



Special Minutes
State Capitol Expenditure Oversight Committee
Oct. 9, 2014
1:30 p.m.
Room 419C
State Capitol Building
Oklahoma City, OK

A meeting notice was filed with the Secretary of State and agenda posted in accordance with the Open Meeting Act.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Phillip Kennedy
Stephen Mason
Rep. Mark McBride
Sen. Dan Newberry at 1:45 p.m.
Sen. Susan Paddock
Rep. Earl Sears
David Thompson
Sen. Corey Brooks

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rep. R.C. Pruett

GUESTS: John Estus, OMES, Director, Public Affairs
Trait Thompson, OMES, State Capitol Project Manager
Melissa Milburn, OMES
Beverly Hicks, OMES
Tim Tuck, OMES
Kathy Pendarvis, OMES Legal
Travis Monroe, OMES
Duane Mass, Capitol Architect/Mass Architects
Michael Tower, Mass Architects
Fred Schmidt, FSB
Jeff Napoliello, JE Dunn
Kyle Nelson, Manhattan Construction
Mark O'Rear, Manhattan Construction
Bryan Dean, OK Election Board

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and establish a quorum. [Steve Mason]

Chair, Steve Mason, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was established. Mr. Mason was advised that notice of the meeting had been given, and an agenda posted in accordance with the Open Meeting Act.

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of the Sept. 4, 2014 minutes. [Steve Mason]

Representative Sears moved to approve the minutes of the meeting held Sept. 4, 2014. David Thompson seconded the motion; the minutes passed and the following votes were recorded:

Sen. Corey Brooks – aye; Phillip Kennedy – aye; Steven Mason – aye; Rep. Mark McBride – aye; Sen. Susan Paddack – aye; Rep. Earl Sears – aye; David Thompson – aye.

Agenda Item 3 – Update on OMES Sept. 12, 2014 trip to Kansas State Capitol. [John Estus and Steve Mason]

Mr. Estus presented a power point presentation to the committee on the restoration details of the Kansas State Capitol, otherwise known as their State House, with before and after pictures.

The trip proved to be helpful and significant to the mission hoped to accomplish here at our Capitol. Mr. Estus pointed out fifteen years ago their Capitol was in a condition very similar to ours. It was over a century old, mechanical systems failing, structural and aesthetic problems, and outdated systems. In Kansas they opted not to move anyone out of the building. The restoration process was done by wings in phases. It took them fourteen years to accomplish.

Another trip has been scheduled by Trait Thompson for Monday, Nov. 24, 2014, for those who weren't able to make the initial trip.

Agenda Item 4 – Discussion and possible action on goals and criteria for the interior of the Capitol. [Steve Mason]

Mr. Mass, of Mass Architects, Inc., explained that to begin the process of repairing and restoring the interior of the State Capitol, a list of goals and criteria must be established. He gave each of the members a copy of the proposed comprehensive list of fifteen goals and criteria. The list was based upon the findings in the 2010 Historic Conditions Report, as well as additional needs determined through subsequent evaluation by the Office of Management and Enterprise Services and Mass Architects, Inc.

Mr. Thompson told the committee that, if approved, this report allows OMES what they need to add on the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) document to hire a qualified vendor.

Rep. Sears moved to approve the goals and criteria as presented. David Thompson seconded the motion, the motion passed and the following votes were recorded:

Sen. Corey Brooks – aye; Phillip Kennedy – aye; Steven Mason – aye; Rep. Mark McBride – aye; Sen. Dan Newberry – aye; Sen. Susan Paddock – aye; Rep. Earl Sears – aye; David Thompson – aye.

Agenda Item 5 – Discussion and possible action on selection criteria for the design-build vendor. [Steve Mason]

Mr. Mass gave the members a handout of the design-build selection criteria for the interior repair and restoration of the State Capitol; required in House Joint Resolution (HJR) 1033. If approved, the following selection criteria below will be included in the Request for Proposal (RFP).

RFP selection criteria:

1. Past performance and relevant experience

- Respondent will be evaluated on past performance with projects of this or similar type.
- Technical criteria may be requested that represents the vendor's understanding of this project and how previous projects may apply.
- References for past client performance evaluations may be requested of the vendor.

2. Project Approach

- Respondent should demonstrate grasp of the technical aspects of the project and how it would staff, manage, schedule and maintain internal control of the project for quality assurance. The project approach may have the following three categories:
 - **Specific technical approach**
Respondent will demonstrate understanding of the technical issues surrounding the project and how this may be applied to successfully complete the project. This may include forensic investigation to establish scope, preparation of scope of work and budget forecasting.
 - **Managerial approach**
Respondent will include qualifications of staff dedicated to the project and reasoning for the assignments. Further, respondent will note how staff performance will provide solutions sought by the state.
 - **Quality assurance and quality control plan**
Respondent will indicate how it will ensure work, from design through implementation, is completed at the highest quality.

3. Cost or fee basis

- Respondent will include the realistic expected cost or fee for the fixed cost (the competitively bid sub-contracting portion) of the work.
- Respondent will indicate the percentage above the fixed cost of work for:
 - Investigations
 - Evaluations
 - Preparation of scope of work
 - Pre-design services
 - Budget estimation, forecasting
 - Design
 - Construction documents and specifications
 - General conditions affecting work
 - Overhead and profit

Sen. Susan Paddock moved to approve the selection criteria as presented. David Thompson seconded the motion, the motion passed and the following votes were recorded:

Sen. Corey Brooks – aye; Phillip Kennedy - aye; Steven Mason - aye; Rep. Mark McBride - aye; Sen. Dan Newberry – aye; Sen. Susan Paddock - aye; Rep. Earl Sears - aye; David Thompson – aye.

Agenda Item 6 – Discussion of Capitol occupancy during repair and restoration process. [Duane Mass]

Upon the request of Senator Dan Newberry from September's meeting, Mr. Mass provided the committee with a document that addressed occupancy options during the interior repair and restoration of the State Capitol. Several ideas were discussed, but nothing can be determined until further into the process when more facts and information are gathered.

It was requested that OMES legal counsel, Kathy Pendarvis research constitutional provision regarding relocation of the seat of government.

Agenda Item 7 – Project Manager's Report. [Trait Thompson]

Mr. Thompson let the committee know that the exterior project is proceeding on schedule. The Response for Qualifications (RFQ) was issued on Sept. 9, 2014. Design-build vendor firms are in the process of responding to that RFQ. It is due back to the state on Oct. 14, 2014. After that date, there will be a team within Office of Management and Enterprise Services (OMES) that will technically score those reports and then three vendors will be selected to respond to the the Request for Proposal (RFP). The RFP will be put out on Nov. 4, 2014. The vendor for the exterior project will be selected by Dec. 17, 2014.

The company out of Chicago, WJE Associates, has been on-site for two weeks, reviewing the exterior of the building. In late September they repelled off the State Capitol and did a thorough analysis on the exterior of the building, using sophisticated technology, making note of the condition of the stone around the building. Their work can be followed on Instagram, Twitter and Facebook.

Jerry Fent, attorney arguing against the Oklahoma Capitol Improvement Authority (OCIA), questioned the legality of HJR 1033. The OCIA voted Sept. 22 to approve an action to ask the Supreme Court review the constitutionality of that measure.

Due to what was accomplished in this meeting, there is no need to have the Nov. 13 meeting. Chair Mason made a motion to cancel meeting. Senator Dan Newberry seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Rep. Earl Sears made a motion to adjourn. Phillip Kennedy seconded the motion. There being no opposition, the meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.