TO: Board of Trustees

FROM: Interim Director of Public Works Kate Nelson

SUBJECT: Project Close Out Reports

DATE: May 8, 2024

To: Board of Trustees

Through: Kate Nelson, P.E., Interim Public Works Director

From: Hudson Klein, P.E., Interim Engineering Manager

Date: April 30, 2024

Subject: PROJECT CLOSEOUT, CIP 2299WS1705, Crystal Peak Waterlines

The subject project has been completed and the Notice of Completion was recorded by the County on September 5, 2024 for the subject Project, CIP 2299WS1705, PWP WA-2023-032. It is now ready for project closeout.

Attached is the Project Closeout packet, consisting of two parts. Part 1 consists of project information for the record; Part 2 is the Financial Summary. All encumbrances should be reversed, all purchase orders closed, and the balance should be dispersed as indicated on the Financial Summary sheet.

PROJECT CLOSE-OUT

PART 1 - INFORMATION

- 1. **Project:** 2299WS1705, Crystal Peak Waterlines
- 2. Original Scope: Installation of approximately 2,280 LF of 8" DR-14 PVC or Class 350 DIP water main in Washoe Co. ROW. Connection to (E) 8" water main in Washoe Co. ROW. Reconnect existing domestic service lines. Construct three (3) new fire hydrant assemblies. Construct one (1) combination air valve. The Work also included: Abandonment of specified lines and valves, traffic control, maintain residential and business driveway access, erosion & sediment controls, pavement restoration, replacement of existing features, including vegetation, concrete, and other utilities removed and/or damaged by construction activity, acquisition of Washoe County street cut permits and all related appurtenances; compliance with County permit conditions and working within Right of Ways in Incline Village.
- **3a. Contractor:** Burdick Excavating Co.
- 3b. Subcontractors (Name and Type of Work):
 - Colbre Grading and Paving, Asphalt Paving
 - Western Nevada Supply, Supplier, Pipe Materials
 - Intermountain Slurry Seal, Slurry Seal
- 4. Inspection Services (Name/Address/Type of Work): None
- **5. Project Oversight:** Hudson Klein, P.E.
- **6. Project Manager:** Randolph McLean
- 7. Project Inspector/Engineer:

Construction Materials Engineers, 300 Sierra Manor Drive, Suite 1, Reno NV 89511 Jordan Miller, Michael Hatridge, Nathan Burke and Allison Collette for bedding backfill inspections.

Ron Laylon, Jordan Miller and Ron Laylon for Paving Field Testing; CME In-House asphalt hot mix analyses.

- 8. Significant Deviations from Original Scope (What was Changed and Why):
 Added 30 days to completion date to accommodate delays in material availability resulting from Build America Buy America Act grant funding requirements.
- 9. Critique:
 - A. What went particularly well? Why?

This was a prevailing wage project (both State rates and Davis-Bacon); all reports – both contractor and subs - turned in on time, and all requirements of Apprenticeship Utilization Act were met.

B. What did not go well? Why?

The contractor dug through a gas service as SWG had not located the project area yet and the contractor opted to excavate without proper USA marking completed. Discovered a mislocated IVGID SS lateral, unmarked fiber-optic and one large boulder within the work zone.

The contractor's trailer was discovered to be within the NDOT clear zone on SR28 within the Preston Field parking area. This required a retrospective temporary occupancy permit.

C. What should be done differently in the future? Why?

Contractor trailer to be located out of NDOT ROW or apply for a NDOT temporary occupancy permit prior to mobilization to Preston parking area.

PROJECT CLOSE-OUT PART 2 - FINANCIAL SUMMARY

CIP #2299WS1705

PROJECT NAME: Crystal Peak Waterlines

1	Original Budget	\$	1,364,114.00
2	Budget Adjustments	\$	204,528.00
3	Total Project Allocations (1+2, above)	\$	1,568,642.00
4	Engineer's Estimate of Construction Cost	\$	1,200,000.00
5a	Construction Contract Award Amount	\$	1,111,111.00
5b	Total of Construction Contract Change Orders	\$	21,020.81
5c	Amount left in the Construction Contract after Notice of Completion	\$	-
5d	Total Cost of Construction Contract (5a+5b, less 5c, above)	\$	1,132,131.81
6a	Consultant Contract Amounts	\$	86,700.00
	eonsaltant contract / unoants	Ą	80,700.00
6b	Total of Consultant Contract Amendments	\$	1,949.00
			-
6b	Total of Consultant Contract Amendments	\$	1,949.00
6b 6c	Total of Consultant Contract Amendments Unused Amount Remaining in Consultant Contracts	\$	1,949.00 8,085.00
6b 6c 6e	Total of Consultant Contract Amendments Unused Amount Remaining in Consultant Contracts Total of Consultant Contracts	\$ \$ \$	1,949.00 8,085.00 80,564.00
6b 6c 6e 7	Total of Consultant Contract Amendments Unused Amount Remaining in Consultant Contracts Total of Consultant Contracts Staff Time	\$ \$ \$ \$	1,949.00 8,085.00 80,564.00 44,778.00

To: Board of Trustees

Through: Kate Nelson, P.E., Interim Public Works Director

From: Bree Waters, District Project Manager

Date: April 30, 2024

Subject: PROJECT CLOSEOUT - CIP 3453BD1806, Base Lodge Walk-In Cooler &

Food Prep Reconfiguration

The subject project has been completed and the Notice of Completion was recorded with the County Recorder on February 29, 2024 for the Diamond Peak Base Lodge Walk-In Cooler & Food Prep Reconfiguration Project, FY 2023/24 CIP 3453BD1896. It is now ready for project closeout.

Attached is the Project Closeout packet, consisting of two parts. Part 1 consists of project information for the record; Part 2 is the Financial Summary. All encumbrances may be reversed, all purchase orders closed, and the balance should be dispersed as indicated on the Financial Summary sheet.

PROJECT CLOSE-OUT

PART 1 - INFORMATION

- 1. **Project:** CIP 3453BD1806, Base Lodge Walk-In Cooler & Food Prep Reconfiguration
- 2. Brief Description of Original Scope: This was a Design-Build project for the final design and construction services for a 4,650 ± SF remodel of the existing Base Lodge Kitchen facility at the Diamond Peak Ski Resort.
- **3a. Contractor:** Brycon Corporation
- 3b. Subcontractors (Name and Type of Work):

Delta Fire Systems, fire sprinklers High Desert Surface Prep, epoxy flooring Mesa Energy Systems, refrigeration Morgan Construction, Inc., concrete R&J Painting, LLC, epoxy flooring

- 4. Inspection Services (Name/Address/Type of Work): None
- **5. Project Oversight:** Bree Waters and Hudson Klein, P.E.
- 6. **Project Manager:** Bree Waters
- 7. **Project Inspector/Engineer:** Bree Waters
- 8. Significant Deviations from Original Scope:
 - The project required removal of a load-bearing wall to improve workflow and path
 of travel between the food prep area and the dry storage area. This required a
 structural engineer to design the new opening due to the load-bearing requirement.
 - The kitchen equipment had not been included in the contractor's GMP.
 Negotiations caused IVGID and the contractor to split the cost, 23% and 77%, respectively.
- 9. Critique:
 - A. What went particularly well? Why?

The full project scope and more was accomplished on time and to an expected high quality; this was despite issues highlighted in Item 9.B below.

The working relationship with Brycon management and site staff was notable. The initial project kickoff was problematic due to miscommunication (highlighted in 9.B. below) and the working relationship kept everything on track and on schedule.

B. What did not go well? Why?

The initial kitchen equipment purchase was left off the project budget as IVGID Staff believed Brycon was carrying the cost and, likewise, Brycon believed IVGID was carrying the purchase cost. This caused a budget strain before any work was completed. As above, the collaborative nature of the working relationship resulted in a win-win solution whereby Brycon forfeit certain contingency money and profit margin.

The flooring subcontractor repeatedly delivered a sub-par/unacceptable floor finish that had to be removed/replaced several times.

C. What could have been done differently? Why?

The kitchen equipment inclusion should have been clearly itemized in the project documents. The manner in which the kitchen equipment was addressed was clearly ambiguous and, therefore, an example of an opportunity for marked improvement in a similarly scoped project.

PROJECT CLOSE-OUT PART 2 - FINANCIAL SUMMARY

CIP #3453BD1806

PROJECT NAME: Base Lodge Walk-In Cooler & Food Prep Reconfiguration

1	Original Budget**	\$ 905,603.00
2	Budget Adjustments	\$ -
3	Total Project Allocations (1+2, above)	\$ 905,603.00
4	Engineer's Estimate of Construction Cost	\$ 584,259.00
5a	Construction Contract Award Amount (GMP 1 , including 10% contingency)	\$ 516,390.00
5b	Total of Construction Contract Change Orders	\$ 310,177.16
5c	Amount left in the Construction Contract after Notice of Completion	\$ -
5d	Total Cost of Construction Contract (5a+5b, less 5c, above)	\$ 826,567.16
6a	Consultant Contract Amounts	\$ 8,000.00
6b	Total of Consultant Contract Amendments	\$ -
6c	Unused Amount Remaining in Consultant Contracts	\$ 1
6e	Total of Consultant Contracts	\$ 8,000.00
7a	Additional Non-Contract Expenditures	\$ 450.00
7b	Staff Time	\$ 55,517.00
8	Total Project Cost: (5d+6e+7a+7b)	\$ 890,534.16
9	Fund Transfers and Reimbursements	\$ -
10	Unexpended Balance	\$ 15,068.84

^{** -} Budget figure includes carry forward and allocated FY24 funds

To: Board of Trustees

Through: Kate Nelson, P.E., Interim Public Works Director

From: Hudson Klein, Principal Engineer/Interim Engineering Manager

Date: April 30, 2024

Subject: PROJECT CLOSEOUT, CIP 2599SS1103, Wetlands Effluent Disposal

Facility Improvements

The subject project was awarded by the Board at their April 12, 2023 meeting, work began in mid-September, 2023, was completed on November 3, 2023 and the Notice of Completion was filed with the Douglas County Recorder on November 14, 2023. This project is now ready for closeout.

Attached is the Project Closeout packet, consisting of two parts. Part 1 consists of project information for the record; Part 2 is the Financial Summary. All encumbrances should be reversed, all purchase orders closed, and the balance should be dispersed as indicated on the Financial Summary sheet.

PROJECT CLOSE-OUT

PART 1 - INFORMATION

- 1. **Project:** CIP 2599SS1103, Wetlands Effluent Disposal Facility Improvements
- 2. Brief Description of Original Scope: The District owns and maintains 900 acres of land in Douglas County for the disposal of WRRF effluent, at the discharge of the effluent export pipeline. The levees and roadways needed to be maintained and resurfaced due to years of wear and tear as well as sub-grade subsidence. With the continued subsidence along levees and roadways, staff was installing barriers in the levees and roadways to reduce and/or eliminate the short circuiting of underground water between cells. With the facility being 39 years old, there were infrastructure improvements that needed to be addressed in order to keep the facility in good working order including vegetation control, and flow control gates.
- **3a. Contractor:** McCuen Construction, Inc.
- **3b.** Subcontractors (Name and Type of Work): Cinderlite Trucking Corporation Aggregate & Trucking
- 4. Inspection Services (Name/Address/Type of Work):
 None.
- 5. **Project Oversight**: Jim Youngblood
- 6. Project Manager: Hudson Klein
- 7. **Project Inspector/Engineer:** Randolph McLean
- 8. Significant Deviations from Original Scope (What was Changed and Why): This work was originally bid on September 23, 2021. However, bids were rejected as the wetlands were too wet and it became unsafe to perform the work that fall when an early winter storm rolled in, effectively ending construction season.

The work was rebid in 2023 and four bids were received on March 23, 2023, with McCuen Construction the low bidder.

9. Critique:

A. What went particularly well? Why?

The working relationship with McCuen was very efficient and effective following changes to the design required to suit the ground conditions observed at time of pre-construction meeting. Overall, the project goals were met through a collaborative process between IVGID Staff and McCuen staff.

B. What did not go well? Why?

The borrow pit identified as the project fill material was too saturated for use on the project, even at the end of the summer season. This was primarily due to internal wetland valving that directs water to the borrow pit in certain circumstances. The valves were not adjusted early enough to allow the borrow pit to dry out in time for project execution.

C. What should be done differently in the future? Why?

As in Item 9.B. above, the borrow pit valves will need to be closed - with water diverted elsewhere in the wetlands - in a more timely manner to allow sufficient dry time. Additional existing condition site survey may also be useful for continued analysis of the hydraulic function of the wetland facility, however, this can be limited to project specific, design-phase timeframes.

PROJECT CLOSE-OUT PART 2 - FINANCIAL SUMMARY

CIP #2599SS1103

PROJECT NAME: Wetlands Effluent Disposal Facility Improvements

1	Original Budget **	\$ 430,040.00
2	Budget Adjustments	\$ -
3	Total Project Allocations (1+2, above)	\$ 430,040.00
4	Engineer's Estimate of Construction Cost	\$ 175,000.00
5a	Construction Contract Award Amount	\$ 200,524.05
5b	Total of Construction Contract Change Orders	\$ (231.67)
5c	Amount left in the Construction Contract after Notice of Completion	\$ -
5d	Total Cost of Construction Contract (5a+5b, less 5c, above)	\$ 200,292.38
6a	Consultant Contract Amounts	\$ -
6b	Total of Consultant Contract Amendments	\$ -
6c	Unused Amount Remaining in Consultant Contracts	\$ -
6e	Total of Consultant Contracts	\$ -
7a	Additional Non-Contract Expenditures	\$ 277.88
7b	Staff Time	\$ 41,164.75
8	Total Project Cost: (5d+6e+7)	\$ 241,735.01
9	Fund Transfers and Reimbursements	\$ -
10	Unexpended Balance	\$ 188,304.99