

ADMINISTRATIVE/EXECUTIVE JOINT COMMITTEE

February 14, 2017

The Administrative Committee met on Tuesday, February 14, 2017 at 1200 p.m. in the Administration Building, 111 S. Jefferson Street, Lancaster, WI in Room 264 on Second Floor pursuant to the last meeting of October 24, 2016.

Members present: Administrative Committee Members present Robert Keeney, Mark Stead, Roger Guthrie, Mike Lieurance, John Patcle, Dale Hood and Robert Scallon. Department Heads present: Nancy Scott, Finance, Joyce Roling, Personnel Department, Lori Reid, ADRC, Fred Naatz, Social Services, Nate Dreckman , Jack Johnson, Grant County Law Enforcement, Steve Braun Emergency Management. Others present are listed on attached sheet. Kurt Berner, Samuel's Group and Kevin Anderson and Eric Lawson were present from Potter and Lawson.

The Administrative Committee meeting was called to order by Robert Keeney, County Board Chair at 12:00 p.m.

Grant County Clerk, Linda K. Gebhard verified both meetings were in compliance with the open meeting law, posted in four locations and on the Grant County web site.

Agenda: Mark Stead, seconded by Dale Hood made a motion to approve the agenda as printed. Motion carried.

Minutes: Roger Guthrie, seconded by Mike Lieurance made a motion to approve the minutes of October 24, 2016 as printed. Motion carried.

Estimate Cost Presentation for Designed Facility: Kurt Berner, Samuels Group presented the fiscal impact for the projected project. The directive given to the Samuels Group by the Grant County Board of Supervisors was to try and find some savings in the total project cost. Potter and Lawson were able to reduce some of the scope of the project and cut about 3,000 and 4,000 square feet from the jail, general circulation areas, and main lobbies and that helped to reduce the cost.

Description - Division of Work		Cost By Division
DIVISION 1	Project General Conditions	1,256,046
DIVISION 2	Demolition	250,000
DIVISION 3	Cast in Place Concrete/precast Structural members	1,113,030
DIVISION 4	Masonry	3,068.447
DIVISION 5	Structural & Misc. Steel	1,222,558

DIVISION 6	Rough & Finish Carpentry	327,253
DIVISION 7	Thermal & Moisture Protection	1,175,913

Description - Division of Work		Cost By Division
DIVISION 8	Doors & Windows	1,080,537
DIVISION 9	Building Finishers	2,059,163
DIVISION 10	Building Specialties	368,431
DIVISION 11	Detention Equipment	1,087,214
DIVISION 12	Building Furnishings	360,000
DIVISION 21	Fire Protection Systems	425,924
DIVISION 22	Plumbing Systems	1,616,124
DIVISION 23	HVAC Systems	3,017,295
DIVISION 26	Building Electrical	2,356,515
DIVISION 27	Building Electrical (Data)	656,799
DIVISION 28	Building Electrical (Security Systems)	1,054,859
DIVISION 31	Earthwork	407,928
DIVISION 32	Exterior Improvements	426,367
DIVISION 33	Utilities	<u>292,701</u>
CONSTRUCTION TOTALS		23,623,104
ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING FEES		1,500,870
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT FEES		692,709
PRELIMINARY CONTINGENCY (4%)		<u>1,023,355</u>
TOTALS		\$26,840,038

Kurt stated this cost represents about a 1.7 million dollar savings from the previous cost of 28.5 million dollars for this project. Kurt stated these estimates are only in relation to construct cost; no financial expenses are included.

Kurt explained over the last couple months in construction cost in today's markets they are finding spikes in the mechanical and electrical elements in construction and the cost

of steel materials have gone up about 10%. The Samuels Group built a 3% escalator in the mechanical, electrical and steel costs.

Robert Keeney, Chair stated one big concern that has been questioned is what the costs would be if the project was split to reflect the cost of Law Enforcement on one campus and Social Services/ADRC on a different campus. Kurt stated the estimates were based on the facility being built on one campus but by the next County Board Meeting he could split the cost for each facility.

The next step Kurt explained was for this committee to send a recommendation to the Grant County Board of Supervisor for the approval to continue on to the next phase of Construction Document Stage. This would give the project another layer of detail to finalize some of the finer components of the project such as the exact product to be used for flooring, windows, air handlers, detention equipment, cameras, etc. Kurt proceeded to explain the bidding process; how they would handle the bidding of each category breaking them down as much as possible in order to involve local vendors. If the project stays on one campus the County would be looking at the bid process taking about 3 weeks; total process to awarding the bids would take a twenty month duration until the time of construction. The Samuels Group would conduct this total process on behalf of Grant County. Kurt stressed the importance of keeping this process going forward so the projected budget can stay on track and the current market prices can be locked so Potter Lawson can begin the actual construction on the project as soon as possible.

Robert Scallon questioned the plumbing costs in the construction budget; Kurt stated those costs only reflect the cost on the building and not the cost relating to the City of Lancaster water and sewer connections to the project.

Dan Timmerman questioned if local banks would be able to be involved in the financing. Nancy Scott, Finance Director stated there are some limitations in regard to obtaining a bank note verses a bond. It would depend on the borrowing capability of the bank.

Mike Lieurance questioned the Demolition costs. Kurt stated that cost only relates to taking down the 52 Building; this does not include the demolition of the existing Law Enforcement Facility.

Kurt discussed “add alternates” meaning areas that the county can live with what the budget allows, but it would be better if that item could be upgraded to improve the quality. He doesn’t recommend a lot of these categories but in the end it can offer a potential savings; this is the least we can construct this building for, and these are some added things that the county is willing to add for better quality to the project. Kurt stated this strategy is well received by the bidding vendors.

Robert Keeney, Chair asked if energy rebate bundles offered by Focus on Energy, are those costs included in the budget. Kurt stated yes, but; to be cautious on some of the bundled saving offers, many of them depend on the anticipated period of pay off on of the facility and depend largely on the efficiency of the item.

Kurt stated the design of the facility was based on the Master Plan the county devised in the beginning to anticipate a 50 year existence. This is why all mechanical equipment was designed to be housed within the structure and not on top of the roof to help insure the life of their efficiency.

Kurt asked what the committee wants to present to the Grant County Supervisors to help move this project alone. A power point was suggested to show the modifications made to bring the cost down. The committee felt offering to split costs for each facility; stating the cost of the Law Enforcement facility and stating the cost of the Social Service/ADRC facility. Eric Lawson stated with the approval to go forward from the Board, at this point they are looking at a 13 week duration to finalize the documents in order to go out for bids which would get that process into June.

Roger Guthrie asked if it was incorporated into the facility to house mental health and drug related inmates more efficiently than the current structure. Eric Lawson stated the square footage and the number of bunks had been decreased but the classification for handling these types of inmates has not been compromised.

Mark Stead asked Sheriff Dreckman if he was content with cutting down the bunk capability because earlier the sheriff was skeptical if cutting the inmate capacity was wise in order to cut costs. Deputy Breitsprecker who is a jailer stated with the different classification areas in the pod area and the capability to double bunk should help for future expansion in inmates. Eric Lawson stated the design of the structure offers future expansion capabilities that have been designed into the plan so if the county needed to expand in the future it could be done.

Dale Hood asked about the space that was decreased in the kitchen and laundry areas if that would be a problem in the future to expand. Kurt Berner indicated that the space was not cut down they cut some of the equipment cost in those areas.

Robert Keeney asked Kurt if this was a firm number for the project. Kurt stated if the County gave the approval to go forward at this point; the costs could be locked in immediately. The more time that goes by the construction costs will fluctuate.

Robert Keeney asked the committee if they were ready to make a recommendation regarding the project. They asked to go to the next agenda items to review the issues of the 52 Building before proceeding.

Concerns with the 52 Building: Robert Keeney, Chair reiterated some of the issues regarding the 52 Building.

1. IT capabilities within the building. There have been issues in the ability to connect to the internet. Some of the employees had to be placed in the Administration Building so they could continue to work. An electrician was hired to come in and try to find out the connection issue. A grounding issue

was uncovered causing stray voltage. The purchase of a faster connection cable to be installed has been discussed. Some outlets have been replaced. Thermal-imaging has been conducted by Steve Braun which uncovered one circuit that was elevated in the server room but was not a major concern.

2. Safety issues have been question such as radon to electromagnetic fields.
3. Discussion has taken place to use the third floor of the Administration Building to place Social Services.
4. Per a study about 4 years ago, there were questions regarding remodeling the building or to vacate the property. That project was place on hold to continue on with the Master Plan.
5. ADRC is not in compliance with State requirements to continue to operate in the 52 Building in 2017; they do not have an alternate location to continue to operate.
6. Questions on Regionalization in the future which would affect departments such as ADRC and Social Services.

The discussion once again went back to what location would work best for a combined facility of Law Enforcement and ADRC/Social Service. Mike Lieurance brought up concerns of traffic patterns for the elderly, a location closer to the Social Security Building, using the same entrance for the jail and ADRC/Social Service in the new facility, and where do private construction sector fit into this decision. Mike would like to see the break downs of each facility so a firm cost could be obtained for each facility.

Eric Lawson stated by delaying this decision it would prolong their time line out for every month that goes by. At this point, if the Board decided to split the building there would not be too much involved to make this plan change because the Law Enforcement part is the largest part. But if they go into the Construct Development stage and then try to split the building would then be much harder. If the Board is talking to completely remove the ADRC/Social Service part of the project that could be done. But, if they are separating the two buildings on the same campus that would entail more cost and delay the time lines. Eric Lawson stated the building is designed to go out to bids for one structure not two structures. Both Eric and Kurt stated that in the beginning the direction that was given to them was to be built on one location and that was the direction taken.

Dan Timmerman again brought up the idea to use the Administration Building's third floor for Social Services/ADRC. He wanted to go on record that he feels ADRC/Social Services should not be combined with Law Enforcement.

Don Splinter asked about the security reasons; he felt this decision that was made was because ADRC/Social Services wanted more security.

Dale Hood stated he didn't feel a combined entrance for Law Enforcement and ADRC/Social Services is a justified reason to turn the project down. He doubted if anyone would know if a person was walking in to visit the jail or ADRC/Social Services.

Robert Scallon brought up the outdated Wastewater Treatment Plant and sewer system at the Orchard Manor site. He questioned the DNR mandates regarding closing it down because of insufficient phosphate levels. Robert Keeney stated those mandates have backed up those time lines for at least 10 years. The existing system along with the water lines could maintain the added facility.

Dan Timmerman stated that the cost of 26 or 27 million for a new Law Enforcement facility is un-acceptable; there are cheaper ways to satisfy the needs for Grant County tax payers. If we found a plan for a jail we want we could go with a local private contractor to build that facility on property we own. There are banking facilities who could take this project on for the County. The whole project needs to be simplified, get the cost down and go forward.

Mike Lieurance stated he also keeps hearing that local private contractor can build this facility cheaper, why not take a look at it.

Recommendation to the County Board on Building Project: Kurt Berner again reiterated that the direction of the Board was to continue on one campus. This is why the plans and budget reflect costs on one campus. Kurt stated they would supply the costs of a Law Enforcement Facility and an ADRC/Social Services facility for the next County Board meeting. But what he keeps hearing in the discussion is to have a private contractor build the ADRC/Social Services building. Kurt stated maybe they should just concentrate on building a jail only, go in that direction if that is what would satisfy Grant County tax payers.

Gary Ranum asked if the current design could be used by a private contractor to build for the county. Kurt and Eric agreed most contractors would not use a design from another company this is not how they typically do business. Gary questions whether or not two buildings are needed.

The committee gave Dave Bainbridge the opportunity to speak. It was stated that Grant County will not go into a contract to lease a building, so if a private contractor would build a facility it would be to build and buy. Dave reiterated what his plans were to build a facility for ADRC and Social Service on land he owns for the county.

Jack Johnson, Chief Deputy stated as a tax payer, he felt if you are talking to separate the building you would be doubling the common spaces, bathroom areas, etc. for two building verses incorporating these in one building. He stated the Board keeps stating there are private local contractors who would probably love to have the opportunity to construct a building for the county but so far all we have heard from is one. In his opinion, other private contractors should have the opportunity to be heard.

Fred Naatz also stated he agreed that the common areas would be a big savings for all the departments instead of dividing between two facilities. And the added security is a big plus for his staff and he didn't think the public would really know there was a jail in the same structure because of the design of the building. Social Services has worked with

Law Enforcement very closely in the past few years with the drug situation, he feels this is also a plus in being combined. There has been a substantial investment made by the county up to this point in the design; is it in the best interest of the tax payers to start changing it now?

Robert Keeney asked again what would be the recommendation to the Board. Mike Lieurance stated he would like to see the facilities separated and would like to see the costs separated and presented to the full county board.

During the discussion Mark Stead stated he thought the County Board of Supervisor had made a motion at a previous meeting to go forward with this project on one campus. He asked if this committee could make a recommendation stating something different without rescinding the motion to go forward on one campus.

Roger Guthrie stated he has heard from more citizens to leave the facilities together on one campus than he has heard to separate them.

Roger Guthrie made a motion to present the information given to this committee today from the Samuels Group and Potter Lawson and also bring the cost of the Law Enforcement only with Social/ADRC removed from the design.

Some of the committee members were concerned with the previous motion that had been made by the County Board to go forward on one campus. They felt Corporation Counsel should be consulted.

A recess was called by Robert Keeney for time to consult with Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel.

Robert Keeney called the meeting back to order at 2:00 p.m. The determination made by Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel was as follows: "The committee does not have the authority to recommend a decision to the full county board because of the previous motion that had been made. The motion would have to be rescinded. If the action to rescind is properly noticed on the agenda it would take a simple majority to rescind, if it is not properly noted it will take a super majority to rescind original motion."

Because the motion Roger Guthrie made did not receive a second, the motion died.

The committee asked The Samuels Group, Kurt Berner to supply the cost of the Law Enforcement and Social Service/ADRC separately at the next Grant County Board of Supervisor meeting.

Continuation of Operations Plan: Dan Timmerman presented information regarding contingency plans for a disaster. He has worked in this line of work during his career and wanted to make sure the County has this kind of contingency in place. Steve Braun, Emergency Management stated the County does have these contingencies but it would probably not hurt to update the plans. Steve stated there were two kinds of contingency

plans, one for each building with the actions that should be taken in case of an emergency. And another contingency plan to ensure the operations of the County Government can continue on if a disaster. Steve will work with the Department Heads to make sure all the contingency plans are up to date.

Energy Performance Contract for Infrastructure and Sustainability: Aaron Rittenhouse, Johnson Control presented their information to the county back in August 2016. The RFP was put on hold because the county was working on the Master Plan. They were asked to come back in February 2017 to update the county on their savings projections. The original offer was projected to save the county well over \$100,000.00 in savings. The original fee was for 2% of the total savings which was \$134,000.00. Right now the flat fee is \$64,000.00 to enter into an energy savings contract. They are offering the county a flat fee of \$20,000.00 with no upfront fees to the county. Because the terms now have changed Robert Keeney stated that a new RFP would have to be drawn up and the county would have to go out for bids again. This is not strictly an electrical savings but also operational cost savings. Between now and August the cost of this energy savings contract will be increasing by the Federal Open Market Committee.

For lack of a motion, Robert Keeney stated this issue will be included on the next Administrative Committee meeting for discussion.

Adjournment to the Call of the Chair: Roger Guthrie, seconded by Mark Stead made a motion to adjourn to the call of the chair. Motion carried.