

Grant County Board of Supervisors
April 6, 2017

The Grant County Board of Supervisors met on Tuesday, April 6, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. in Room 264 on second floor of the Administration Building, Lancaster, WI pursuant to the adjournment of the March 21, 2017 meeting.

Robert Keeney, County Board Chair called the meeting to order and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Verification of compliance with the open meeting law was a notice in the Herald Independent stating the date, time and place of the County Board Meeting and posted in two public posting locations and the county website verified by Linda K. Gebhard, County Clerk.

Roll Call, April 6, 2017

	Present	Absent	Excused
Carol Beals	X		
John Beinborn	X		
Ronald Coppernoll	X		
Roger Guthrie	X		
Dale Hood	X		
Lester Jantzen	X		
Robert Keeney	X		
Mike Lieurance	X		
Grant Loy	X		
Dwight Nelson	X		
John Patcle	X		
Gary Ranum	X		
Patricia Reynolds	X		
Robert Scallon	X		
Donald Splinter	X		
Mark Stead	X		
Daniel Timmerman	X		

At the time the Clerk took the roll call John Beinborn had asked to be excused he was going to be late, but he came shortly after the roll call was taken. First roll call resulted in 16 present and 1 absent but was changed to 17 present by the County Clerk. Therefore a quorum was present.

Agenda: Roger Guthrie, seconded by Lester Jantzen, made a motion to approve the agenda as printed. Motion carried.

Construction Management Services Presentation

- a. Maximum 15 minute per firm
- b. Question/Answer by Board of Supervisors
- c. Closing comments - 5 minute per firm

Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel drafted a series of questions both firms answered.

- 1. List their firms; experience;
- 2. Describe the fee schedule on their past projects;

3. Were those past projects completed on time and on schedule;
4. How they arrived on the fee schedule for Grant County's project;
5. How will the Grant County project be bedded;
6. How will the County be protected.

Names were drawn to see which company would present their information first. EPIC was drawn but opted to go second. The Samuel's Group continued with their presentation. Kurt Burner and Sid Samuels were present from The Samuel's Group, Brad Bierman was present to talk about EPIC.

Both companies answered all the stated question for the County Board. The Samuel's Group reiterated their experience in constructing correctional facilities, as they have done many time in the last two years. They reiterated the methods they use in the various processes that will happen and they felt they had 100% devotion to this project; that is why they have continued to go forward in their staffing for this project.

EPIC informed the Board Members of the many buildings they have built, although their experience in constructing a correctional facility has been limited. He touched on the differences in the costs; Brad felt that was due to the structure of their companies, EPIC being a smaller based company verses a larger construction company. The basic bidding process would be handled by both companies in the same manner, but Brad stated being a local company he felt the participation from local construction companies would be more. Brad stated he felt his company was capable to complete the project and keep it going on track.

After their presentations were done, the County Board members were given time to ask questions or state any concerns.

John Beinborn asked what would be the time frame for the bidding process. The Samuel's Group stated the process for them would take about a week, they would work with the Board Members and pull from a contractor base pool; however they did feel there could be some difficulty in filling some of the construction processes because the local pool is slim. They felt there needed to be a definition of " local contractors" the Board and The Samuel's Group would have to have a conversation on that and there needs to be some education on what is available when the bid pools have been established so the best bids are being considered. EPIC felt there would not be an issue to find what is needed locally or out of the area.

There was a question submitted while working on the new facility, how would it be handled to continue using the 52 Building. EPIC felt it would be handled as a restoration project, using fencing and barriers; working with the contractors as the process goes forward. The Samuel's Group stated they had been worked that out with Potter Lawson to work in staging so they could occupy the Social Services and ADRC part before the Law Enforcement was completed. There is a difference in grade and that will have to be dealt with once the construction has begun.

Dale Hood asked about bonding for smaller companies. The Samuel's Group stated they work with the smaller companies, it would depend on the County in how they want to handle that, they have in the

past covered the smaller companies under their umbrella bonding. EPIC stated they have done the same in the past.

A question was posed on Self Performing. Robert Keeney stated he felt it had been decided by the County that each company even though they would be the Construction Manager they can also self-perform.

Robert Scallon questioned the demolition of the 52 Building; were the costs included. The costs were taken out of the budget because that was not a construction process. Both companies agreed that could be established later in the process and as long as the overall construction budget would have the funds available that would be fine to bid that later.

John Beinborn asked about the specialty items that would be needed for the correctional facility. Brad felt that would not be a problem, they would all be part of the bid packages. The Samuel's Group identifies the product needed up front and finds the best company that can supply that piece in the best time lines and best price. This would be a part of the bid process in the beginning and not ordered as a special part; that process could prove very costly.

Carol Beals questioned staffing. EPIC will have staff on site and off at all times. On-site would be reimbursable costs, in office costs are not. The Samuel's Group stated that may be were the questions on the costs first came up. The on-site staff was included in the construction budget; it was not an added cost when the contract was sent for the Construction Manager position. Kurt Berner stated a corrections facility is very different from just building a building. There are deadlines that will be different than on a regular building; that is why more staffing is essential in a project such as this. Safety issues are a large part also; more staff working on that part is very important to help keep costs down during construction.

Carol Beals asked Brad Bierman if EPIC has ever worked on a correctional facility. He stated no, only through a previous employer, but he felt there would be consultants and experts through the Potter and Lawson team that would be helpful through the process.

The Samuel's Group stated their experience should now speak for itself but they felt Potter and Lawson should have been included in this discussion, they are a very important part of the team and would be able to identify what they can offer and cannot offer as far as direction in the construction plan. As far as their experience in these types of facilities; Kurt told the Board Members the meeting for the electronic components has not happened yet for this project. That discussion will be happening in the next three weeks. Those components can make or break a construction budget. That equipment needs to be discussed and studied for the best fit for the facility. There are major differences in the capability of things like the cameras and software. Kurt stated you can rate experience where you want it but these types of details are facts and you need a company who has the experience regarding those things.

Dwight Nelson asked The Samuel's Group where their employees come from. Sid Samuels stated some come from Wausau, Wisconsin and Fort Dodge, Iowa; these are the construction experts for correctional facilities they would have on the job. EPIC stated most come from the general area.

Robert Keeney asked how much interaction will the County have in the bid packages. The Samuel's Group said the Special Building Committee would work with them first and once the job specs are identified The Samuel's Group does the interview to find the best fit and then it comes back to the County for the final decision. There may be some of the packages that will not be filled on the bidding day; that is another process that then will have to be ongoing to completely fill all the construction components needed. EPIC concurred with that answer. They will make sure the County's best interests are followed.

Sam Samuel wanted to qualify an understanding on the bid categories. The architect is an expert on the drawings and specification but not an expert on coordinating them both. There needs to be someone who can understand the language that needs to be in place to make sure there are not any holes and/or missing work scopes in packaging the work categories so the work does not get interrupted and now the County has to find extra funds in a tight budget because some of the scope of the work was missed.

Carol Beals asked if there was any previous discussion regarding splitting the Law Enforcement from the Social Services/ADRC and hiring a General Contractor. EPIC stated that would be a recipe for disaster, they are the same facility. The Samuel's Group stated the titles of General Contractor and Construction Manager are two different positions that typically get confused. There is a mark-up on every one of the manager's positions. Construction Management is treated as a reimbursable. The County can receive some savings back if managed properly by getting the project done sooner and not using up their contingency. There is more of an ownership with a Construction Manager than a General Manager. There is more liability for the County also by having a construction Manager. EPIC concurred with the answer.

Robert Keeney asked The Samuel's Group why 2.7 Dispensing Agent was added to the scope of the contract. Sid Samuels stated 2.7.1 puts more teeth in the contract for The Samuel's Group on the Construction Management side. Knowing how to present the language regarding owner warranties, delivery practices that go with the process of ordering construction components and are carried out correctly. The second reason, it takes more work off the County. Because the County employees are doing a full time job as it is and now they are being asked to contribute to the construction process. This gives The Samuel's Group the ability to approve, pay and disperse the payment for all the individual contractor invoices using the benefit of the tax exempt status verses the County having to draft all the individual check. EPIC also intended to pay all the individual contractors even though the language was not in their contract.

Closing Comments were taken from each company. EPIC felt there was good discussion tonight, he reiterated they are 100% vested in this project; they are locally owned and feel they are capable of taking on a project such as this. He is excited for the opportunity to work for the County.

The Samuel's Group asked the County Board, "Why did the County pick them to come in two years ago". Sid Samuels felt it was for their expertise in the project the County is planning and that hasn't changed. He told the Board his first experience in building a correctional facility was a disaster from start to finish. He did not know what he did not know! The Samuel's Group has the same commitment in building this project to make it a success. There will be discrepancies, change orders and mistakes; they will be on

the site to correct the issues as they come up. Those can take a project down very fast if not handled correctly. They will engage local contractors as much as possible. The Samuel's Group just doesn't build buildings they protect the owners by making sure they have the best and most qualified workers on staff to ensure the project gets done right. This is a correctional facility, different for a motel. Sid Samuels hoped that the County talks to Potter Lawson and gets their input; they are a very important part of the decision. They were ready to move this project forward; they have been gearing up for this project. If they are asked to draft a contract they make sure they are ready to meet the schedule and are ready to begin within the next five weeks. They thanked the County for the opportunity to work with the County for the past two years; being part of the process and are looking forward to working for the County in the next two years.

Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Contract for Construction Management Services for the proposed Law Enforcement/Jail/Emergency Management/Social Services/ADRC facility:

John Beinborn brought up references, is it necessary to have those before a vote is taken. It was agreed that most references are asked for after someone is hired and how much more time do they want to see pass before a decision is made.

Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel stated he felt both companies are very reputable; the comparisons have been discussed between both companies.

Carol Beals stated she goes back to the fact that in constructing a correctional facility maybe they owe the County the expertise that is needed to complete this facility.

Don Splinter asked who would make the ultimate decision on the correctional components that will be needed. Robert Keeney stated that decision would be on the employees of Law Enforcement. Nate Dreckman confirmed they would be involved in that process. Carol Beals stated the architect and Construction Manger should also be in the discussion to get the best product for the County's needs.

Gary Ranum stated that throughout this whole process; the cost has always been in consideration. He has confidence in the design that Potter Lawson has supplied and with all the experts that have been brought in on the subject matter designs and staff members who have been involved he feels the best decisions are being made that will best fit the County.

Roger Guthrie went on record in saying he did not appreciate some of the comments made by the Samuel's Group at the last meeting.

Carol Beals, made a motion, seconded by Dale Hood, to go with The Samuel's Group for the Construction Manager for the Building project of the Law Enforcement/Jail/Social Service/ADRC to approve the signing of the AIA Document C132 – 2009 contract as presented in the County Board packets and to have the contract back within a week contingent on a few minor changes that may be made between the County and the Samuel's Group. A roll call vote was asked for.

DATE: April 6, 2017

QUESTION: Vote to award The Samuel's Group the position of Construction Manager for the Building project of the Law Enforcement/Jail/Social Services/ADRC.

	YES	NO	ABSENT
1. GARY RANUM		X	
2. GRANT LOY		X	
3. ROBERT SCALLON		X	
4. ROBERT KEENEY		X	
5. ROGER GUTHRIE		X	
6. JOHN PATCLE		X	
7. PATRICIA REYNOLDS		X	
8. RONALD COPPERNOLL		X	
9. MIKE LIEURANCE		X	
10. MARK STEAD		X	
11. DALE HOOD	X		
12. DWIGHT NELSON		X	
13. CAROL BEALS	X		
14. LESTER JANTZEN		X	
15. JOHN BEINBORN		X	
16. DONALD SPLINTER		X	
17. DANIEL TIMMERMAN		X	

Clerk took the results resulting in 2 yes votes and 15 no votes therefore the motion failed.

Dan Timmerman, seconded by Ron Coppernoll, made a motion to go with EPIC for the Construction Manager for the Building project of the Law Enforcement/Jail/Social Service/ADRC to approve the signing of the AIA Document C132 – 2009 contract as presented in the County Board packets and to have the contract back within a week contingent on a few minor changes that may be made between the County and EPIC. A roll call vote was asked for.

DATE: April 6, 2017

QUESTION: Vote to award EPIC the position of Construction Manager for the Building project of the Law Enforcement/Jail/Social Services/ADRC.

	YES	NO	ABSENT
1. GARY RANUM	X		
2. GRANT LOY	X		
3. ROBERT SCALLON	X		
4. ROBERT KEENEY	X		
5. ROGER GUTHRIE	X		
6. JOHN PATCLE	X		
7. PATRICIA REYNOLDS	X		
8. RONALD COPPERNOLL	X		
9. MIKE LIEURANCE	X		
10. MARK STEAD	X		

	YES	NO	ABSENT
11. DALE HOOD		X	
12. DWIGHT NELSON	X		
13. CAROL BEALS		X	
14. LESTER JANTZEN	X		
15. JOHN BEINBORN		X	
16. DONALD SPLINTER	X		
17. DANIEL TIMMERMAN	X		

Clerk took the results resulting in 14 yes votes, and 3 no votes, Therefore motion carried.

Robert Keeney stated Ben Wood, Corporation Counsel will negotiate the contract with EPIC Construction and bring them up to speed. There will be a Construction Document meeting on Monday, April 10, 2017 at the Law Enforcement Center.

Adjournment: Dan Timmerman, seconded by Mark Stead, made a motion to adjourn the meeting pursuant to the next meeting on April 18, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. Motion carried.