

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the November 26, 1996 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee was held on Tuesday, November 26, 1996 in the Administrative Complex Conference Room #59, 2621 Northgate Lane, Carson City, NV at 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Gary Sheerin
Vice Chairperson Jennie Lopiccolo
Richard Baker
Ed Moran
Craig Mullet

STAFF: John Berkich, City Manager
Walter Sullivan, Community Development Director
Jay Aldean, Public Works Director
Barney Dehl, Undersheriff
Jerry Mather, Chief Deputy Sheriff
Fran Smith, Recording Secretary
(CPAC 11/26/96 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. ROLL CALL - Chairperson Sheerin called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Members Honkump and Swirczek were absent and Member Lopiccolo had not yet arrived. (Arrived at 5:39 p.m.)

AGENDA ITEMS

C-3 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING VANIR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT, INC. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS - (1-0025.5) Ken Harms and Gordon Graham of Vanir - Bruce Fullerton of DMJM - Mr. Harms said they were to concentrate on an analysis of structural and mechanical systems and the type of construction. He noted they had also looked at some other items including monitoring equipment, ceilings in the inmate area, and security locks in lesser detail. He added that basically with the design, as far along as it is in its evolution in the construction document phase, they believe there are no significant savings available in the structural and mechanical types of construction without radical changes happening given the date they hope to go to bid, how far along they are, and how satisfied the user clients are with the design. He added that they feel the design is reflective of the program and the needs and wants of the users who have been working with the Committee and the architects for so long. He said unless they tear the design apart they do not think there are significant savings to be had. He noted that Mr. Fullerton is expecting a revised or new cost estimate to be completed within two weeks and if that estimate shows that the project is within the budget there would be no problem and no point continuing this type of effort.

(1-0079.5) Mr. Graham said it would take a major revisit with all the users and would be a major loss of time. He added that, given the upcoming marketing window, he had contacted all the contractors who would be likely to be bidding and to pull back or lose time in the design trying to save money would hurt more than going out with what exists. He explained that February, March, or April would be best because that is when the major contractors would be coming off major projects, will be keenly interested, and will sharpen their pencils to give the City a good number.

(1-0101.5) Mr. Graham said there are some things they would like to come back to the Committee with and these are some changes in design which could save energy costs in the jail. He added that these were being calculated and felt the cost to do the analysis would be worth it. Mr. Aldean said Vanir had looked at such things as lowering

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the November 26, 1996 Meeting

Page 2

ceilings, changing skylights around, changing the structural design, and the HVAC system. He felt that they had found the way the design is configured it is efficient the way it is. He said he did not feel that significantly changing the building now would be in the best interest of the City. Mr. Graham reiterated what he had said about the contractors being interested because they want to get into something big.

(1-0193.5) Mr. Fullerton commented that Vanir had done a lot of research and had not found any major flaws in the design and that changing the design of the building is a course that can be taken if it is found there is a budgetary problem, either if the cost estimate is off or if the bids are not favorable. He added in terms of progressing there was a good window to get it bid and did not believe there should be too much delay. He noted that at a previous meeting during which some of the systems in the building had been discussed the Committee had directed DMJM to hold off on doing work that might be on the wrong track and said they had put their engineers' work relating to this on hold. He said they were working on other projects but could resume approximately December 9. He said a suggestion had been made prior to this meeting that perhaps they could wait to make a decision on the HVAC system and anything that might be changed on it until an energy analysis is completed. He added that Vanir had offered to provide that. He noted that DMJM could still get their drawings to plan check by ground breaking day. He said the plans could be in plan check in January and they could pick up comments in February and still put it out to bid in early March. Mr. Graham expressed his belief that the longer this is delayed the less advantage would be available as far as aggressive bidding from the contractors.

(1-0267.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked for an update on the type of HVAC system. Mr. Graham said part of the problem is that a chiller and boiler system was already in place and was more extensive than shown on drawings. He noted there would only be a small part of the jail which would be impacted by substituting an alternate system. Therefore, the savings would be smaller to the point where they would be insignificant. He also noted they believe there are some energy reclaim recommendations that should be brought to the attention of the Committee and considered in terms of long term costs and they would have that information soon. He also noted this would be a modification to the existing design which would add energy reclaim. Discussion ensued on how this would work.

(1-353.5) Mr. Graham had forwarded a letter to Chairperson Sheerin from a Clark Gibbon, P.E., who had made suggestions on structural changes. Mr. Graham explained that if they really had to save a lot of money and were aggressive they could revisit the structural system of the courthouse. He added what would have to be done would be reconfiguration of all the columns and beams into a more regular pattern but it would destroy the floor plans. This would delay the process several months and the window of opportunity on the bidding time would be lost. He said it would be a major time consuming effort by the architects. He explained that the economy and function of the structure take priority over the floor plans and the use of the space which would probably not be acceptable. Mr. Fullerton said he had received a copy of the letter and noted that their structural engineers have reviewed it. He added that some of the suggestions could be helpful and cited examples. He suggested that they could come back for a meeting on approximately December 10 when they would have the cost estimate and energy analysis. Members consulted their schedules and it was agreed to meet then. Mr. Harms said he would like to present a concept at that meeting relating to prequalification. He noted that prepurchase of a couple of major items for the project had been discussed and said he would like to pursue this at the meeting. Mr. Graham explained that in this type of project there are invariably items that have to be specially made and take a long time to be delivered. He cited an example of security where door and window frames need to be made of special material. It was his suggestion that the City prepurchase some items so that when the contract is awarded the items would already be available. He also commented on the overhead that could be saved. Chairperson Sheerin said he was interested in doing that. He asked what Mr. Harms had in mind when he talked about prequalification. Mr. Harms said this is allowed under state law and it typically includes an evaluation of a contractor's financial capability, similar project experience, identification of the lead superintendent on the site, review of that superintendent's qualifications as they pertain to this size of project, and the type of construction. He also provided details on the process. Chairperson Sheerin stated that there is some cash available for purchases. It was also determined that District Attorney Noel Waters would be the appropriate person to review the prequalification concept. No formal action was taken.

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the November 26, 1996 Meeting

Page 3

C-1 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS - (1-0681.5) Mr. Fullerton provided some new samples of wood colors. At the previous meeting the colors he had brought were either too dark or too light. He said the cost of these would be the same as the others. He also commented that lighter wood, as seen from the outside of the building and in the concourses, should be used and that darker wood should be used in the courtrooms. Chairperson Sheerin said he would like to user groups to make a decision on which they would like. The Members studied the samples and indicated their preferences and Mr. Fullerton said he would bring the samples to the next meeting and would let the user groups know they would be available at that time. Chairperson Sheerin suggested perhaps those people could come before the meeting to look at the samples and would not have to stay for the meeting itself. No formal action was taken.

C-2 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING REVIEW OF CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT/CLERK OF THE WORKS CONTRACT FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY/COURTHOUSE COMPLEX PROJECT WITH VANIR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT - (1-0785.5) Mr. Sullivan said there was nothing new to report. Chairperson Sheerin asked Mr. Harms to provide a status of the \$80,000 contract at the next meeting. No formal action was taken.

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

E. REPORT FROM PROJECT ARCHITECT (NON-ACTION) - None.

F. REPORT FROM STAFF (NON-ACTION) - (1-0805.5) Mr. Sullivan said one of the things Mayor Teixeira wanted before he leaves office was the groundbreaking. He suggested an appropriate time would be the Board of Supervisors December 19 meeting and Members agreed.

(1-0835.5) Mr. Aldean reported they are working on the location of the Sheriff's impound yard and the demolition contract. He said they had bid the utility relocation contract, have a low bidder, and will be making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. However, they did not have the demolition contract ready, primarily because of the location that was originally targeted for the impound yard. He did not believe they would be ready to proceed with this by December 19 but rather it probably will be in January.

(1-0885.5) Chairperson Sheerin asked for an update on the Detox project. Mr. Sullivan explained that they were waiting on the relocation of the water and sewer line. Mr. Fullerton said he has not talked to Detox in a while and what they are doing now is interfacing with Public Works about their permits, hookups, etc. Mr. Sullivan said he could contact their architect, Art Hannafin, for an update.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

G. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING - This was discussed earlier in the meeting.

H. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None.

I. ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business Chairperson Sheerin entertained a motion to adjourn. Member Lopiccolo moved to adjourn. Member Baker seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

The Minutes of the November 26, 1996 meeting of the Capital Projects Advisory Committee meeting

ARE SO APPROVED____1/14____, 1997

CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the November 26, 1996 Meeting

Page 4

/s/ _____
Gary Sheerin, Chairperson