

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING  
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
APRIL 28, 1993

Presiding: Frank Bering, Jr., Chairman

Members Present: Karen Berryman, Tom Ralser, Paul Nelson, Cindy George, Lon Carpenter, Steve Hilliard, Linda Afman, Janet Comerford

Staff Present: Debbie Kovalik, Judy Manning, Irene Carlow

Earlier today a meeting was held with Greg Dillon and Ken Hunt to discuss the Visitor Center project. Present at that meeting were: the Chairman, Lon Carpenter, Paul Nelson, Barney Barnett, Debbie Kovalik, Dave Varley, Jim Shanks, Mark Smith, and John Kenney. The group discussed the potential of continuing to work with Dillon-Hunt or going to a design/build process. The consensus of the group was that Dillon-Hunt will continue.

The Chairman displayed drawings of the six options presented by Dillon-Hunt. Drawing A1-F (option 6) was considered the most efficient of those presented. Ken Hunt is to begin calling the bidding contractors this afternoon to try to get them together in the next 2-3 days to get a general cost estimate of this preliminary drawing. He will solicit input from the contractors on the types of changes that would need to be made if they feel this can't be built for \$300,000; he will advise the VCB of the results of this "reality check". This work will be done at no charge to the VCB. This extra step of soliciting estimates from contractors is not normally done; however, if this had been done before the RFP was issued, the VCB may have been put on notice of the potential costs of the project.

The results of this "reality check" needs to be delivered to the VCB no later than Friday, May 7 so that information can be conveyed to the Board prior to the regular meeting May 11.

If the VCB wishes to continue working with Dillon-Hunt after the above work is completed, a new contract for design fees would need to be prepared for a total amount of \$16,700. Dillon-Hunt estimates 80 hours of principal time and 140 hours of design time; they estimate they will actually spend twice that amount of time on this project. The elements of a new design contract would include professional engineering fees for:

Mechanical	\$ 2,400
Structural	3,000
Civil	900
Land	<u>900</u>

Subtotal	\$ 7,200
Dillon-Hunt	<u>9,500</u>
Total	\$16,700

The pragmatic approach would be to continue in that direction rather than changing at this time. Lon stated that he is more comfortable with the firm now; he sees a commitment from Dillon-Hunt that he felt was missing before. We need to decide: (1) if we want to continue with Dillon-Hunt; (2) which plan to go forward with to take to the contractors for estimates; (3) if the budget remains unchanged at \$300,000. There are no additional costs for Dillon-Hunt's work at this time; they will tell us what they expect the cost of the building to be. The Board needs to make Dillon-Hunt understand what we need from them in the way of estimates and also that the budget is fixed.

Francis Constructors' bid included \$180,000 for "site work", but some other costs were included. The Director will ask Public Works to get a better handle on what the site work will cost.

Concerning ownership of Dillon-Hunt's work product: the plans are the VCB's, but the use is not. We cannot build from their plans, meaning we cannot have Dillon-Hunt's plans on-site during construction because of liability to that firm. (Dillon-Hunt confirmed that another architect could reproduce Dillon-Hunt's plans or elements of previous designs, as that work is owned by the VCB.)

The design/build process was also discussed at the earlier meeting. This process would provide for guaranteed completion of the project at a fixed price. Some of the drawbacks identified are less control, more supervision by the VCB and less specific plan documents.

There was a discussion concerning assigning 2-3 Board members to a subcommittee to make quick decisions on the Visitor Center project. This ability to respond quickly would accommodate both the needs of Dillon-Hunt and our time limits. Linda expressed her reluctance to have the final design approved by less than the full Board. Once that design is approved, a subcommittee could be appointed. The Board recognized that special meetings will be necessary to move this project along.

Paul moved that: Both principals of Dillon-Hunt be asked to continue working on preliminary plans; those plans be submitted to the bidding contractors in order to get a reality check to confirm if a building can be constructed from those plans for the budgeted amount of \$300,000; and that the contractors' comments be conveyed to the VCB as soon as possible, but no later than Friday, May 7. Lon seconded; passed unanimously.

Cindy George moved the meeting adjourn, Tom Ralser seconded. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

MEETING REGARDING VISITOR CENTER  
April 28, 1993

Present: Debbie Kovalik, Frank Bering, Paul Nelson, Lon Carpenter, Barney Barnett, Mark Smith, John Kenney, Dave Varley, Ken Hunt, Greg Dillon

Mark Smith opened the meeting, stating it had been called because the Visitor Center project is stalled, We need to get back on track, and decide what to do. We need to determine the process, players and roles. All agreed we need to find a win-win solution.

Dillon-Hunt presented a brief history of the project since the bid openings. Ken talked with contractors and tried to mitigate the high costs. Six single level options were prepared; this would eliminate the expense of an elevator, high foundation walls, basement excavation and some demolition work; restrooms were also cut down.

Some of the options included two pods with two entrances, 3,051 sq ft; single entrance, stucco pattern exterior, but not enough storage. Other options were three modules, with the building set further up the site; two floor plans had inefficient circulation area. The final drawing (A1-F) was the most efficient of the six presented, with 3,280 sq ft; the center core maximizes efficiency. This option would have simple trusses in the office/core areas and scissor trusses in the Visitor Center.

Ken couldn't proceed further without more specific instructions from the VCB (single or double entrance, etc.). After receiving more direction, he would want to talk with Francis Constructors to see if this design could be built for \$300,000, then develop bid documents. Greg feels the project is underfunded and asked if \$300,000 is all that is available. Paul advised him that the \$300,000 is a fixed amount; Council has stated that additional City funds will not be contributed to this project.

Dillon-Hunt suggested the project be built in phases; Board members advised that was not a possibility because the project is self-funded by the VCB. They said that the trades are busy and jobs are bidding higher. The VCB needs to allow for contingency; need to find a way to overcome the large percentage of the budget that site costs consume.

Barney said that the 2,700 sq ft Taco Bell was built for \$170,000 (excluding equipment). If the \$300,000 budget includes site costs (it does), that leaves \$165,000 for the building, parking and landscaping. Greg said the Taco Bell site has the same soil as the VCB's, but does not have elevation problems. Francis' bid for earthwork was \$47,000 (caissons, land and paving). That bid included substantial costs for tearing out retaining walls behind

Taco Bell and digging down, some of which will be eliminated with a single story design. Caissons, however, will still be needed. Greg said we need to have/create a safety valve or will end up the same as the first bid; he needs the VCB's input. Jim Shanks stated that a lot of the "site work" indicated is actually part of the building. He guesses actual site work would be more like \$50,000 than the \$120,000-\$150,000 estimated by Dillon-Hunt.

Frank responded that the Board is gun-shy after receiving bids 55% over Dillon-Hunt's estimated construction costs. The Board is also frustrated; we had expected revised plans at the March 9 Board meeting. We are looking at alternatives. There are three options for the Board to consider:

- (1) Build/design contract not-to-exceed \$300,000
- (2) Cancel the project
- (3) Continue with Dillon-Hunt

The build/design process was discussed. Greg said he doesn't think this process would save on fees. Architectural work has to be done, and those fees would be folded into the cost of the building; they can do it cheaper because of their knowledge of the site. Would still need mechanical, electrical, etc.

Board members discussed the \$39,000 in fees already paid to Dillon-Hunt and that there is no value to show for those expenditures; this has created a serious credibility gap. The \$300,000 budget cap appears in minutes of previous Board meetings and the VCB relied on professional opinion that the project could be completed within the budget. The Board is hesitant because members have seen a different level of enthusiasm from Ken since bid openings.

Dillon-Hunt has never been hammered this hard with bid discrepancies. They gave construction estimates after checking with suppliers and based on a confidence level that this could be done within their estimates. Site problems, lumber prices and the unique design of the building are three elements that impacted the bids. They tried to change some systems to accommodate the VCB's needs, but those three elements were unknown to anyone. They showed the two-pod drawing to Francis and received a rough estimate of \$350,000.

Debbie said that this is a unique design, but pointed out that this was the only design brought to the VCB and is disappointed to hear that Dillon-Hunt feels the VCB "drove" the design. The VCB was told that this design could be built on the Taco Bell site for the budgeted amount.

Greg assured the group there is no change in the firm's enthusiasm. There are a lot of players and they need to know who they're working for: the Board, a single individual, the City? Would be open to any streamlining to make this process quicker/smooth. He doesn't like preparing and using a short set of documents, but is willing to work in any way possible; With a short set, the Board

will have to accept the possibility of greater problems in the field.

If Dillon-Hunt is not contracted to perform additional work, the VCB could use Dillon-Hunt's ideas, but their drawings can't be used on-site because of liability. Another architect could re-create those designs, but State law requires each professional to stamp his work. Dillon-Hunt would charge an additional \$16,500 to take final form drawings and elevations to a contractor and get a construction estimate before going to bid. Other engineering and professional services that are included in that amount are:

Mechanical	\$2,400
Structural	3,000
Civil	900
Land	900

Ken noted that these other engineers are making concessions on their fees to move the project along. The balance of \$9,800 would be Dillon-Hunt fees.

Greg stated they would like to do this for free, but can't; they can, however, do it cheaper than any other firm. They will prepare only a short set of documents if asked to. Dillon-Hunt will continue for free to preparation of construction documents. Ken was reminded that the Chamber lease expires 12/31/93 and we must occupy the building before year-end; the Visitor Center lease expires 1/31/94. He is concerned if the VCB's deadlines can be met; actual building will take 5 months.

The Board was disappointed that it has been 2 1/2 months since bids were opened, and we're just now looking at documents for a project that may be affordable.

All agreed that the project must go to bid again. The Board will discuss how to respond quicker to Dillon-Hunt's needs for direction.

This afternoon, Ken will begin calling all of the bidding contractors to try to get them together for a general estimate within the next 2-3 days. This information will be presented to the Board at the next Board meeting, May 11.