

**Highway Facility Evaluation Committee
Minutes
January 19, 2015**

Committee members present: David Hintz—Chair, Robb Jensen—Vice Chair, Bob Mott, Sonny Paszak, Jack Sorensen, Freeman Bennett, Lisa Charbarneau, Brian Desmond and Mike Romportl.

Others present: Ryan Thacker (Barrientos design & Consulting) via phone, Alan Van Raalte, and Dan Gleason.

Call to order: Chairman Hintz called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. noting the meeting had been properly posted.

Approve agenda: Motion to approve the agenda by Sorensen, second by Mott. All ayes; motion carried.

Approve the minutes of the December 5, 2014 meeting: Motion to approve the minutes of the December 5, 2014 meeting by Paszak, second by Mott. All ayes; motion carried.

Vouchers, reports, and bills: None

Update on Barrientos Design & Consulting study: Bennett stated that Norman Barrientos had emailed the preliminary numbers and costs for upgrades to the old building as well as cost for construction of a new facility as well as blue prints and he would be available by phone for a conference call. Bennett discussed regulations relating to the existing building and proposed upgrades and changes. Mott recommended asking him to list upgrades as to priority. Bennett noted there are things that need to be upgraded now such as fire doors and the fuel system. Hintz recommended commencing with the conference call to discuss the proposed upgrades. Ryan Thacker joined the meeting via phone and stated he would be filling in for Norman Barrientos. Hintz asked if the items included in the renovation were categorized as to priority. Thacker indicated that this was a preliminary report and priorities had not been assigned. Discussion followed as to what was deficient and what would be optimal for the site in addition to regulations governing what percentage can be upgraded while keeping certain aspects grandfathered in noting level 2 alterations would likely apply the 20 percent rule and how to satisfy those conditions. Thacker discussed areas that were found to be deficient, compliance with ADA, upgrades to the warm storage and heating system, benefits of an automated vehicle wash and creation of dedicated storage of shop equipment. Thacker stated that options would be available for utilizing what already existed on site noting that the data was about a week out. Mott questioned potential site prep costs. Thacker indicated that the study allowed for a \$200,000 placeholder for additional asphalt for existing site adding he has seen, depending on acreage, new sites that require up to \$2 million for site development. Thacker continued addressing areas including windows and lighting, make-up system and vehicle exhaust system, floor drainage and the addition of ceiling fans to get air moving. Discussion continued of savings related to the automated vehicle wash in terms of both savings to equipment and labor costs followed by recommendations for soil borings and analysis indicating he would rely upon a geo-technical engineer for information related to the benefits of pits or borings. Mott asked if an

analysis of consolidation could be part of the study. Thacker stated he has seen consolidation of satellite shops work well with centralized facilities but there are varying degrees and that would be affected by how much of the 40 acres are feasible to develop and it would be important to know if it would be developed as a campus facility. Bennett asked if the remote wash bay could be attached to the main shop. Thacker stated that it was remote so the vehicles could queue up and exit in a fluid motion as well as not adding humidity to the vehicle storage bay adding the scale was also kept separate to aid in the circular flow of the site. Paszak asked about savings for heating from a new facility compare to older facilities. Thacker stated it was not a simple answer; however, insulated areas are 40% - 50% greater but that doesn't necessarily result in savings because of higher roofs etc.

Discussion of need for soil borings of proposed site: Romportl stated he spoke with REI of Wausau and one of the issues is that unless you take a lot of borings you will have to be cautious of the readings since they go to refusal and that boulder could be ten feet underground. He had suggested considering pits because it will tell you if there is bedrock or boulders. Norman Barrientos recommended the pits go at least 12 feet. Bennett stated depth was based on safety and could go down 20 feet. The committee discussed who would do the readings and Jensen commented that Norman Barrientos could get someone to do the borings for approximately \$3,500. Desmond commented that it might be wise to have the borings done per Barrientos recommendation but if they run into problems have Bennett dig the pits to see what is there. Hintz recommended gathering more information and evaluating a bit more before the next meeting. The committee discussed how much usable area was available and the bridging of a creek that was approved by the DNR; however, there was a high power line that needs to be addressed according to Bennett.

Update on the cost to upgrade current facility: Nothing additional.

Near term action steps: Jensen recommended a tour of the Forestry and River Street facilities. Sorenson asked about the sale of the current Forestry Facility. Desmond stated that the DNR would need to approve and Sorenson advised that the interest free loan that was repaid may now require the repayment on interest. Analyze the borings/pit issue and how to proceed, setup time for other department tours and talk to DNR about sale of Forestry building. Mott noted that there was \$7,000 available that could be used toward studying consolidation of outlying facilities noting he felt confident with the answers that were provided so far.

Update on the cost of a new facility: Mott asked what could be done to reduce the potential site prep cost of \$2 million. Hintz stated that \$2 million was the high end. Mott estimated that costs might be between \$1 million to \$1.5 million. Romportl stated in addition to 600 feet of access roads fencing is a cost that may not have been included in the report. Bennett stated that he did not think that there was a need for the in ground lift or the 2 post lift and instead use 4 wheel lifts adding he felt the salt storage at 650,000 is too high since the state said they would pay for their own salt storage building to avoid inventory problems. Mott asked if they could get by for about half of the initial \$650,000; Bennett indicated he thought they could, adding Juneau County built theirs for about \$180,000. Jensen noted savings because the storage had a membrane roof that would need to be included in capital projects. Bennett estimated the cost of the access road would run about \$50,000 including the culvert.

January 19, 2015

Future meeting dates: January 30, 2015

Future agenda topics: Update to Barrientos Design & Consultation study, soil borings and sale of outlying highway facilities.

Public Comments: None

Adjournment: Motion by to adjourn by Paszak, second by Sorensen. All ayes; motion carried.

David Hintz, Committee Chair

Dan Gleason, Recording Secretary