



City Council Agenda Special Meeting

Friday, June 9, 2017

8:00 a. m. - General Session

This agenda contains a brief general description of each item Council will consider. The City Clerk has on file copies of written documentation relating to each item of business on this Agenda available for public inspection. Contact the City Clerk's Office at (714) 990-7756 or view the Agenda and related materials on the City's website at www.cityofbrea.net. Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Council after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office at 1 Civic Center Circle, Brea, CA during normal business hours. Such documents may also be available on the City's website subject to staff's ability to post documents before the meeting.

Procedures for Addressing the Council

The Council encourages interested people to address this legislative body by making a brief presentation on a public hearing item when the Mayor calls the item or address other items under **Matters from the Audience**. State Law prohibits the City Council from responding to or acting upon matters not listed on this agenda.

The Council encourages free expression of all points of view. To allow all persons the opportunity to speak, please keep your remarks brief. If others have already expressed your position, you may simply indicate that you agree with a previous speaker. If appropriate, a spokesperson may present the views of your entire group. Council rules prohibit clapping, booing or shouts of approval or disagreement from the audience. PLEASE SILENCE ALL PAGERS, CELL PHONES AND OTHER ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT WHILE COUNCIL IS IN SESSION. Thank you.

Special Accommodations

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office at (714) 990-7757. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable City staff to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. (28 CFR 35.102.35.104 ADA Title II)

Important Notice

The City of Brea shows both live broadcasts and replays of City Council Meetings on Brea Cable Channel 3 and over the Internet at www.cityofbrea.net. Your attendance at this public meeting may result in the recording and broadcast of your image and/or voice as previously described.

**GENERAL SESSION
SPECIAL MEETING
8:00 a.m. - Executive Conference Room
Level Three**

CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL - COUNCIL

1. **Matters from the audience**

DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. **Reconsider the Elevator Option for the Brea Superblock I Parking Structure Project, CIP 7903 - 1)**
Receive and File a Presentation by Staff on Elevator Options; and 2) Reconsider the Elevator Option

ADJOURNMENT

City of Brea

COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: City Manager

DATE: 06/09/2017

SUBJECT: Reconsider the Elevator Option for the Brea Superblock I Parking Structure Project, CIP 7903

RECOMMENDATION

1. Receive and file a presentation by staff on Elevator Options; and
2. Reconsider the Elevator Option

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the June 6, 2017 City Council meeting, City Council approved option 3 which would provide one glass elevator at the Paseo location and eliminate the elevator at the Birch Street location and directed the City Engineer to negotiate the modifications that were made after the original plan such as the deletion of the office space, air conditioning unit and other changes to offset the additional funds needed for the one glass elevator.

The Brea Superblock I Parking Structure Project, CIP 7903 ("Project") was initiated in 2011. The original concept and goal for this Project was to construct a four-level parking structure (one ground level, three elevated floors) on the City owned South Orange Street/Birch Street surface parking lot that provided approximately 470 parking stalls (300 stall increase) with dedicated office spaces/store frontage along the north side (Birch Street). The west side was envisioned as a 32-foot alley passageway with the main entrance and exit from Brea Blvd. Additionally, the west side area would be the main pedestrian thoroughfare with access to and from the structure via stairs and a central elevator with back glass cab and an exterior west facing elevator shaft wall with glazing. The secondary vehicle entrance/exit was planned from South Orange Ave.

In April 2012, a Request for Prequalification ("RFQ") of Bidders was sent out to six (6) design-build entities. Staff reviewed the submitted prequalification documents from the six (6) bidders, but did not pursue the next step of issuance of a Request for Proposals ("RFP") and the Project was placed on hold. In early 2015, staff re-initiated the Project and looked into several options. In April 2015, City Council directed staff to confirm costs and schedules of the proposed parking structure design concepts, provide funding options, and look into other design concepts inclusive of mixed-use. In May 2015, staff with design consultant obtained a quote from Bomel for a Parking only design concept in the amount of \$9,975,532. The total Project cost at this time was estimated at \$12.6 million, which included a \$10 million design-build contract plus \$1 million contingency (10%) and \$1.6 million for construction inspection, material testing, and administration costs ("construction engineering"). The quote contained a price to install a glass cab elevator of \$170,000. The elevator shaft costs were separated out into the various items such as masonry, steel reinforcement, exterior glazing, stucco, and paint.

In June 2015, staff presented two parking structure options with costs and schedules as well as two added design concepts related to housing proposals from Jamboree Housing and Bear Development. Soon thereafter, in August 2015, City Council directed staff to pursue the Parking Structure Only option and initiate a RFQ package. In September 2015, City Council approved funding in the amount for a \$10.5 million Project; an approximate \$9 million design-build contract estimate with \$1.5 million for 40% design, contingency, and construction engineering. In October 2015, staff received five (5) RFQ's, and after review, narrowed the list to three (3) qualified bidders: McCarthy, Swinerton, and Bomel. In November 2015, staff solicited these three qualified bidders through a RFP and, in January 2016, staff received three proposals in the amount of \$8.92 million, \$8.95, and \$9.39 million respectively.

The November 2015 RFP documents specified various elements that continued the 2011 design goals such as

number of stalls, number of levels, access points, etc. However, there were several updates to the 2011 specifications and design with the intent to stay within a \$9 million design-built contract. One such design update was related to the central elevator, which was modified to a non-glass cab with a masonry only elevator shaft (no exterior glazing). Furthermore, as part of the proposed pedestrian bridge alternative bid item, a second non-glass elevator was added at the north-west location (Birch Street). Other nonstructural/architectural, landscape and hardscape features were also minimized to stay within a \$ 9 million design-build contract.

As part of their proposals, each bidder provided individual item lump sum costs within a proposal schedule as provided in the RFP that identified various item costs such as: excavation/grading, concrete and formwork, masonry, and elevators/glass and glazing. The proposed costs from each of the three bidders for the elevators were \$258,000, \$260,600, and \$259,000 respectively. Although the bid schedule title for the elevators shows glass/glazing, Section I.F of the RFP, Outline Specifications states "Elevators are not to have glass openings." Therefore, the schedule proposed prices mentioned previously covered only the specified non-glass elevator costs. Furthermore, the RFP scope did not include exterior glazing for the elevator shaft wall, which is designed as a Cement Masonry Unit ("CMU") Wall system.

In April 2017, the subjects of Project schedule, architectural features, and the elevators was discussed at the regular monthly Brea Downtown Owners Association and McCarthy coordination meeting. At this meeting, it was mentioned that the original design concept depicted a glass elevator at the west alley area adjacent to the paseo between Lilly Q's BBQ and Tower Records and that the approved design plans did not. Soon thereafter, staff looked into the matter further and requested McCarthy to provide a quote to modify the two elevators with a glass back wall cab and back elevator shaft wall with glaze openings in the CMU. McCarthy's estimated price for this change was \$173,695 for two and \$95,233 for one (See Exhibit A). The cost for the elevator located at the west alley (Elevator #1) was more than the Birch Street elevator (Elevator #2) due to the extra height of the system. Additionally, this price assumed that the CMU elevator shaft wall system could accommodate the glass openings.

At the May 2, 2017 City Council Study Session, staff presented a brief history of the Project and the topic of the elevators with the proposed quote from McCarthy. During this presentation, staff discussed the original concept design, which included a glass elevator at the west alley location, and potential safety concerns with elevators. Staff did consult with the Police Department ("PD") regarding safety concerns with elevators, which provided no recent history of reported incidents at the two existing downtown parking structure elevators. However, the general consensus of PD is that the glass elevators provide a safer visual environment versus no glass.

Additionally, at this meeting, staff discussed the concern from McCarthy's structural engineer that the redesign of the back CMU wall with glaze openings might not work and that a steel or concrete frame system might be required, which would increase the cost. Thereafter, City Council directed staff to work with McCarthy's structural engineer to determine if the initial quote was valid with the CMU design, or if a new design would be required and to report back.

On May, 16, 2017, staff reported back to the City Council during Study Session and presented the finding from McCarthy's structural engineer. The conclusion from the structural engineer was that the elevator shaft would need to be designed as a steel frame with ply and plaster in order to accommodate a 5 foot by 43-45 foot full framed glass opening at the exterior elevator shaft wall. Additionally, McCarthy provided an updated quote for this design, inclusive of the two elevators with back wall glass cab, of \$572,446 (See Exhibit B). The quote from McCarthy is separated out into two components for both elevator locations; 1) deductions and additions of work items (i.e. added glazing, deducting for CMU, added steel frame, etc.) in the amount of a net Contract Price increase of \$401,186, and 2) General Conditions costs related to extending the project schedule by 76 days in the amount of \$171,260 (\$2,100/day). From this meeting, City Council directed staff to further evaluate the updated quote from McCarthy, look into other elevator options, and to come back to the City Council to report the findings with costs. This staff report provides such findings with the following elevator options and costs for City Council to consider:

Option 1 - Modify the design of the two (2) elevator locations to accommodate an elevator cab with back wall glass and a steel frame elevator shaft with full glazing on the exterior wall.

- McCarthy's proposed Contract Change Order Price of \$572,446 with 76 calendar days added to the Contract (Exhibit B).

Option 2 - Modify the design of one of the elevators (Elevator #1) to accommodate an elevator cab with back wall glass and a steel frame elevator shaft with full glazing on the exterior wall. Retain the existing design of

Elevator #2 location with no change.

- McCarthy's Proposed Change Order Price of \$402,214 with 76 calendar days added to the Contract (Exhibit C).

Staff also evaluated a third option, which would provide the same change to Elevator #1 as Option 2, but with the elimination of Elevator #2. This option would provide a significant Contract deduction, which would reduce the overall change order cost. However, this would provide only one elevator for the parking structure. McCarthy did not provide a quote for this option, however, staff estimates this cost reduction to the Contract Price could be in the range of \$125,000 to \$200,000.

Pursuant to City Council direction staff completed an evaluation of the two McCarthy's proposed change costs and has determined that most of the additions and deductions appear to be within a reasonable probable cost range. However, there could be further cost reductions realized within the proposed General Conditions component pursuant to revisions to McCarthy's proposed sequencing and schedule logic.

Based on the findings herein, staff is seeking City Council's direction with respect to the selection of a preferred option for a "not to exceed" price. Additionally, staff is requesting City Council consider authorizing the City Engineer to negotiate and execute a Contract Change Order with McCarthy for the preferred option at a "not to exceed" price.

FISCAL IMPACT/SUMMARY

On April 19, 2016, the City Council approved Resolution 2016-021 appropriating an additional \$10.4 million to the Project for a total budget of \$10.5 million. \$10.3 million was programmed for the Design-Build work with \$203,000 for the 40% RFP development. The Project was further programmed in the 2016-2017 Capital Improvement Program budget with \$203,000 (Fund 182), \$5,063,000 (Fund 140) and \$5,237,000 (Fund 517 - Bonds). The following table provides the most recent costs incurred on this Project up to April 2017 (not including the design costs associated with the development of the November 2015 RFP documents), as well as encumbered costs within the approved Design-Build Contract and Purchase Orders:

Cost Item	Estimated Costs	Expenses Paid To Date	Approved Contract Changes	Pending Contract Changes	Remaining Balances
Design-Build Contract	\$ 8,927,383	\$ 2,301,450	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,625,933
Contingency (6%)	<u>535,643</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>52,270</u>	<u>4,000</u>	<u>479,373</u>
Total	9,463,026	\$ 2,301,450	52,270	4,000	7,105,306
Construction Engineering	565,000	169,401	-	-	395,599
Contingency (10%)	<u>56,500</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>56,500</u>
Totals	10,084,526	2,470,802	52,270	4,000	7,557,405
Approved Budget	10,272,628				
Remaining Budget (1)	188,102				

Note (1) - Based on the Design-Build Contract amount, pending and approved Contract Change Orders to date, and remaining contingency, there is approximately \$188,102 remaining in the budget that has not been encumbered or expended. Therefore, there is a total available unencumbered amount of \$723,975(\$479,373 plus \$56,500 plus \$188,102) using the remaining contingency amounts and remaining budget amount identified in the table.

The Project is currently in construction and is now in the vertical phases of the parking structure with the construction of the concrete columns and concrete slabs. The approved design depicts two (2) elevators without glass back cab wall enclosed within a CMU wall system with no exterior glass facade. The original concept design depicted one glass elevator with an exterior glass facade centrally located along the west alley adjacent to the paseo between Lilly Q's BBQ and Tower Records. McCarthy's schedule depicts the milestone to initiate the ordering of the current elevator design fabrication as June 7, 2017. City Council directed staff to evaluate the options to modify the approved elevator design to a glass back cab and back wall glass facade. Staff worked with McCarthy to developed two main proposed change options with a third for City Council to consider as; 1 - Two Glass Back Cab Elevator/Steel Frame back Glass Elevator Shaft (\$572,446), 2 - One Glass Back Cab Elevator/Steel Frame back Glass Elevator Shaft and One As Designed (\$402,214), and 3 - One Glass Back Cab Elevator/Steel Frame back Glass Elevator Shaft, Eliminate one Elevator (McCarthy to provide cost), staff estimated \$125,000 to \$200,000 Contract Deduct for eliminating the one elevator. Staff seeks City Council's direction on the preferred option with a "not to exceed" price. Staff also requests City Council consider authorizing the City Engineer to negotiate and execute a Contract Change Order with McCarthy for the preferred option with a "not to exceed" price.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

William Gallardo, City Manager

Prepared by: Steve Kooyman, P.E., City Engineer

Concurrence: Tony Olmos, P.E., Public Works Director

Attachments

Exhibit A

Exhibit B

Exhibit C

Glass Back Elevator Costs ROM

Glazing RO @ Shaft	5' X 43'	215 SF
Glazing Cost	\$125/SF	\$ 26,875.00
Masonry Deduct	\$20/SF	\$ (4,300.00)
Rebar Cost	\$4K/EA	\$ 4,000.00
Misc. Metals Cost	\$25K/EA	\$ 25,000.00
Elevator Costs	\$10K/EA	\$ 10,000.00
Flashing Costs	\$10K/EA	\$ 10,000.00
Re-Design Costs	\$15K/LS	\$ 15,000.00
ELEVATOR #1		\$ 86,575.00
Markups (~10%)		\$ 8,657.50
TOTAL ELEV. #1		\$ 95,232.50
ELEVATOR #2		\$ 71,575.00
Markups (~10%)		\$ 7,157.50
TOTAL ELEV. #2		\$ 78,732.50
TOTAL BOTH ELEVATORS		\$ 173,965.00

Exhibit B

Glass Back Elevator - STEEL SHAFT - ROM		
Glazing RO @ Shaft	5' X 43'	215 SF
Glazing Cost	\$125/SF	\$ 53,750
Masonry Deduct		\$ (95,000)
Rebar Deduct		\$ (5,000)
Steel Shaft Cost		\$ 182,380
Framing & 1/2" to 7/8" Plaster Costs	\$60K/EA	\$ 120,000
Expansion Joint Deduct		\$ (17,000)
Concrete Deck Extensions, Embeds & Curb		\$ 14,000
Elevator Costs	\$16.5K/EA	\$ 33,000
Flashing Costs	\$5K/EA	\$ 10,000
Shaft Painting	\$7.5K/EA	\$ 15,000
Elevator Operator		\$ 19,100
Elev. Pit Remediation	\$4.5K/EA	\$ 9,000
Re-Design Costs		\$ 35,710
	SUBTOTAL	\$ 374,940
	Markups (~7%)	\$ 26,246
	TOTAL BOTH ELEVATORS ROM	\$ 401,186
Glass Back Elevator - Time Extension - ROM		
General Conditions (76 Days)	\$2.1K/DY	\$ 160,056
	Markups (~7%)	\$ 11,204
	TOTAL TIME EXTENSION ROM	\$ 171,260
	GRAND TOTAL GLASS-BACK ELEVATORS ROM	\$ 572,446

QUALIFICATIONS:

- Elevator shaft glazing based on code minimum laminate clear glass.
- Preliminary Fragnet schedule shows elevators starting prior to glazing being installed. This requires coordination & confirmation from the elevator contractor (if not allowed per elevator contractor, may extend schedule delay).
- Temporary weather protection for shaft enclosure not included with ROM.
- Durations for owner direction are provided within the Preliminary Fragnet schedule. Adjustment to those durations will adjust the overall schedule delay.
- Elevator costs are based on 2017 rates. All elevator pricing/rates are subject to change for work performed in 2018.

Glass Back Elevator <u>#2 ONLY</u> - STEEL SHAFT - ROM		
Glazing RO @ Shaft	5' X 45'	225 SF
Glazing Cost	\$135/SF	\$ 30,375
Masonry Deduct		\$ (47,500)
Rebar Deduct		\$ (2,500)
Steel Shaft Cost		\$ 92,620
Framing & 1/2" to 7/8" Plaster Costs	\$60K/EA	\$ 60,000
Expansion Joint Deduct		\$ (7,000)
Concrete Deck Extensions, Embeds & Curb		\$ 7,000
Elevator Costs	\$16.5K/EA	\$ 16,500
2nd Elevator Inspection, 2nd Delivery & Remob Costs		\$ 12,000
Flashing Costs	\$5K/EA	\$ 5,000
Shaft Painting	\$7.5K/EA	\$ 7,500
Elevator Operator		\$ 9,550
Elev. Pit Remediation	\$4.5K/EA	\$ 4,500
Re-Design Costs		\$ 27,800
	SUBTOTAL	\$ 215,845
	Markups (~7%)	\$ 15,109
TOTAL BOTH ELEVATORS ROM		\$ 230,954
Glass Back Elevator - Time Extension - ROM		
General Conditions (76 Days)	\$2.1K/DY	\$ 160,056
	Markups (~7%)	\$ 11,204
TOTAL TIME EXTENSION ROM		\$ 171,260
GRAND TOTAL GLASS-BACK ELEVATORS ROM		\$ 402,214

QUALIFICATIONS:

- Elevator shaft glazing based on code minimum laminate clear glass.

- Note: Due to the limited quantity of glazing for only one elevator shaft, the budgeted unit rate was increased to \$135/SF within this ROM.

- Preliminary Fragnet schedule shows elevators starting prior to glazing being installed. This requires coordination & confirmation from the elevator contractor (if not allowed per elevator contractor, may extend schedule delay).

- Temporary weather protection for shaft enclosure not included with ROM.

- Durations for owner direction are provided within the Preliminary Fragnet schedule. Adjustment to those durations will adjust the overall schedule delay.

- Elevator costs are based on 2017 rates. All elevator pricing/rates are subject to change for work performed in 2018.