



CALIFORNIA STATE  
**PUBLIC WORKS BOARD**

EDMUND G. BROWN JR. • GOVERNOR

915 L STREET ■ NINTH FLOOR ■ SACRAMENTO CA ■ 95814-3706 ■ (916) 445-9694

STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD

August 12, 2011

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:**

Mr. Pedro Reyes, Chief Deputy Director, Policy, Department of Finance  
Mr. Esteban Almanza, Deputy Director, Department of General Services  
Ms. Ann Barsotti, Chief Information Officer, Department of Transportation

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Greg Rogers, Administrative Secretary  
Chris Lief, Assistant Administrative Secretary  
Theresa Gunn, Assistant Administrative Secretary  
Stephen Benson, Budget Analyst  
Madelynn McClain, Budget Analyst  
Andrew Ruppenstein, Budget Analyst

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Pedro Reyes, Chairperson of the Board and of the Department of Finance, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Greg Rogers, Administrative Secretary for the Board, called the roll. A quorum was established.

The first order of business was approval and adoption of the minutes from the July 8, 2011 meeting. Mr. Rogers reported Board staff had reviewed and recommended approval and adoption of the minutes.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

**A motion was made by Mr. Almanza and seconded by Ms. Barsotti to approve and adopt the minutes. The minutes were approved by a 3-0 vote.**

**BOND ITEMS:**

There were no Bond Items on this month's agenda.

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

The second order of business is the Consent Items. Mr. Rogers informed the Board there are four Consent Items

- 1 request to authorize site selection [Item 1]
- 1 request to authorize the acceptance of a gift of real property [Item 2]
- 1 request to approve preliminary plans [Item 3]
- 1 request to recognize a scope change, approve performance criteria and concept drawings, and recognize revised project costs [Item 4]

However, Mr. Rogers explained to the Board that a letter from the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) was received late in the afternoon of August 11, 2011 related to Consent Item 4, and copies of the letter were distributed to the Board members. Mr. Rogers proposed the Board consider Consent Items 1-3, and discuss Consent Item 4 separately.

Staff recommended approval of Consent Items 1-3.

Mr. Reyes asked the Board members if they would like to pull any Items 1-3 from the Consent Calendar.

There were no comments or questions from the Board or public.

**A motion was made by Mr. Almanza and seconded by Ms. Barsotti to approve Consent Calendar Items 1 through 3. The Consent Items were approved by a 3-0 vote.**

#### **CONSENT ITEM 4:**

Mr. Lief, staff to the Board, explained that Consent Item 4 is for the Dewitt Nelson Correction Facility Infill Project. This request would recognize a scope change, approve performance criteria and concept drawings, and recognize revised project costs.

DeWitt Nelson Youth Correctional Facility (DeWitt) is currently deactivated, and this project will convert DeWitt to an independent adult male Level II facility that will rely on California Health Care Facility (CHCF) for administration and primary support. The CHCF is located adjacent to the facility. Included with this project is approximately 229,000 square feet of space for inmate housing, health care services, rehabilitation programs, inmate visiting, and limited ancillary support services. DeWitt will provide housing for 1,133 inmates which includes 528 Specialized General Population (medical needs inmates), 180 Permanent Work Crew inmates in converted dorms, and 425 Enhanced Outpatient Program (with mental health needs) in new celled housing.

California Department of Corrections requested a scope change that will result in a decrease of the DeWitt project by approximately \$21.3 million. The changes will include improvement to the construction and operational coordination between the DeWitt and CHCF projects; and will allow various changes by accommodating design changes, and enhance operational coordination with CHCF.

Department of Finance (Finance) notified JLBC, the Senate Appropriations, and Assembly Appropriations Committees on July 19, 2011 of its intent to approve this scope change and recommend the Board to recognize it no sooner than 20 days from that date.

The JLBC informed Finance that it did not object to the scope change; however they still had concerns regarding the necessity of the project due to the implementation of public safety realignment. The JLBC recommended that CDCR should evaluate the necessity of the project in the context of the implementation of public safety realignment and the prison overcrowding ruling by the federal three judge panel. JLBC is requesting that CDCR conduct and share with them an analysis on how much of an impact the public safety realignment will affect the number of inmates with medical and mental health needs that would be served at this institution and whether the population could be served in existing institutions where space has been freed up which will result in reducing the need for prison construction.

JLBC is requesting that the information be provided to the committee before CDCR executes a design-build contract for the project.

In summary, staff recommends the Board recognize the scope change, approve performance criteria and concept drawings, and recognize revised project costs.

Further, staff recommends, as part its actions, the Board direct staff to ensure CDCR provides the JLBC the additional analysis and information requested before Finance approves award of the design-build contract for the project.

Mr. Reyes confirms that Finance is in agreement with the JLBC in requesting additional information on the project before it gets its final approval.

Mr. Lief agrees with the recommended request from JLBC.

Mr. Almanza inquired if there is any harm for this project to be carried over to the next meeting.

Mr Lief responded that the timeline is very tight and the Coleman court has ordered a specific timeline for the project and to delay the action a month will put that schedule in jeopardy.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

**A motion was made by Ms. Barsotti and seconded by Mr. Almanza to approve Consent Item 4. Consent Item 4 was approved by a 3-0 vote.**

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**ACTION ITEM 1:** Action Item 1, the Judicial Council's New Ukiah Courthouse, Mendocino County, consider authorizing site selection.

Mr. Rogers reported that this item is being brought to the Board as an action item due to the extensive environmental cleanup that is needed, which has been noted in the staff analysis. The County of Mendocino (County) has accepted the responsibility for the contamination and associated clean-up of the site. They reportedly have enough funds and have entered into an agreement with a private firm for the remediation, which is to begin in March 2012 and be completed by June 2012.

The environmental work may seem extensive; however this property is feasible for a new courthouse. The location of the property is across the street from the existing courthouse, allowing use of the existing courthouse infrastructure when the new courthouse is complete. There are a number of suitable properties in downtown Ukiah to build the new courthouse; however they lack access to public transportation, infrastructure, and are not within walking distance of existing court services and partners.

This is one of two sites that Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) are considering to locate the new courthouse. The other site that is being considered could take a little longer and may not be feasible because it involves the assemblage of multiple parcels from both private owners and local government and the private owners may not be willing to sell. At a later date, the second site may be brought to the Board for site selection.

Mr. Rogers stated that staff are comfortable with the Board approving this site selection with the remediation plan and associated funds that have been put in place, on the condition that all environmental cleanup be completed along with any associated environmental site assessment reports necessary prior to the AOC requesting the Board to approve acquisition.

Mr. Reyes emphasized the importance of AOC must have all environmental work completed and approved before bringing the parcel before the Board for approval. He recommended the condition be placed on record.

Mr. Rogers agreed and suggested amending the staff recommendation to be authorizing site selection, and before the item is brought back before the Board for acquisition approval, the entire environmental cleanup will be complete, if the AOC intends to acquire this site.

Mr. Reyes was comfortable with the revised recommendation, given its current environmental condition and he wanted to make sure the AOC followed through with cleaning up the site prior to acquisition by the state.

Mr. Almanza stated that he is supportive with redeveloping Brownfields, and he's sure it will be a good location once the project is complete.

No comments or questions from the AOC or the public.

**A motion was made by Mr. Almanza and seconded by Ms. Barsotti to approve Action Item 1. Action Item 1 was approved by a 3-0 vote.**

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Rogers informed the Board that there were no Items under Other Business.

### **REPORTABLES:**

Mr. Rogers informed the Board there were 7 items under reportables on this month's agenda and were placed in the briefing binders and will be posted on the website after the meeting.

### **NEXT MEETING:**

Mr. Rogers announced the next meeting Public Works Board meeting is scheduled for **Friday, September 9, 2011, at 10:00 am, at the State Capitol, in Room 113.**

There were no comments or questions from the public.

The meeting was concluded at 10:14 am.