

Livonia Township
Special Meeting
March 24, 2010

On Wednesday March 24, 2010 the Livonia Board of Supervisors met in a Special Meeting located at 11162 265th Avenue, Livonia Township, Sherburne County, Minnesota.

Those present: Supervisors Doebler, Hass, Hewitt, Sherper, Wallin, Clerk/Treasurer Spencer, Graeme Mahler, Architect and Ryan Maloney, Fire Chief.

Chairman Sherper called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. for the purpose of: Consider/approve sealed bids for maintenance/fire building and Consider well quotes.

Bids were received from two precast companies. Hanson Structural Precast submitted a base bid of \$312,076.00, voluntary alternate credit of \$13,705.00 to reduce R to 17.7, no brick, acid etch, sandblast, exposed aggregate, flat end panels and stated recycled product at \$18,124.25; bid bond was included. Wells Concrete submitted a base bid of \$292,374.00, alternate credit of \$3,300.00 to reduce building by two feet wide, voluntary alternate credit of \$1,200.00 to reduce R to 17.3 at double T's and stated recycled product at \$79,892.90; bid bond was included. The apparent low bid is Wells Concrete Company. Hewitt/Hass unanimous to accept base bid of \$292,374.00 from Wells Concrete contingent upon review by Mahler. The alternate credit of \$3,300.00 to reduce building by two feet wide (the building dimension will be 78 feet x 113 feet) and the voluntary alternate credit of \$1,200.00 to reduce R to 17.3 at double T's was not accepted. Mahler stated a letter of intent needs to be sent to Wells Concrete to reserve bed time.

Bids were received from three general contractors: Conlon Construction Company submitted a base bid of \$804,902.00, alternate bid for water tank \$68,553.00, alternate credit of \$2,200 to reduce building by two feet wide and stated recycled product at \$59,955.76; bid bond was included. K. Johnson Construction submitted a base bid of \$789,900.00, alternate bid for water tank \$67,347.00, alternate credit of \$2,727.00, to reduce building by two feet wide, voluntary alternate \$69,970.00 for use of CMU wall panel in lieu of double T's at N/S walls, CMU split face colored dry block additive with #5 rebar vert at 32" reinforced, furred, insulated gypsum board, liner panel and stated recycled product at \$47,104.59; bid bond was included. There was discussion about the voluntary alternate of \$69,970 as proposed by K Johnson. The cost difference is unknown between the CMU panel and the double "T" panel, the value of the recycled content of the CMU wall panel is unknown and the CMU wall panel is permanent; the double "T" panels can be moved and reused for future expansion. Alliance Building Corporation submitted a base bid of \$719,646.00, alternate bid for water tank \$62,920.00, alternate credit \$2,900.00 to reduce building by two feet wide, voluntary alternate credit of \$1,000.00 to use local granite for landscape rock; bid bond was included. The apparent low bid is Alliance Building Corporation. Wallin/Doebler to accept base bid of \$719,646.00 from Alliance Building Corporation contingent upon review by Mahler. Sherper made motion amending the original motion to include: To encourage avenues of approach that would increase the recycled content if at all possible; Doebler seconded. Board unanimously approved Sherper's amendment to the motion. Board unanimously approved motion to approve original motion to accept apparent low bid from Alliance Building Corporation. Board talked about addition of water tank as bid by Alliance at \$62,920.00. Motion by Wallin, second by Doebler to include alternate for water tank at \$62,920.00 as bid by Alliance. Discussion followed. Hass suggested and would like to look at alternates to installing water tank including filling trucks at nearest hydrant, downsize tank capacity and just stub in piping now for installation of tank later, questioned pump capacity. Maloney stated there is a time advantage for water source being closer. He also researched tank sizes; the cost is in the pump and controls. General consensus is that expenses for installation of the tank later will cost more, will be an advantage to have water source closer, on site when fighting a fire. Motion carried with Hass voting no.

Board reviewed quotes for well installation. Mahler indicated there is no preference for a 4 or 6 inch well as long as the well can produce 60 gpm at 60 psi. As requested McAlpine confirmed the 4 inch well will produce 60 gpm at 60 psi. Board asked that McAlpine be contacted to request quote for a 6 inch well. No further discussion.

Sherper/Wallin unanimous to adjourn at 8:55 p.m.

Dated this 26th day of April 2010


Chair or Vice Chair


Clerk/Treasurer or Deputy Clerk/Treasurer