

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the August 20, 1996 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee was held on Tuesday, August 20, 1996 in the Administrative Complex Conference Room #59, 2621 Northgate Lane, Carson City, NV at 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Vice Chairperson Jenny Lopiccolo

Richard Baker

Kevin Honkump

Ed Moran

Craig Mullet

Ron Swirczek

STAFF: Noel Waters, District Attorney

Jay Aldean, Public Works Director

Barney Dehl, Undersheriff

Bill Callahan, Chief Deputy Sheriff

Kathi Lear, Office Supervisor, Community Development

Katherine McLaughlin, Recording Secretary

(CPAC 8/20/96 1-0000.5)

OTHERS

PRESENT: Bruce Fullerton, DMJM

Dan Carne, DMJM

Khristina Tokes, DMJM

NOTE: - Unless otherwise indicated each item was introduced by Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo. 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. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM - Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Chairperson Sheerin was absent.

D-2 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REVIEW OF CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT/CLERK OF THE WORKS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT - (1-0010.5) Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo noted the sub-committee had met on August 19 and had taken action to make a recommendation to the full Committee. Member Baker reported there had been twelve applications. He explained how they had ranked the proposals numerically and narrowed them down to the three top choices. These were Vanir, Turner, and Taylor/Morse Diesel. At this point Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo advised she had a potential conflict of interest and would not participate in the interview process. Member Honkump moved that the Committee ask Carson City Purchasing to notify the top three candidates for construction manager and that they be interviewed and voted on by the committee designated and that both the members of the Committee and City staff members of that Committee are voting members. Member Baker seconded the motion. Discussion ensued on what the RFP that had gone out said regarding construction management/clerk of the works. Motion carried 6-0.

D-3 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE PROPOSED CONTRACT EXTENSION FROM LIEBERT AND ASSOCIATES - (1-0229.5) Mr. Liebert asked for an update from the Committee on the subject. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo noted Mr. Liebert's correspondence regarding his proposal for a contract extension. Mr. Liebert said he had laid out the representative's service and has been working on the construction phase documents as well as a transition proposal to help the Sheriff Department's team through the opening of the facility. He said it was his understanding that the Committee had not considered that proposal because the Sheriff's Department had come in with a separate proposal which cut out the transition proposal and Dan Wiley and had come up with a figure of \$7,600 for what they felt they needed. He explained he had written

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the August 20, 1996 Meeting

Page 2

he was willing to accept what the Committee wanted for his services. He added he had sent a second letter stating he had analyzed the \$7,600 figure and had determined that he could only provide some of that which was requested of him. Mr. Dehl explained why they had decreased the number of required trips to three and said they had to save every dollar they can. Mr. Liebert commented he had met with the Denver office of DMJM and had met with the Sheriff's Office here today and stated he felt he had probably saved the City \$100,000 in security equipment, e.g., cameras, monitors, intercoms, etc. Member Baker said he had been in the meeting with the Sheriff's Office and was convinced that Mr. Liebert is worth what he has been paid. He commented that this is a \$19 million project and that a difference of only \$2,400 is what is being discussed. He said he would strongly recommend that the Committee amend the contract again to include the extra trip. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo expressed her agreement with Member Baker's position. Member Honkump said his feeling was that the Sheriff's Department is in the best position to evaluate their need for a consultant and what they feel comfortable doing themselves. He said he would defer to them if they feel three trips is enough. Member Mullet asked Mr. Fullerton if he concurred with Mr. Liebert's statement about the savings he had achieved and did he feel some security had been lost. Mr. Fullerton said if DMJM erred it would be on the side of more security. He added it is helpful to them to have Mr. Liebert's expertise and felt it would not hurt the project to have his input. He did not feel some of the cuts have compromised security. Member Swirczek mentioned raising the contract amount to the \$10,000 proposed by Mr. Liebert and said the Committee is still talking an amount not to exceed. He added this does not mean they have to use the \$10,000. Member Baker moved that the Committee amend Mr. Liebert's contract again to bring his total contract amount up to a maximum of \$10,000 for his future services. Member Moran seconded the motion. Member Swirczek asked who authorizes Mr. Liebert's services. Mr. Liebert and Mr. Fullerton explained the process whereby his services are scheduled. Motion carried 5-1. (Member Honkump voted nay.)

D-5 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CARSON DETOX CENTER AND ITS DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE AND IMPROVEMENTS - (1-0657.5) Mr. Callahan said it was his understanding there have been discussions among Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, architect Art Hannafin, and the Center's director, Tim Hogan regarding the hookup fees. He added that Mr. Sullivan would like to delay the move so that there would be one time hookup fees once the new sewer line is installed on Harbin Street. However, he said Detox would like to move as soon as possible but there is something of a stalemate at the present time and Mr. Aldean explained the problem. Mr. Callahan said the Detox timetable for moving in is October 1. No formal action was taken.

D-4 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF A REVISED PROJECT SCHEDULE INVOLVING THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS AND PERMITTING/BIDDING PHASES OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT - (1-0725.5) Mr. Fullerton provided copies and said this was a schedule that DMJM had developed for the construction document and bidding phase of the project. He said the sewer line relocation was not included nor was the site demolition which had been separated out into a separate project. He also said they had not included input or participation with the construction manager. He noted this was sent to Mr. Sullivan but he had not yet received feedback. He said they were proposing to submit their documents for plan check on October 1 and that meant this would be basically the middle of the construction documents phase. He said this would be when Public Works would begin review of their documents and DMJM would be at approximately eighty or ninety percent complete with their documentation. He said after that DMJM would be completing their documents and will anticipate a five week period for Public Works to get back with their comments. He said it was his understanding that the City did not want to either award a contract or begin payments to a contractor until March based on finance. He also noted that the schedule was based on the assumption that the contract would be awarded in early March which he felt is what the Committee might or might not want to do. Mr. Aldean stated that Finance Director Mary Walker had said the March timeframe is when the City should award the contract. He said he had discussed the dirt turning date with Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Fullerton said he had also talked to Mr. Sullivan about a ground breaking ceremony on December 19. He noted that the site would be cleared by then and the sewer line would have already been moved by that time. He said in terms of having a formal ceremony it would correspond with when the plan check of the construction documents would be complete and approved for a permit by then to go into the process of bidding. He felt the major question is if DMJM had listed the correct length of time for project being out to bid and the time

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the August 20, 1996 Meeting

Page 3

to review bids. He felt the month of December is the critical time for the City to prepare the bid documents. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo suggested scheduling Ms. Walker to attend the next meeting so that she can explain the reasons for awarding the contract in March. No formal action was taken.

D-1 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT AND BUDGET RELATED MATTERS - (1-0889.5) Mr. Fullerton reported he had met with the courthouse user groups and the Sheriff's people. He felt there have not been any setbacks in the courthouse segment except for a pallet of materials which the justices of the peace did not have a problem with but the district courts did. He stated he would have to come back with some new ideas for them. This had to do with the wood and colors that went with it. However, he noted this does not impact his schedule. He said in the meeting with the Sheriff some security issues arose. He emphasized that these are not perplexing but are things that need to be resolved. He also noted that the issue of responsibility for security at the entrance to the courthouse, the duress alarms in the courts and some office space needs to be studied. This had to do with redesigning the system at it relates to location of buzzers. He felt that closure on some of these things needs to be done in order for them to complete their documents in September. Mr. Dehl reported that the Sheriff's Department had not considered taking over the responsibility of security at the courthouse unless it was a duress situation and noted they had considered a private entity for the regular service. He also stated the security in the courtrooms would depend on the judges and if the judges wanted this the Sheriff would have to go to the Board of Supervisors to ask for additional personnel. He said their personnel are basically for operating the jail and getting the inmates to the courts.

(1-1097.5) The discussion turned to the materials to be used on the exterior and interior of courthouse. Mr. Fullerton reported that the district court had favored darker wood rather than the blond and said DMJM needs to go back to the drawing board in terms of what the court had requested. He commented on the brick and block on the exterior of the building and said they are warm natural colors. He also commented that they have designed the brick to have some be vertical and there is also some striping made of lighter colored brick which is being considered. He also provided a sample of some of the material to be used for the exterior of the jail and described how it would be applied. He also discussed the chairs and benches being considered for use in the courts and the concourse. No formal action was taken.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

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

F. REPORT FROM PROJECT ARCHITECT (NON-ACTION ITEM) - (1-1385.5) Mr. Fullerton asked if the Committee wanted DMJM to review the three proposals from the construction management companies. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo said she would like them to be involved in the interview process. Mr. Fullerton agreed to send someone from the company to participate. He will coordinate this with Mr. Aldean.

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

H. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS - (1-1445.5) Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo suggested continuing items D-1, D-2, D-4, and D-5 for future discussion. Member Mullet felt that a discussion with Ms. Walker should be agendized for a future meeting. Mr. Callahan commented that the Sheriff's Department has vehicles confiscated from criminal activity and said they would have no place to put them other than the Corporate Yard and they would not be secured. He noted they do not have a timeframe on this and also on the mitigation of the asbestos issue. Mr. Fullerton said he had not included the demolition at the site in the schedule he had given Mr. Sullivan. He added that the demolition drawings are at the plan review stage. He said it was his understanding that Mr. Aldean was working on this. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo suggested also contacting Mr. Sullivan about this.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - (1-1525.5) Member Baker had corrections on Page 2 of the June 27, 1996

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the August 20, 1996 Meeting

Page 4

Minutes - from "changed to" to "rather than" and delete "broad category" and add reduction "of", delete "reduced", delete "five feet", delete "1,650 square feet". Member Swirczek moved to approve the Minutes of the June 27, 1996 meeting as amended. Member Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Member Moran moved to approve the Minutes of the June 6, 1996 meeting. Member Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Member Mullet moved to approve the Minutes of the July 23, 1996 sub-committee meeting. Member Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Member Baker moved to approve the Minutes of the July 30, 1996 meeting. Member Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

Discussion ensued on scheduling a date for the next meeting. It was agreed it could be the week of September 10.

I. ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo entertained a motion to adjourn. Member Honkump moved to adjourn. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Vice Chairperson Lopiccolo adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

The Minutes of the August 20, 1996 meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee

ARE SO APPROVED _____ 10/2 _____, 1996

/s/ _____
Gary Sheerin, Chairperson