

**CITY OF VERONA**  
**MINUTES**  
**PUBLIC SAFETY AD HOC COMMITTEE**  
**TASK FORCE MEETING**  
**MAY 8, 2014**

**VERONA CITY HALL**  
**111 LINCOLN STREET**

1. The meeting was called to order by Dale Yurs at 5:30 p.m.
2. Roll Call: Chief Joe Giver, Chief Brian Myrland, Mike Goetz, Tim Homan, Delora Newton, Heather Reekie, John Wickstrom (arrived 5:35 p.m.), Dale Yurs. Absent (excused): Jon Hochkammer, Chief Coughlin, Mac McGilvray, Joleen Semmann, Diane Smith. Others Present: Steve Gausman, Five Bugles Design; Tyler Smith, Graef; Bill Pennoyer, Tri-North Builders; Bill Burns, City Administrator.
3. Approval of Minutes of the April 2, 2014 Public Safety Ad Hoc Committee Meetings  
Motion by Goetz, seconded by Reekie, to approve the minutes of April 2, 2014 meeting.  
Motion carried 7-0.
4. Update on the Design Development Process and Review of a Revised Site Plan  
Tyler Smith provided an update on the revise site plan. Several modifications have been made including:
  - Moving the location of the flag poles and future monument from the right-of-way to the southwest corner of the building adjacent to the main entrance. This will avoid potential conflicts in the right-of-way and places the monument in a location that will be more visible for visitors.
  - Removing a planned sidewalk extending from the museum space. This is not needed for access for the antique fire engine.
  - Shifting the location of the training tower and generator. This allows for additional area for the geothermal system, a more direct path for utilities to the building, and the placement of a dumpster enclosure.
  - The main stormwater retention area is located on the southeast corner of the site over the planned geothermal wells. The size of this basin may be reduced if the City is able to accommodate some of the stormwater in a regional basin by City Hall.
  - A median has been added to the parking area on the west side of the lot.

Bill Burns provided an update on discussions about potentially accommodating a Verona Area Community Theater (VACT) building on the southwest corner of the site. VACT currently owns a facility on property leased by the City adjacent to the City's Public Works Facility. They are looking for a site for a larger facility that would include a small performance space. One of the potential sites would be to locate a building on the southwest corner of the Fire/EMS facility lot and to utilize shared parking in the area. Conceptually, this use could fit on the site and accommodate the storm water and geothermal needs. The City's Public Works Committee has taken an initial look at this concept and is open to

exploring it. The City Council has not reviewed the proposal yet. Staff is seeking input from the Ad Hoc Committee Members that can be shared with the City Council.

There was discussion about the challenges of sharing parking and the need to clearly be able to segregate parking areas when events would be planned at both facilities. In addition, Committee Members shared the following comments:

- Delora Newton stated that she would like VACT to locate on a different site from the Fire/EMS station property. She is concerned that there may be a need to use the area for emergency services needs in the future.
- Dale Yurs stated that he likes the idea of shared use of the site and the potential for public use at the VACT facility. He also noted that the parking issue would need to be addressed.
- Mike Goetz commented that it may be short sighted to commit to using this property. He asked what other sites have been considered.
- Tim Homan stated that he likes the idea of sharing resources.

Steve Gausman reported that the facility design has not had any significant changes since the last meeting. The design team has been reviewing interior items including mechanical systems, flooring, door hardware, and other interior design components. Ms. Reekie asked what was planned for flooring in the training report. It was reported that the design team is recommending a carpeted floor for this room as that would be most appropriate for a classroom style training environment.

#### 5. Project Cost Estimate and Projected Budget

Bill Pennoyer presented an updated project cost estimate based on the current design development plans. These estimates are based on quotes from contractors, but items have not been competitively bid at this point. The January 2, 2014 conceptual estimate was \$9,143,779. Adjustments to date include adding a partial basement +\$231,000, using masonry construction rather than pre-cast -\$644,346, adding an additional fire bay +\$292,191, and adding a geothermal system \$225,000. It was noted that the geothermal cost is a gross figure and the actual net cost of the system will likely be less. Bill Burns reported that based on the updated construction estimates, the total projected cost for the project including construction, soft costs, and equipment is currently \$10,864,414 which is \$870,381 higher than the previous estimate of \$9,994,033.

Mr. Pennoyer explained that the following construction areas resulted in much of the projected increase:

- Concrete – the current site layout has larger areas shown as concrete rather than asphalt and the use of colored concrete has increased.
- Earthwork – the size of the bio-retention basin has increased.
- Steel – the structural steel estimates are very high. The roof trusses are estimated at \$300,000. There may be other framing options that are significantly less expensive.
- Drywall – this area is running high due to increased demand and limited contractor availability. Summer may be a better time to bid this work.
- Plumbing – the estimates are high, especially for the floor drains.

Mr. Burns suggested that the design team meet to go over options for reducing the costs back to the level of the earlier estimates. Mr. Pennoyer stated that by working with subcontractors it may be possible to design alternative construction methods that are less expensive without sacrificing quality. Other options that were discussed were reconsidering the decisions to add the 6<sup>th</sup> fire apparatus bay and the basement, not finishing out all of the dorm room initially, and considering the kitchen build out. The consensus of the committee members was to direct the design team to meet to review cost saving options before taking the project to the City Council.

6. Project Timeline and Next Steps

The design time will meet on May 14 to review the cost estimate and to develop alternatives to lower the projected cost of the facility to under \$10 million. The planned meeting with the City Council will be delayed from May 12 to May 27. Tri-North will look at options for adjusting the schedule to delay the release of bid package #1 under after the May 27 Council meeting without significantly impacting the project schedule. The next meeting of the Ad Hoc Public Safety Committee is tentatively scheduled for June 3 at 5:30 p.m.

7. Adjournment

Motion by Reekie, seconded by Newton, to adjourn the meeting at 6:41 p.m. Motion carried 8-0.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bill Burns, City Administrator