

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

May 10, 2017

The Administrative Committee met on Thursday, May 10, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in the Administration Building, 111 S. Jefferson Street, Lancaster, WI in Room 266 on Second Floor pursuant to the last meeting of February 14, 2017.

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, Lori Reid, ADRC, Nate Dreckman, and Jeff Anderson, IT. Others present were Supervisors Gary Ranum and Dan Timmerman.

The Administrative Committee meeting was called to order by Robert Keeney, County Board Chair at 1:00 p.m.

Chair Robert Keeney verified the is in compliance with the open meeting law, posted in two locations and on the Grant County web site.

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

Minutes: Roger Guthrie, seconded by John Patcle made a motion to approve the minutes of February 14, 2016 with the following correction on page 7, correct the word spelling of resend to rescind Motion carried.

Progress Report on Construction Document Phase of Proposed Jail/SO/EM/SS/ADRC Facility: Brad Bierman, EPIC updated the committee on the process. The 50% plans were reviewed in April with Potter and Lawson. The 90% plans will be due for all consultants to have all their information to Potter and Lawson on May 18, 2017. EPIC will meet with Potter and Lawson in Madison on May 19, 2017 to do a page turn review, which gives them a week to complete the plans to go out for bid on May 30 until June 22, 2017. Bids will then be opened up on June 22 in the County Board Room, EPIC will then qualify the bids; at the July County Board Meeting the bids would go before the County Board of Supervisors. On June 6, 2017 at 10:00 a.m. there will be a pre-bid meeting so all potential vendors can come and look over the prints and make sure they understand what is involved in their bid packets. This meeting is where they can ask their questions or voice their concerns regarding the bid packages. EPIC has been meeting with all the consultants, they have been out recruiting potential bidders for all the categories needed. Brad feels the process was going very well. Brad feels from the feedback from the potential bidders, there seems to be a lot of interest in this project. Brad is hoping to have a number of bidders for each category.

Robert Keeney brought up the drop off canopy that had been dropped in the previous plans in order to save some cost. Potter and Lawson previously stated that could be added later, but it was in the plans. Now Potter and Lawson Consultants would need

\$3,660.00 to put the canopy back into the plans. Brad suggested if the county wants the canopy added back in the plan, they should add it now so it can be part of the bid; as an add-on it would cause more problems and could cost more.

A motion was made by Roger Guthrie, seconded by Mark Stead to not consider the canopy for the Law Enforcement/Social Service/ADRC new facility as an add alternate item; this will be contingent on the consideration of the Full County Board at the May 16th County Board Meeting. Motion carried.

Updated Estimated Cost for Proposed Facility: Brad Bierman, EPIC handed out the list for the work packages for the bidding process explaining each package as they went through the categories. Brad pointed out; all labor fees in the reimbursable costs are included in EPICs fee which has brought that cost down considerably from the previous Samuels Group costs. There are 23 categories.

Brad reviewed all the work packages with the committee. The General Construction group contains many different items which Brad feels will make the package more appealing to the bidders. His hope is that some of the other packages can be combined or included in the General construction category. In Package No 2A because there is basically one asphalt company in this area, Brad suggested that there should be an option to use alternative products giving the county the price break down of each option. Brad stated concrete would be more money up front but would last longer. These kinds of changes can be made as the process goes forward.

Brad also questioned whether landscaping should be in the General package instead of on its own. He would rather keep the excavator working on their work and separate the landscaping on its own in the general package.

Dan Timmerman asked if private people or inmates could come in and help with jobs such as cleanup or help on the landscaping. Brad stated EPIC would rather not use that alternative because of the liability issues it could cause for their company. And also in landscaping there is special equipment that has to be used.

Dan Timmerman asked if Baird finance costs have been included in the total cost and when would the County have to start working with them for bonding. Nancy Scott, Finance stated there is no magic number that the County has to have order to buy bonds. There are six local banks that have shown interest in setting up a construction loan package for the County, Old National (formerly Anchor), American Bank and Trust, Mound City, Peoples, Royal, and Community First Bank. A bank can give a loan for 10 years to a government according to the State Statute. The loan would then have to be refinanced at whatever rates were at the time. By issuing bonds through Baird they can be issued for 20 years and the rate can be locked in. The question would be if rates went up, the rates would not be locked in by the banks, but is the interest rate saving enough for the county to take the risk. The banks have also offered the possibility of a line of credit for the construction period. They may be willing to do the line of credit even if they are not part

of the long-term financing, but that remains to be seen. To bond with Baird underwriting cost would be one to one and a half percent, with the banks that cost would be three tenths of a percent, which would be the advantage in going with banks versus Baird if they can come up with a package loan for the County. Robert Keeney stated that is still being looked into for the financing; which way would be more beneficial for the county.

Brad feels at this point he has been somewhat conservative on his costs; there are some concerns yet, like the soil test. Brad will know more on that after the tests come in.

Brad stated there are a lot of potential bidders out there to handle this project; he has gotten a lot of good feedback and interest regarding this project. Brad feels there are many companies still looking for work.

The committee questioned the contingency funds. Brad explained as long as the contingency is used only for construction it is adequate, if the County is thinking about adding many things than it may be a little light.

Jeff Anderson, IT Director was asked if computer racks and wiring are in the bid for the technology needs, Jeff stated they were. The computers, servers and equipment will be separate from the bid. These items such as phone systems, computer, etc. will be worked in and implemented later. There may be multiple bid packages regarding the technology needs for this project.

There are still some components that are not included in this cost such as furniture and office supplies, hopefully there will be enough saved on all other items that these things can be furnished later, or the current office equipment and supplies could be brought over to the new facility.

The final cost of the bidding packages were:

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Subtotal of packages | \$21,075,000 |
| Construction Management fee | \$750,000 |
| Construction Contingency | \$500,000 |
| Architectural fees | <u>\$1,418,000</u> |
| Total cost | \$23,743,000 |

Brad explained the Contingency cost is whatever the County feels safe in establishing and the Architectural fee was based on the last contract with Potter and Lawson. That contract was based on a percentage of the overall cost established by The Samuels Group; that may have to be re-negotiated because EPIC's costs are under what The Samuels Group had proposed.

Discussion/Recommendation on Bid Packages and Bonding Preferences for Building Project: Each bidder will have to include a performance bond in their bid and indicated what the value of that bond is. Once those numbers have been supplied to EPIC they will

then know if they can supply the bonding over all the bidders that cannot supply their own bonding. No firm decisions were made at this point; they will wait until the bidding process has been completed. Brad is comfortable they can bond over the whole job going forward; they have never seen the bonding market this soft before, he does not feel the bonding issue should hold any of the bidding up.

Concerns during the Construction Phase: Gary Ranum questioned on the electronically controlled devices; who has the responsibility to install. Brad stated the Electricians contract will supply the conduit and boxes for all the communication and security components. The communication people will do the installing. Security electronic people will do the installation of the cameras. The company which sells the County the camera system will most likely subcontract with security electronic companies to do the installation. The concern was the County does not want to double pay for the component and then have to pay for installation.

The committee asked Brad if he had any concerns on filling all the bid packages and lead times. Brad stated he is confident that the packages are very clear on the scopes of work in each package, and they clearly state what is expected from the bidder. His hope is that some of the packages can be combined. He feels there are plenty of vendors in this area that can fill all the package bids. He is confident in the qualification process all the requirements of each bidder will be established and there will be no questions on the scope of the each component. The lead times will also be addressed in the qualification, if the company cannot deliver the product in the time it is needed, they will not be awarded the bid. The challenge will be in getting the Law Enforcement structure enclosed before the first frost. He reiterated one other concern is the soil testing, Wisconsin has many different types of soil that can be challenging to build on, until the tests come back, EPIC does not know what they are up against with that. Brad stated it may just be a case of digging out more dirt and adding a layer of gravel.

Brad stated EPIC can keep the time line going by giving a verbal agreement to the bidder for the precast steel so they can keep going on the shop drawings before the final approval at the July County Board meeting.

Another concern stated is the operation of the 52 Building while construction is happening. There will have to be a temporary parking lot established, which will be an add on cost, but Brad stated that gravel can be used for the new parking lot or fill for the basement on the new building. A staging area will be made also for the construction workers also, so they are not in the way for the employees.

Brad suggested finding a place on the property so they can use as a dumping site for the soil that they need to move. That could save money not having to drive the trucks down the road. Orchard Manor Committee will discuss a location.

Mike Lieurance asked if the offices will be an open concept with more than one Social worker present in the office. Lori Reid did not see this as a problem for confidentiality

most of the Social Workers see their clients out of the office at this time. Mike stated there could be money saved in an open floor plan than creating offices. Gary Ranum stated dividers had been talked about before, those could be utilized.

Robert Scallon stated the old jail has not been sold what is the urgency to enclose the Law Enforcement facility before frost hits. Brad stated in order to protect the footings once the construction has been started those cement walls will have to be protected so it will be very important to keep going and not let them stand over winter.

Adjournment to the call of the Chair: Robert Keeney asked is there would be a need to have another meeting before the bid opening day. The pre bid meeting is scheduled for June 6 and on June 22 the bid opening has been set. Bid opening will be at 2:00 the committee could attend that process and then go over the information once the bids have been qualified by EPIC.

Robert Keeney and Gary Ranum asked if a bidder would ask questions or try to make suggestions in the packages before they bid the job. Brad stated during the bidding process they have the opportunity to state their opinion on the forms, but that is why there is a pre-bid date set so those concerns should have been addressed. Potter and Lawson will be present at the pre-bidding meeting taking notes on the concerns and questions from potential bidders. Those concerns will be addressed as addendums and will be explained in the bidding specs in the bidding packets.

Mark Stead made a motion, seconded by Robert Scallon, to adjourn the meeting pursuant to the next meeting on June 22, 2017, (bid opening day) at 2:00 p.m., unless issues come up which than a special meeting can be called. The meeting will be held in the County Board Room to accommodate a larger crowd. Motion carried.