the Planning Commission on May 29.

(1-0017.5) Mr. Fullerton said they were not scheduled to present a design at this meeting. He commented that one of the things he wished to discuss is the schedule for completing their work. He said he, Mr. Sullivan, Member Baker, and John Iratcabel had met and determined they should plan to make a presentation on a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on December 5. He noted in order to do that they need to put the project out to bid on October 7. This would allow for a five week bidding period and another couple of weeks to review bids. This would be followed by a meeting with the Committee the week before the presentation to the Board. He also said he would be meeting with Larry McPhail of Public Works on May 8 to try and establish some milestones for interacting with Public Works and other departments on communications for meeting their deadlines. He also commented they had updated the matrix which included the anticipated bid cost of the project and included the computer cabling and telephones which were added and that a number of other items still need to be added so that they can determine what the overall project costs will be. These included potential hookup fees. He noted they have also found other costs which were not in the original budget one of which is alternative fuels for the boilers in the jail if there should be an outage. He stated they had learned the additional cost would be approximately \$45,000. He reported another big item not originally in the budget was a "muffin monster" which is a device that grinds up sewage. This would be to insure against contraband either going in or out of the jail and the cost could be as much as \$50,000. Chairperson Sheerin felt these items would fall into the discretionary category. Mr. Sullivan said he expects to receive a report on hookup fees from the Utility Department within a week. Mr. Fullerton then reported they had submitted documentation relative to a special use permit which

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 2

Community Development is working on that will be included in the May 29 presentation to the Planning Commission. No formal action was taken.

D-2 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT - (1-0241.5) Jack Chapman and John Thomas of Turner Construction Management - Mr. Chapman had a series of slides depicting construction of correctional facilities that Turner has been involved in. He provided an extensive description of what the company had done on the projects.

(1-0599.5) Mr. Thomas then talked about the advantages of having a construction management company with a lot of experience on these types of projects. Chairperson Sheerin said the Committee has a fixed budget for the project and commented on what had been spent for consultants. He also noted that the users have been involved since the onset regarding the design work with the jail consultant, the court consultant, and the architects. He added there is funding for a clerk of the works. He then asked what it would cost to have Turner work on the project and what could they provide that the Committee does not already have. Mr. Thomas commented that the biggest part of the budget would be the construction cost and did not believe savings would be achieved during the construction by having a clerk of the works. He also expressed his feeling that funding for the clerk of the works should be put into pre-construction and provided some details.

(1-0869.5) Member Honkump asked if Turner would come in on a professional services contract and Mr. Thomas confirmed they would. Mr. Thomas also explained the process other municipalities have used in going with multiple contractors rather than one general contractor. Member Moran asked what their fee would be in this project. Mr. Thomas said if it was the multiple contractors he had mentioned the fee would be about six percent and if it was straight construction management it would be about three. Chairperson Sheerin asked if an RFP would be required if the Committee decided to go with construction management rather than a clerk of the works and Mr. Sullivan said it probably would.

(1-0941.5) Mr. Fullerton felt that timing is critical. He said they are basically at the end of design development. He added that the time it would take to go through the process of bringing in a construction management company would change the timetable and nature of their scope. He expressed his feeling that perhaps this discussion should have happened a couple of months ago. Mr. Thomas said he did not feel it was too late because DMJM is still in design development. Mr. Fullerton provided details of their schedule as it is now. Member Mullet said up to this point he had only seen schematic drawings and had a concern with some of the options. Mr. Fullerton said they have presented a building which they feel is the most cost effective based on the budget. He added he could not comment on the position DMJM would take with regard to a construction management company since he had not been aware of this before the meeting and that he would bring a response to the next meeting.

(1-1135.5) Member Honkump asked Mr. Thomas if they would bid the project. Mr. Thomas said they would not and explained. Member Mullet echoed Mr. Fullerton's comment that this discussion should have been held several months ago. However, he felt if Turner could help the project to come in under budget it could be a good thing. Member Bacigalupi had a concern with a fee of \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 and asked if this would be typical on a project of this size. Member Honkump said a general contractor would be working on a net of five percent and there is potentially big savings. Chairperson Sheerin suggested perhaps Turner could study the spreadsheet showing the budget for the project and Mr. Thomas said they would be happy to spend some time and money on this. Member Bacigalupi asked how the Committee would be able to hire Turner's services. Mr. Thomas said when Mr. Fullerton returns with DMJM comments the Committee could take what they have put together for the clerk of the works and then an RFP could be put out on the street. Mr. Fullerton felt if this were to happen it would change the nature of their contract and that Mr. Silverman had said this in the beginning. Mr. Aldean asked if this was such a good thing why hadn't DMJM hired Turner or someone similar during the design. Mr. Fullerton said it is an industry standard to have the construction manager work with the client. He explained what they have done in terms of studying the costs and that they will be in touch with the contractor often.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 3

(1-1303.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Aldean and Member Baker if they had any experience in the probability of bringing a job in at or under bid by using construction management vs. using a straight bid. Member Baker said he had not and Mr. Aldean said he, too, does not although in San Antonio he had worked on a number of projects on the outside but not directly with the city. He expressed a concern that the time schedule is tight and this proposal should have probably been considered several months ago. Chairperson Sheerin then solicited a motion one way or the other. Mr. Aldean suggested if the Committee has an appetite to follow the direction of construction management it should be done on a parallel basis with the clerk of the works. Member Moran moved that the Committee not spend any more time on the possibility of construction management. Member Honkump seconded the motion. Member Mullet expressed his feeling that if the Committee wants to continue the idea he would not want to wait until the next meeting and that a special meeting should be set up for Turner to come back with some real plans or ideas on how to save money on the project. He added they could look at the current budget matrix and show the Committee how they could offset some other costs that are already in there. Member Bacigalupi said that is what she would like to do.

(1-1433.5) Member Baker reiterated he did not have experience with construction management. However, he explained while he was with the State they had been approached by construction management companies on projects but it had always been felt that staff had the expertise to do this. Member Honkump said the Committee had made the decision for the clerk of the works when it should have been made and believed the project is past the point where Turner could do the most good. Member Mullet felt that decisions have not been made on some of the equipment and if Turner could convince the Committee they are getting the right equipment at the right price he favored the idea. Member Bacigalupi said she was not sure of the extent of the DMJM contract with the City and Mr. Fullerton explained that their contract is a standard architectural/client relationship. He said their role in the construction phase is to administer the contract which means they would be involved in what the clerk of the works is doing. He added that the clerk would be checking to make sure the contractor is building what DMJM had drawn. Member Bacigalupi said she had an interest in hearing more details from Turner.

(1-1623.5) Mr. Sullivan commented on the RFP process with the consultants and the architects and that the process with the clerk of the works anticipates interviews the latter part of June with the selection probably around July 1. Member Moran felt it is too late in the process to consider construction management because it would slow up progress, there are already enough consultants involved, and that the Committee would have difficulties presenting this to the Board of Supervisors. Member Mullet reiterated his desire for a special meeting to see if Turner can convince the Committee to go forward with their proposal. Chairperson Sheerin asked for a roll call vote. Honkump - aye; Moran - aye; Mullet - naye; Baker - aye; Bacigalupi - naye; Sheerin - naye. Motion failed 3-3. Chairperson Sheerin said he did not want Turner taking the time of staff and the Committee. However, if they want to develop the figures and come back and try to sell the idea to the Committee he did not have a problem with giving them the time. He added that, given the time constraints, the Committee will be talking about a clerk of the works and the RFP will be going out soon. He commented that if the Committee decides to do an RFP for construction management that there should be parallel RFPs. Chairperson Sheerin then told Turner they could take as much time as they want but the more time they take the less chance they will have of being successful. He then asked Mr. Fullerton to be free in giving Turner whatever documents there are and send a simple letter of response from DMJM to the Members and staff as discussed earlier.

D-4 STATUS REPORT REGARDING REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR CLERK OF THE WORKS - (1-1875.5) Mr. Sullivan mentioned the RFP process and indicated it could possibly be held off some and that it definitely will be ready by May 30. No formal action was taken.

D-3 REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF OUTSIDE REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT HVAC SYSTEMS - (1-1905.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked if the Committee wants to have a second consultant to come in and give their opinion. He commented on Finance Director Mary Walker's concern with the energy costs. An extensive discussion ensued on the materials and equipment to be installed in an attempt to curb those costs. Member Bacigalupi felt that DMJM could study this and bring it back to the Committee at the next meeting and Mr. Sullivan said he would await

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the May 7, 1996 Meeting

Page 4

direction from the Committee on whether to pursue this further. Chairperson Sheerin said it would be on the next agenda. No formal action was taken.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

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

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

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Member Honkump moved to approve the Minutes of the February 15, 1996 meeting. Member Bacigalupi seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

Member Honkump moved to approve the Minutes of the March 7, 1996 meeting. Member Moran seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

Member Honkump moved to approve the Minutes of the April 9, 1996 meeting. Member Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

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

H. ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business Chairperson Sheerin entertained a motion to adjourn. Member Honkump moved to adjourn. Member Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Chairperson Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.

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

ARE SO APPROVED _____ 5/30 _____, 1996

/s/ _____
Gary Sheerin, Chairperson