

**NORTH OGDEN CITY
PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING
MEETING MINUTES**

July 14, 2021

The Public Safety Building Committee convened in a meeting on July 14, 2021 at 6:04 p.m. in-person and at <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81383468334> or by telephone 1 346 248 7799 or 1 669 900 9128 or 1 253 215 8782 or YouTube:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCriqbePBxTucXEzRr6fclhQ>. Notice of time, place, and agenda of the meeting was posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on July 8, 2021. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on December 13, 2020.

PRESENT:	Brent Chugg	Committee Chairman	
	Dirk Quinney	Committee Member	
	Clark Crowther	Committee Member	
	Laura Barker	Committee Member	excused
	Karen McIntosh	Committee Member	excused
	Jay Johnson	Committee Member	excused
	Gary Stoker	Committee Member	
	Neal Berube	Committee Member	
	Cheryl Stoker	Committee Member	excused
	Robert Bolar	Committee Member	
	Tim Scott	Committee Member	excused

STAFF PRESENT:	Jon Call	City Manager/Attorney
	Susan Nance	City Recorder

VISITORS:	Kendall Tate	via Zoom
	Stefanie Casey	via Zoom

Committee Chairman Chugg called the meeting to order. Committee Member Gary Stoker offered the invocation and led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 9, 2021 MEETING

Committee Member Robert Bolar motioned to approve the June 9, 2021 Public Safety Building Committee minutes. Committee Member Gary Stoker seconded the motion. All in attendance were in favor.

ACTIVE AGENDA

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

3. DISCUSSION ON REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) **PRESENTER: JON CALL, CITY MANAGER/ATTORNEY**

City Manager/Attorney Call began his presentation by stating that the committee had been given the material in advance in order to give them time for review. He mentioned that Lynn Satherthwait had helped substantially in preparing the request for proposal to construct North Ogden's Public Safety Building. Additionally, there had been modifications added for future needs and expectations.

City Manager/Attorney Call stated that a big question was how long those wishing to bid on the project would take to respond. Contractors were often seasonally overwhelmed, and seemed to have more time in the fall. He felt a two month window would be adequate, and that most could do a good proposal in that amount of time. The City wouldn't be able to completely commit to a cost for the beginning, as such things as countertops and floor coverings wouldn't be decided upon until later. Nevertheless, the proposal had been broken down by components. The expertise of the committee would be relied on heavily because of this.

The committee discussed the concept of allowances for items that could not be bid exactly. One committee member pointed out that if they did it that way, the City would have to make sure they didn't miss anything and that any given allowance covered the same types of things.

City Manager/Attorney Call noted that specific allowances were not proposed. The only categories listed were for drawings, construction elements, and furnishings at the end. The discussion prompted him to suggest that they should perhaps extend their grid.

It was noted that in a previous discussion during which the idea came up to locate a similar RFP from another site or department who had gone through this before. Alternatively, the Committee could check with another city. There hadn't been any other project like this in North Ogden, though they had not checked with other cities yet. City Manager/Attorney Call felt that they would still have electronic copies of them. It was suggested to check with Orem and Clearfield.

City Manager/Attorney Call pointed out that there was some more work to be done on the expectations. The City needed to be sure what it was they wanted to be designed into the building. It was noted that the design would be done for them based on what the Committee outlined as needs. The point was emphasized that this building would include room for growth. The Committee discussed several areas of police work that would require additional staff members as North Ogden grew, and as trends in police work created need for change. The Committee had to project who would need privacy in office space, and who could share office space as that growth occurred. City Manager/Attorney Call outlined what to expect, as far as teams coming in to ask questions, such as whether a conference room could also serve as a jury room.

The Chief of Police pointed out that it was hard to anticipate future demands, but he felt confident that they could add square feet to get five extra work stations. He felt it was very important not to leave future administrations with the last resort of putting people into broom closets. He stated it was much easier to deal with this now than to be in a bind later.

When asked if there was anything in the RFP about the old building, City Manager/Attorney Call stated that he was sure demolition was included, but that he couldn't remember exactly where that was mentioned in the document. He stated he would double check that later. It was mentioned the need to understand how much asbestos was in the old building so that it could be demolished properly per that risk. The question of site studies came up, as they can often slow a project down. City Manager/Attorney Call stated that the City could get those ordered right away and save some time.

There was also a brief discussion regarding water at the site, and how important it would be to engineer that so that it would be kept dry. City Manager/Attorney Call stated that the land drain collected water and moved it out through a system of pipes, eventually to the Great Salt Lake. He pointed out that North Ogden was full of natural springs, and water could be a problem if not properly addressed. It was mentioned it could be very difficult to find a properly trained geotechnical person to do these things, so the sooner one was identified, the better. City Manager/Attorney Call didn't see that as a problem of major concern.

The final discussion on the RFP centered on prioritizing (through a point system) all the elements of the build. For example, City Manager/Attorney Call had not given cost the

highest number of points, though perhaps the committee would prefer that. In his opinion, cost was not the most important thing. As an example, skill might be more important than cost. The City needed the right facility, not the cheapest one. The point system was a very good way to show at a glance what should receive the most attention, the next, the next, and so on. He pointed out that the numbers didn't have to add up to any certain amount, though he suggested they should work toward a total of about 200. He asked committee members to study his prioritizing carefully, as they would not want to leave something really important with a low score.

There was a discussion about putting together examples of other completed projects in the RFP to show what North Ogden would like. It would be very important to know immediately if a proposal wasn't going to give what was expected, so it could be rejected or so they could give the contractor more time to get it right. It was noted that it might be a good idea to have the cost portion of any bid sealed.

City Manager/Attorney Call ended his portion of the discussion by stating that if the group was basically okay with the RFP so far, he would go through it to make some changes as were identified in the meeting, then he would send it out before the end of the week. The Committee could expect to see something by Friday. He pointed out that they would always have the chance to amend it.

There was some discussion as to the firms that might be interested in the project. The question of references vs. reputation came up, with the group's consensus being that a good reputation was better than good references. It's better not to trust references. There was discussion about using a local contractor as they would have greater interest in what happening with the City. Additionally, contractors sometimes collaborate behind the scenes, and they wished there was a way to prevent that. The suggestion was made to ask for subcontracted work instead of having employees of the firm do the work that could be subcontracted.

Committee Chairman Chugg stated he would contact committee members to encourage attendance so they would have a full quorum for future voting.

City Manager/Attorney Call gave a final outline of the timeline he envisioned:

- Friday, July 16—Back to committee with minor changes.
- Thursday, July 22—Packet to the City Council.
- Tuesday, July 27—City Council meets to consider approval.
- Sunday, August 1—RFP would have gone out and the two month window to respond would have started. They could ask contractors if this was enough time.
- Wednesday, August 11—Committee to decide how to proceed in meeting with contractors.

He pointed out that no one had requested information on how to do a referendum, so that was a green light from the community to move forward.

It was suggested that at the August 11 meeting the Committee could discuss how to do some fundraising for contributions. As an idea, a courtroom or other prominent room could be named in honor of someone in exchange for a donation.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were none.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

Committee Member Neal Berube motioned to adjourn the meeting. Committee Member Robert Bolar seconded the motion. All in attendance were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.


M. Brent Chugg
Committee Chairman


Susan L. Nance, CMC
City Recorder


Date Approved