

**Joint Meeting
Infrastructure Committee
and
Highway Committee**

AGENDA

Jefferson County Courthouse
320 S. Main Street, Rm 202
Jefferson, WI 53549

May 1, 2013

8:30 a.m.

Infrastructure Committee Members

Richard Jones, Rick Kuhlman, Russ Kutz, Donald Reese, Chair, Dick Schultz

Highway Committee Members

Glen Borland, Ron Buchanan, Chair, Al Counsell, George Jaeckel, Blane Poulson

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Certification of compliance with the Open Meetings Law
4. Review of the Agenda
5. Public Comment
6. Approval of the April 10, 2013 Joint Highway & Infrastructure Committee Minutes
7. Communications
8. Discussion and final site selection of either the 'Site C' property or the 'Old Countryside Home' property for the new Highway Department central facility in Jefferson
9. Discussion and possible action on advantages of construction management contracts
10. Discuss Request for Proposal (RFP) information on the selection of a Construction Manager for the Highway Department facility project
11. Review and possible action on proposals from architectural and engineering firms on the final building design; site plan; and construction oversight services for the Highway Department's satellite facilities in Lake Mills and Concord
12. Discuss questions received regarding the Highway Department operations and facilities
13. Set next joint meeting date and possible agenda items
14. Adjourn

A quorum of the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors may be in attendance at this joint meeting
The Committees may discuss and/or take action on any item specifically listed on the agenda

Individuals requiring special accommodations for attendance at the meeting should contact the County Administrator 24 hours prior to the meeting at 920-674-7101 so appropriate arrangements can be made

**JEFFERSON COUNTY
HIGHWAY COMMITTEE &
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
JOINT MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, May 1, 2013

The Jefferson County Highway Committee and Infrastructure Committee met on Wednesday, May 1, 2013, at 8:30 A.M. for a joint meeting at the Jefferson County Courthouse, Room 202.

ROLL OF THE HIGHWAY & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEES:

Members present: Ron Buchanan; George Jaeckel; Al Counsell; Blane Poulson; Glen Borland; Donald Reese; Richard Jones; Russell Kutz; Rick Kuhlman; Dick Schultz

Also Present: William Kern, Highway Commissioner
John Molinaro, County Board Chairperson
Brian Udovich, Highway Department
Ann Jenswold, Highway Department
Erik Coonen, Highway Department
Greg Winter, Highway Department
Timm Punzel, Highway Department
Kathi Cauley, Interim County Administrator
Walt Christensen, County Board Supervisor
Phil Ristow, Corporation Counsel
Carlton Zentner, County Board Supervisor
Brian Lamers, Finance
Carla Robinson, Clerk of Courts
Norman Barrientos, Barrientos Design
Lydia Statz, Daily Jefferson County Union

Purpose of the meeting was to discuss and select final site selection of either the "Site C" property or the "Old Countryside Home" property for the new Highway Department central facility in Jefferson, discuss advantages of a construction manager for the facility project, and review proposals from architectural and engineering firms on the final building design; site plan; and construction oversight services for the Highway Department's satellite facilities in Lake Mills and Concord.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- NONE

HIGHWAY & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MINUTES: The minutes from the April 10, 2013 Highway Committee/Infrastructure Committee joint meeting, having been distributed in advance, it was moved by Mr. Kuhlman and seconded by Mr. Reese from the Infrastructure Committee to approve the minutes as printed. Motion Carried. It was moved by Mr. Buchanan and seconded by Mr. Borland from the Highway Committee to approve the minutes as printed. Motion Carried.

7. Communications

There was discussion on the letter/survey that Supervisors Schroeder, David, Christensen, Nass, and Rinard sent to Commissioner Kern regarding facility project and operations.

8. Discussion and final site selection of either the "Site C" property or the "Old Countryside Home" property for the new Highway Department central facility in Jefferson.

The Committees discussed this agenda item and chose to take no action. Mr. Schultz stated that in his opinion the intent of the board was very clear to pursue Countryside, and there was no justification to change our mind now. No Motion

9. Discussion and possible action on advantages of construction management contracts

Corporation Counsel, Phil Ristow, spoke on different options with concern to construction management contracts. He discussed issues regarding facility design, process, fees, size, bond issues, and estimates. He stated that at the July or August County Board meeting would be the timeline for the construction manager.

10. Discuss Request for Proposal (RFP) information on the selection of a Construction Manager for the Highway Department facility project

Following the information supplied by Corporation Counsel, Phil Ristow, and Committee questions being answered:

It was moved by Mr. Kuhlman and seconded by Mr. Schultz to obtain proposals from construction managers (at risk) with guaranteed price, and to allow the construction manager to bid on parts of the project separately.

Carried by the following roll call:

AYES: Reese, Jones, Kuhlman, Kutz, Schultz

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

11. Review and possible action on proposals from architectural and engineering firms on the final building design; site plan; and construction oversight services for the Highway Department's satellite facilities in Lake Mills and Concord

Commissioner Kern discussed how the selection process and points were awarded to architectural and engineering firms that sent in proposals. There were nine firms who submitted bids for the projects, with fees ranging from \$101,250 to \$212,000. He discussed the top two selections, their proposed project approach and qualifications. He answered questions from the Committees, and there was discussion regarding touring other highway or public works buildings for comparison.

It was moved by Mr. Reese and seconded by Mr. Kuhlman to approve and award Barrientos Design of Milwaukee the bid on the basis of qualifications at a cost of \$114,400 for both satellite facilities.

Carried by the following roll call:

AYES: Reese, Jones, Kuhlman, Kutz, Schultz

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

It was moved by Mr. Poulson and seconded by Mr. Borland to support the recommendations and motion made by the Infrastructure Committee regarding Barrientos Design of Milwaukee.

Carried by the following roll call:

AYES: Buchanan, Borland, Counsell, Jaeckel, Poulson

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

12. Discuss questions received regarding the Highway Department operations and facilities

Commissioner Kern further spoke on the letter/survey that Supervisors Schroeder, David, Christensen, Nass, and Rinard sent to him regarding facility project and operations. He stated that hard copies will be given to all County Board members by the May board meeting for their review. The Commissioner answered questions from the Committee, no action was taken.

13. Set next joint meeting date and possible agenda items.

There was no further meeting set up at this time. The decision was made to discuss and set up as needed

It was moved by Mr. Buchanan and seconded by Mr. Jaeckel to adjourn at 10:11 a.m.
Motion Carried.

Approval:

April 17, 2013

Kathy Cauley, Acting County Administrator
Bill Kern, Highway Commissioner
John Molinaro, County Board Chair

Dear Kathy, Bill, and John:

We believe that the proposed highway shop project will move forward only if county board supervisors and the public are confident that all questions related to the project have been addressed. We respectfully request that you provide written answers to the questions listed below.

Sincerely,

Jim Schroeder, District 19
Greg David, District 3
Walt Christensen, District 30
Steve Nass, District 15
Amy Rinard, District 9

1. What is the anticipated future size and mission of the Hwy Dept?

The future size of the Highway Department facility will be determined during the design development of the project. Until the preliminary design and engineering work is completed, we will not be able to provide the future size of the facility. All study work to date, focused on developing a conceptual plan for the facility and through programming analysis determined a preliminary facility size.

Mission

The mission of the Jefferson County Highway Department continues to be 'Maintain a Safe and Efficient Highway System'. Every aspect of our work at the Highway Department revolves around that mission, in the winter it means keeping the traffic moving safely and efficiently by clearing the highways of snow and ice as quickly and safely as possible. During the rest of the year, it means to be productive and efficient with our crews involving the maintenance, construction, and upkeep of our highway systems. The Highway Department is involved year-round on numerous winter and summer projects often working with other government agencies and private contractors to complete the work.

Department Size

Historically, the Highway Department was a much larger department, but over the last 10 years the department size was considerably reduced. Since 2003, the department staffing has dropped from 84 full-time employees to 57 full-time employees (32% reduction). Even with the reduction in staffing over the last 10 years, the department is completing more maintenance and construction work. The department was able to reduce the workforce based on three main factors, newer equipment and technology allowing work to be completed with less labor, more efficient and productive work from the employees, and the department strategically utilizing

more private contractors in various areas of the operations. See the table below regarding history of the Highway Department full-time employment:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Full-Time Employees</u>
1969	141 Employees
1976	126 Employees
1983	94 Employees
2003	84 Employees
2006	65 Employees
2012	57 Employees

Construction Season

With the reduction to only 57 full-time positions in the Highway Department, and the added responsibilities of infrastructure and lane miles to maintain for the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, the department is operating in the summer and winter seasons at a level that leans more toward pressure to increase the workforce. In the summer/construction season, based on the many construction and maintenance needs the department adds additional seasonal staff (5-6 employees). Even with the additional seasonal staff the Highway Department relies heavily on outside service providers to complete the maintenance and construction projects. Some of the outside services provided include asphalt production, gravel and lime rock production/materials, chip seal stone production, rip rap materials, seal coat oil and distribution for projects, pavement marking operations, pavement milling and pulverizing, soil stabilization and erosion control materials, design work, survey work, and material testing.

Winter Season

During the winter months, the department is very lean on staff needed to cover plow sections during normal winter maintenance operations. One issue that has increased the need for additional staffing over the last five years was the State Highway 26 four-lane expansion. Not only has the county added additional winter maintenance sections, but there was an increased staffing need for overnight snow plowing. The department is now trying to fill at least eight (8) overnight plow shift positions covering the 24-hour service highways. The Highway Department employees do a great job plowing snow, but they cannot plow both day and night.

So to review the current staffing needs, the Highway Department has only 35 FTE for field work outside of office, shop, sign crew, and foreman. The Department has thirty-three (33) day positions for winter maintenance operations (29 plow routes, 2 grader routes, 2 loader operators) and needs an additional eight (8) positions to cover the night plowing needs. The winter staffing needs also need to factor in vacancy rates for employees, vacancies occur through vacation, sick leave, compensatory time, workers compensation and other medical/personal reasons. For this example, we will use a typical vacancy rate of three (3) employees. So if you add up the numbers you will see 32 employees available minus 41 employees needed to cover winter shifts leads to a shortage of nine (-9) employees. So how has the Highway Department covered the plowing needs in the county based on the position shortages described above? It is a struggle, but we have cross-trained employees and tried to utilize any employees possible to fill plow routes during the busy winters (This past winter was a prime example). All employees will step-up and fill trucks as needed, including the foreman positions (3) and mechanics (4). We prefer not to pull mechanics out of the shop during prolonged winter storm events, because they may be needed just as much in the shop for the repair work during the storm, but in some cases we do not have a choice. So the department is getting by right now, but the department is very lean in looking at the staffing model for either summer or winter season.

Contract Work

There are also questions raised in regard to contracting and privatizing highway maintenance and construction operations. As the previous information described, the Highway Department utilizes both contractors and other counties to complete maintenance work on county highways. We will utilize outside work based on the specialization of the work and the cost/efficiency of the operations. The department is always analyzing the cost and efficiency of all operations, and striving to make the best decisions on how to best handle the large responsibility of maintaining the county's infrastructure.

While the department does use private contractors in service areas that may require specialized services, in utilizing those services, the department must remain vigilant in cost control and cost containment. In numerous areas of bidding for contracted services, the department is receiving very few bids for work. A recent example is the bidding for approximately \$2,000,000 worth of asphalt for county maintenance and construction projects. The 2013 bid drew interest from only three contractors, with no contractors bidding on the work with asphalt plants in Jefferson County. The increase in cost to haul asphalt from plants located 10 to 15 miles outside the county in 2013 could easily exceed \$250,000 over the price of having the material located at a central plant in Jefferson County. This is an example of why the Highway Department manages costs and reviews efficiencies in all operations on an ongoing basis, and how that information is used in making project scheduling, utilization, and private contracting decisions.

The review process assists in developing plans on how to utilize our own staff in a highly efficient and productive manner, and also how to utilize our relationship with other counties and municipalities, and private contractors and consultants where appropriate. The decision may change year-to-year or even project-to-project, but the Highway Department will always look at all options regarding staff utilization, but the decision will always be made taking all information into account including cost, quality, efficiency, and ownership for each project.

Summary

Based on the previous information and looking forward over the next decade, it appears the Highway Department workforce needed to complete winter and summer work will be at the least the same size. The department expects the work completed for other counties, cities, and townships to be stable. The Highway Department also expects the work on the county highway system to be relatively stable over the next several years. One area that we anticipate an increase in workload is the work for the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT). The Highway Department is already experiencing growth in responsibilities and workload because of the State Highway 26 expansion (Over 100 additional lane miles for maintenance), but based on discussions and future budget projections it appears WisDOT is emphasizing improved maintenance of the state highway systems. In the WisDOT Secretary's budget and the Governor's proposed budget, an additional **\$55,000,000 was allocated for state highway maintenance. If the budget was approved as submitted, Jefferson County would be looking at an \$811,000 increase in funding and work on the state highway system.

**WCA Initial State Budget Summary

'Transportation funding is also increased in the Governor's budget. Specifically, \$824 million in new state funds are designated for transportation-related purposes. Those funds include a new \$23 million general fund transfer to the Transportation fund and general fund supported bonding for transportation projects. As expected based on an earlier announcement, the budget includes a \$55 million increase to counties for providing maintenance on the state highway system.'

***There are three additional documents included in the packet (Addendum #1, #2, #3) that include two joint letters from the Wisconsin Transportation Builders Association (WTBA), Engineers Local 139, Wisconsin State Council of*

Carpenters, Wisconsin Laborers District Council, Wisconsin Counties Association, and the Wisconsin County Highway Association. The first letter is a joint letter supporting the Governor's budget which includes language endorsing the State-County highway Maintenance partnership and the additional increase in funding for state highway maintenance. The second letter was a joint letter from the same group endorsing some minor adjustments in the state budget that were forwarded from WisDOT to the Joint Committee on Finance on April 29, 2013. The third document is the latest budget estimate regarding the Governor's budget including the county GTA estimate and county-state routine maintenance budget.

As a reference for County Board members, one of the above groups [WTBA] was formerly the Wisconsin Road Builders Association and represents the major road builders in Wisconsin.

2. What are the assumptions, projections, and justification for the size and scope of the proposed new highway shop facility?

When any new facility is proposed, the first step of evaluation involves reviewing the present requirements of the operations including staffing and equipment needs. For a highway department, the first step would include reviewing the current employees, equipment, and work tasks. The second step would involve reviewing and discussing any known or anticipated changes in future projects or workload. This process is usually described as a programming analysis, and is the foundation for determining the size of a new facility. The programming aspect is done for any major building project, and it would mimic the process utilized if you were evaluating building a new school.

For the Jefferson County Highway Department, programming analysis work was completed by the last two consultants hired for highway facility studies. Barrientos Design and Bray Associates both completed programming analysis that included reviewing employee positions and responsibilities, equipment analysis, and discussions with employees and managers regarding the future changes in work or major project changes. If you would like additional information regarding the programming analysis completed, please review the Bray Architects and Barrientos Design studies linked on the county website.

At the beginning of the highway facility design, a detailed review will be completed again that will include individual building areas and square footage requirements. The Highway Department staff will be diligent in the review of facility requirements, and will work with the architect to make sure the facility is operationally efficient and is sized for the existing needs. Until the design development is begun, we do not know what the size of the facility will be.

***The Barrientos Design Facility/Site Study 2011 and Bray Architects Facility Study 2012 are available on the Jefferson County Website (Audits Reports Plans)*

3. Barrientos Design recommends acreage and building sizes that are significantly larger than Short Elliott Hendrickson recommended in 2008. What is the justification for the increases?

The information requested from all the facility studies completed over the last thirteen years were different, and for each facility study the firms were expected to provide unique information. In the 2008 facility study completed by Short Elliott Hendrickson, the consultant was asked to review the costs of completing a new facility off-site or a new/rehabilitation facility on-site, and to make a recommendation regarding the most cost-effective option. The consultant was not asked to complete a detailed programming study or detailed analysis of a new site (no site was

even used). The consultant made some rough calculations regarding the size of the new building and site, and based on a preliminary review developed a framework for the facility and site needs. The firm did not provide any detailed programming analysis during the facility study. Short Elliott Hendrickson recommended, based on the review of existing facilities and costs, to build on an off-site parcel and recommended the site be approximately 30 to 35 acres as described in both the study documents and supplemental schematic drawings.

The facility size was also determined through rough calculations, and staff did not receive any details to review regarding the consultants recommendations. The consultant did a poor job with details and communications on the study, and the county did not make final payments to the consultant at the end of the study because of the issues. Based on our review after the study was complete, we determined the consultant made a major mistake in calculations regarding the highway office and employee areas and why the SEH Study recommendations for facility size were listed at approximately 85,000s.f.

Barrientos Design was hired to complete the next facility study in 2011, the county requested more detail in the study including more detailed programming analysis and a review of specific sites to study. If you review the various study information from Barrientos Design, you will see more details on the size of the buildings and other structures based on a much more complete programming analysis. The Barrientos Design study also provided considerable detail on specific site layouts and the land needs based on each parcel. Through all of the Barrientos Design work, the parcel size recommended was approximately 40 acres, with about 30+ acres utilized in the initial building project and allowing some additional land for future expansion needs.

Because Short Elliott Hendrickson did not provide a detailed programming analysis for the facility or site and the error in the office area of the facility, I would expect a difference in details from the SEH study to the following studies from Barrientos Design and Bray Architects. Both Barrientos Design and Bray Architects completed much more detailed analysis of the site and facility needs through programming work included in each study (Recommendations for preliminary facility size based on the programming analysis by Bray and Barrientos ranged from 104,000sf to 112,000sf).

***The Short Elliott Hendrickson Facility Study 2008, the Barrientos Design Facility/Site Study 2011, and Bray Architects Facility Study 2012 are all available on the Jefferson County Website (Audits Reports Plans)*

4. What would it cost to bring the Puerner Street property up-to-code and to be serviceable as the county shop?

In the most recent facility study conducted by Bray Architects, the County Board requested a renovation option to utilize the existing facility. Bray Architects studied the option described as B-2 on the existing site, and included a detailed cost analysis, comments, and a renovation diagram. The option is shown on pages 3.10 through 3.13, and it does show the utilization of the entire existing main building along with renovations and additions needed to make the facility serviceable as a modern county highway shop. The renovation option as analyzed totaled \$11,264,800. A previous study completed by Short Elliott Hendrickson estimated approximately \$9,000,000 to renovate the existing main building, but the Short Elliott Hendrickson Study did not address issues with most of the other structures on the property including the fuel system, salt sheds, and cold storage buildings.

These estimates for renovations of the facilities are extremely high because the current buildings are functionally obsolete. The original 1938 highway facility still houses the fleet operations, parts rooms, and operations offices. The main facility had several small additions that were added for functional needs over the next several decades, but the facility lacks any cohesion, and functions very poorly in today's modern operations. The facility also lacks numerous functions that are standard in highway facilities today, including training facilities, suitable offices, locker rooms, vehicle wash facilities, maintenance shop with vehicle lifts and lubrication systems, welding shop, and updated technology with fuel systems and material management systems. The buildings layouts, size, and configuration are not adequate for operations that are much more reliant on newer technologies, and the facility lacks modern accessibility, security, and safe traffic flow.

Every architect who reviewed the buildings during the studies felt the only way to bring the building up-to-code and to make it serviceable as a modern county shop, was to renovate the interior of the existing main building and to add an addition. The architects all considered the renovation option as a poor option because of the cost of the rehabilitation and the numerous restrictions on the current highway site.

***Refer to the included 'Facility Condition Report' that explains the numerous facility issues (Addendum #4).*

5. What would it cost to replace those roofs that need replacing on the existing building(s)?

It is not known what it would cost to replace all the roofs, as none of the architects hired to review the facilities felt replacing the roof would solve the problems [See the answer to question #4 for more detail]. The existing buildings were built in 1938 and are functionally obsolete. The shop is a health and safety hazard for all of the employees, the HVAC systems all need to be replaced, the electrical systems need to be replaced, the facility layout does not work for the shop and office operations – the equipment today is much larger than the equipment in 1938. The facility does not meet any of the ADA accessibility requirements and there is not proper training or meeting rooms, break rooms for employees, equipment washing facilities, etc. Read through the attached 'Facility Condition Report' that details the numerous facility issues, including health and safety concerns.

All of the architects that reviewed our operations through facility studies have come to the same recommendation, the facilities are too outdated for remodeling, and a new facility is needed. The architects felt the only way to complete a remodel project was to remove a majority of the buildings and try to reuse the outer walls of the existing structure. This is not a very cost-effective method of building and why the costs for remodeling became so high, but none of the architects after reviewing the functional use of the buildings came to a conclusion that we could just repair the roof.

***Refer to the included 'Facility Condition Report' that explains the numerous facility issues (Addendum #4).*

6. Can the installation be staged? Built to add onto as needed?

Yes, but it would not be very cost effective. Because the new site will need to be graded for the entire facility layout, storm water and drainage systems will need to be built and graded, utility

extensions completed, driveway/road accesses graded, and all buildings will be designed and built for the existing operations, it would be very difficult and not very cost-effective to leave buildings until later. The most important aspect of the question is to make sure the new facilities are designed and built to accommodate either additions or additional buildings in the future without major disruptions in operations.

The programming work completed during the facility studies, reviewed the size of the facilities needed based on the existing employee and equipment numbers. The forecast for the future also looks at potential growth or reduction in the department. The buildings will be designed and strategically placed to accommodate any future building additions, or future additional buildings.

Highway Departments will typically use a variety of options for building projects when functional needs change. Options can include new main facilities, building additions, adding additional buildings, and adding/expanding satellite facilities. Every county has different needs regarding satellite facilities, in Jefferson County two main satellite facilities were proposed after a review of needs. In Dodge County, five satellite facilities are utilized in addition to the main facility site in Juneau. If you review all 72 counties, you will see a variety of options utilized for buildings based on many factors including the size of the county, urban vs. rural, centralization of main department functions, etc.

7. Will the facility plan include options for local energy production and other compatible uses?

Yes, the facility can be built to use various energy options including local energy production to the extent the County Board will be willing to invest and fund. Any Local energy options would need to be reviewed for effectiveness and efficiency, and the County Board would need to approve those options as part of the construction and bonding for the project. The design can also accommodate other compatible uses, but again, the County Board would need to determine if there is other needs and to give approval to design those options into the facility.

Regarding energy options in the new facility, numerous opportunities will be available to construct a building that will be more energy efficient. Some of the sustainable design practices to be incorporated into the project are recycled and renewable products, solar orientation, day lighting, energy saving fixtures, and central HVAC control systems. There are also numerous other sustainable design technologies and services that will be evaluated for the buildings in the design phase. The energy items will be reviewed by the Infrastructure/Highway Committee and ultimately by the County Board for approval.

8. What is the history of RFPs for goods and services regarding the highway shop?

Studies

1999 RFP Issued for Facility Condition (\$14,616)
2008 RFP Issued for Facility Study (\$10,790)
2011 RFP Issued for Facility/Site Study (\$71,669)
2012 RFP Issued for Facility Study (\$27,420)

OMNNI
SEH, Inc.
Barrientos Design
Bray Architects

Other Work

Zoning/Annexation for Lake Mills
Land Financial Analysis
Soil Boring Work
Environmental Analysis
Rezoning Countryside – Site Plan
Asbestos Analysis
Land Info/Surveyor

Barrientos Design
Ehlers Associates
River Valley Testing
Giles
Barrientos Design
Delaney Industries
County Surveyor

***An additional attachment compiled by the County Administrator includes a detailed report regarding Highway Committee and Infrastructure Committee actions over the last three years regarding the Highway Department facility projects (Addendum #5).*

9. Were there were any proposals sought last fall before contracting with Barrientos Design for the Lake Mills site plan?

No. The Highway Committee discussed and passed a motion on December 6, 2011 to contract with Barrientos Design for the Lake Mills site plan work/annexation needed for the City of Lake Mills (\$18,760). It was recommended to hire Barrientos Design based on the firm's familiarity with the site from the 2011 Highway Facility Study. Barrientos Design also completed the design on the salt shed at the location for the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT); the salt shed was built in 2012.

The Highway Committee did not feel it was necessary to seek proposals for the above work based on the above information. Barrientos Design successfully completed the work on the salt shed for WisDOT, and the annexation and site plan work needed by the City of Lake Mills.

10. Of the \$416,646 allocated to the Highway Department in the 2012 County Budget for planning, design and construction bidding work for a new main facility, how much of that money has been spent and specifically on what?

There was \$250,000 available for facility work in the Highway Budget in 2011 and \$416,646 available for facility work in the 2012 Highway Budget. The following is a list of expenditures of those funds:

<u>Work Completed</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
Lake Mills Property Purchase	\$ 27,053.99
'Old Countryside' Property Purchase	\$200,000.00
River Valley Testing (Boring Work)	\$ 2,935.00
Giles Engineering (Environmental Work)	\$ 1,900.00
Survey Work (County Surveyor)	\$ 1,362.50
City of Jefferson (Zoning Application)	\$ 250.00
Ehlers Associates (Land Value Study)	\$ 3,500.00
Sub Total	\$237,000.49

An additional \$120,879 of work detailed by the past County Administrator (Gary Petre) in an attached report: \$120,879.00

Total Expenditures	\$357,879.99
Total Funds Available (\$250,000+\$416,646)	\$666,646.00
Approximate funds remaining	<u>\$308,766.01</u>

***Refer to the document provided by the County Administrator for the remaining facility work expenditures (\$120,879) for the Highway Department (Addendum #5).*

11. Is there an updated estimate, based on the latest interest rate projections over the length of the bond issue, of the total cost to build a new main highway facility including debt service and all fees? If so, what is that total? And what is the impact on the county tax rate in each year of the 20-year payment schedule?

Ehlers, Incorporated was hired by Jefferson County in 2012 to evaluate financing/bonding options for a new highway facility. Ehlers produced a report and presented the information to the Finance Committee on August 9, 2012. The report includes a bonding financial analysis and it represents the latest information regarding the interest rate and bond length questions.

***A projection of facility bonding options/costs was assembled by Ehlers Associates on August 9, 2012, and it is included in this report (Addendum #6).*

12. When will the County Board vote on the size, design and total cost of a proposed new main highway facility?

Until a facility design is started, the size of the proposed facility will not be known. At this point, we only have a conceptual plan for a highway facility and an estimated size. After the County Board approves an architect and design contract, the design will be reviewed in phases by the Infrastructure and Highway Committees. All County Board members will be encouraged to attend any Highway Committee or Infrastructure Committee meetings throughout the design process that involve discussion of the building projects. In the final phase of the design, a presentation will be given by the architect to the County Board with design details including final cost estimates for the project. County Board members will have the chance to review the facility design and cost estimates, and to provide input on adjustments before final bid documents are developed.

13. Are there any communications with Barrientos Design about the Lake Mills design services that predate 1/30/13?

The Highway Commissioner was informed by the County Administrator after the January 16, 2013 Infrastructure Committee meeting (Highway Commissioner was not at the meeting), that he requested Barrientos Design provide a proposal for design services for the satellite shops. The Highway Commissioner was emailed a question from Barrientos Design on January 18, 2013 regarding how we would want the proposal split up, and the Commissioner responded there should be a separate proposal for Lake Mills and Concord. These are the only emails

exchanged between the Highway Commissioner and Barrientos Design on the Lake Mills design proposal that predate the 1/30/13 design proposal (the emails are attached).

***The email regarding the design proposal is attached for reference (Addendum #7).*

14. Did someone from Barrientos Design draft or review the RFP for the Countryside site? If so, was there any fee for that service?

If you review the emails attached from the previous question, you will see that the County Administrator asked Barrientos Design if they could provide a draft RFP documents for assisting in developing an RFP for the main facility design.

Most RFP's that are developed use a previous RFP for a framework for the new RFP, existing RFP's are usually obtained by using one from a previous project or by obtaining one from another municipality or another contractor/professional. The main emphasis when developing an RFP is to develop a thorough and fair document that will help firms understand the project while they create their own individual proposal. This is similar to the recent request by the Corporation Counsel to Dodge County, Door County, Barrientos Design, and Mass Brothers for samples of documents and RFP's regarding construction manager contracts. This information will assist in developing our own method for utilizing a construction manager, and will help in developing our own RFP.

In this case, Barrientos Design contacted our County Administrator and let him know he could provide a copy of an RFP that the county could utilize. The County Administrator and Highway Commissioner utilized the draft RFP, and made numerous changes to the RFP to make it fit Jefferson County's needs for a solid and fair document for all architectural and engineering (A/E) firms.

After the RFP was released, the Highway Commissioner personally discussed and met with numerous A/E firms, through all of the discussions and meetings with consultants, there was not one firm that questioned the RFP. The A/E firms were actually very satisfied with the RFP and even some large multi-disciplinary A/E firms (Ayres Associates, Strand Associates) that did not submit a proposal, felt the RFP was done very well. We received thirteen proposals and all firms that submitted proposals felt the RFP process was fair and open to all firms, and all firms accepted the scope of work detailed in the RFP.

No, there were no fees for Barrientos Design providing a draft RFP document.

15. Are there any documents or related emails with representatives of Barrientos Design or others discussing the process as it related to the Lake Mills contract?

Not sure how this question differs from question #13. Barrientos Design provided a design proposal as requested by the County Administrator for the Lake Mills satellite design work. The proposal was requested by the County Administrator after Barrientos Design completed the preliminary site design work for Lake Mills.

The proposal was reviewed and presented to the Highway Committee and Infrastructure Committees for discussion and approval. The Highway Commissioner is not aware of any other emails or documents regarding the Lake Mills Design contract.

16. What is our maintenance cost per lane mile and where does that rank among Wisconsin counties? Also, is it possible to report labor cost for maintenance per lane mile and its rank among counties?

Based on the limited time to complete the information and to make sure we had time to review the data for accuracy issues, the Highway Department reached out to several of our neighboring County Highway Departments for the information requested. We requested information on county mileage and county maintenance costs from the most recent year (2012). You can see the comparison information listed below.

We were not able to obtain information regarding the second part of the question, labor costs for maintenance per lane mile. Every county highway department handles maintenance work differently, and more time would be needed to gather and assemble the data. It would be a significant task for our department and other county highway departments to complete this work in a short period of time.

2012 County Data

<u>County</u>	<u>Centerline Miles</u>	<u>Highway Maintenance</u>	<u>Hwy Maint/CL Mile</u>
Jefferson	256	\$2,042,378	\$ 7,978
Walworth	203	\$2,224,304	\$10,957
Rock	213	\$2,432,981	\$11,422
Dane	527	\$4,449,544	\$ 8,443
Dodge	540	\$5,774,877	\$10,694
Washington	186	\$2,971,377	\$15,975

***Highway maintenance costs included all county general maintenance and winter maintenance work in 2012. Based on the data received from our neighboring counties, Jefferson County would have the lowest cost per centerline mile for county general maintenance costs.*

County lane mile and cost data is a very difficult way to examine the efficiency of a department because of the numerous differences from county to county. All County Highway Department are very unique and one operation model that works for a more urbanized county may not be an effective model for a more rural county. In Jefferson County, we spend more time reviewing the productivity per employee and priority work for employees as an efficiency measure, and we also analyze equipment operations numbers as one of the most critical highlights of a county highway department's efficiency and health. When measuring the health and balance of a highway department operation, poor equipment efficiency and utilization results will always be a major 'red flag'.

17. Please explain all funding sources for this proposed project, beginning with design conducted to date and concluding with a finished facility.

As of April 26, 2013, \$250,000 in funds was budgeted for the Highway Department in the 2011 County Budget for highway facility work. An additional \$416,646 was budgeted in the Highway Department for facility work in 2012. For 2013, there was no additional funding placed in the Highway Department budget, but \$1,543,127 was reserved in fund balance for highway facility project work.

To date, the facility discussions from with the Finance Committee, Highway Committee, and Infrastructure Committee have assumed the facility building projects will be completed through long-term bonding. This is a decision the County Board will need to approve.

18. Please provide any other information which might help us explain to our constituents how this project is necessary, and being pursued in a responsible manner.

The Highway Department facility projects are necessary because the original facility that was built in 1938 is in poor condition and is functionally obsolete. The Highway Department continues to operate a modern highway operation in facilities that are well beyond their design life, and decades beyond their functional life.

As a matter of highway facility history, the county has invested only \$1,900,000 in all highway facilities (Main sites, satellite sites, salt storage, fuel, etc.) since the county purchased the City of Jefferson site in the late 1920's. For perspective, the Highway Department spends more money than that every year on the maintenance of the county highways. The facilities, which are in extremely poor condition have a book value of approximately \$400,000 but realistically have far less intrinsic value, are housing over \$8,000,000 worth of county equipment. The Department is very concerned about housing over \$8,000,000 worth of county equipment inside facilities with numerous issues including multiple false/fire alarm issues, leaking roofs, and electrical loading problems including a recent electrical fire in a building housing a large portion of our equipment.

The facilities are also housing the most important asset of the department, the employees. The employees work every day in the outdated facilities, doing their best to complete tasks and projects in extremely poor working conditions. It was been reported in previous studies including the OMMNI Study in 1999 and the SEH Study in 2008 there are numerous health, safety, and sanitary concerns including the comments in the SEH Study that employees working in the shops without updated 'purge' ventilation systems are being exposed to a known carcinogen (exhaust).

This leads to the second part of the question regarding 'pursuing facilities in a responsible manner'. The Highway Department works diligently managing all operations in both an ethical and fiscally responsible manner. Throughout many years the employees have waited patiently as the facilities have deteriorated, and employees have worked through poor and unsanitary conditions. During all those years the department has answered all questions regarding the facilities, and worked with numerous consultants hired to evaluate and justify the facility needs of the department. The Highway Department continues to answer all the questions and is

dedicated to being a responsible steward of the taxpayer dollars regarding any facility work moving forward.

Additional Comments

Design Fee Question presented at the County Board Meeting on April 16, 2013: An architect discussed during the public comment period at the April County Board meeting the fee for design services as approved by the Highway Committee and Infrastructure Committee. The architect felt the design fees were outrageous, and presented the fees as extremely high for a project like this.

To provide the County Board with relevant data from a recent Highway Design project, Jefferson County reached out to Dodge County to compare the design fees for their recent Highway Facility addition in Juneau. The comparison of projects and fees are listed for your review:

Jefferson Main Facility Design

Design Base Contract (Barrientos Design):

\$592,400

Estimated Project Cost = \$15,000,000

Design Fee = 3.95%

Dodge Main Facility Addition Design (2010)

Design Base Contract (Angus Young):

\$533,200

Estimated Project Cost = \$8,400,000

Design Fee = 6.35%

Summary Comments

◦ Based on many of the questions in regard to the Highway Department facility project, it appears some of the County Board members feel the size of the facility and many of the project details have been pre-determined. This is not the case, and during the design development all sections of the facility will be reviewed for not only size needs, but also circulation and functional relationship issues. This process will include input from internal staff and county board members, and a final detailed room-by-room analysis will be completed before the project moves into a construction document phase.

County Board members need to be aware of the conditions of the existing facilities and the numerous safety, sanitary, health, and building code problems identified over the last 15 years. Some of the issues are listed below:

- Ventilation (Not in compliance with state building codes) – Vehicle exhaust is a known carcinogen and this was identified as an immediate concern in the SEH Facility Study.
- Storm water discharge/separation – Identified as a major concern.
- Sanitary Violations – Employees utilize work areas for break areas, there is no common break rooms/lunch areas in the facility.
- Interior Water/Moisture Damage and Roof Leaks – Annual repairs by county staff including roofing work by contractors. Safety concerns for employees in offices, welding areas, and shop work areas, and concerns for health of employees without proper ventilation in all the buildings.
- Office Conditions – Very poor, need to be upgraded.
- Training/Meeting Facilities – Department does not have any training/meeting or break room/assembly areas for the employees.
- Accessibility of Buildings – Very poor access for all public and many areas of the facilities do not meet ADA compliance requirements.

- Concrete Floors - Numerous areas are spalling and tenting, trip hazard for employees.
- Inventory Control - Very inadequate, lack proper control based on the layout of the facilities for supplies and tools.
- Fuel system – System is not secure (major security concern), failing pumps, does not meet current state requirements and additional spill protection and infrastructure will need to be added if the department does not move off-site (Recent state order).
- Scale System – Failed, a portion rusted and collapsed, system needs to be replaced.
- Toilet Facilities – Very poor condition, need to be replaced.
- Vehicle Maintenance Bays – Cumbersome, inefficient, and dangerous. No vehicle lifts in main mechanic area.
- Wash System – No interior wash system to protect the counties major investment in trucks and equipment. Hazard for employees who try to wash vehicles outside during the winter.
- Inventory Control – Existing facility layout leads to very poor physical security of large county investment in materials, supplies, fuel, etc.
- Fire Alarm Issues – Because of the age of the facilities and wiring, the department continues to deal with major issues involving fire/false alarms. The department also had a recent issue with an electrical wiring fire in one of the buildings housing a large percentage of the county equipment.