WEST HAYMARKET JOINT PUBLIC AGENCY (JPA)
Board Meeting
April 14, 2011

Meeting Began At: 3:31 P.M.

Meeting Ended At: 4:45 P.M.

Members Present: Tim Clare, Jayne Snyder, Chris Beutler

Item 1 - Introductions and Notice of Open Meetings Law Posted by Door

Chair Snyder opened the meeting and advised that the open meetings law is in effect and is posted in the back of the room.

Item 2 – Public Comment and Time Limit Notification

Snyder stated that individuals from the audience will be given a total of five minutes to speak on specific items listed on today's agenda. Those testifying should identify themselves for the official record and sign in.

Item 3 – Approval of the minutes from the JPA meeting held March 30, 2011

Snyder asked for any corrections or changes to the minutes from March 30, 2011. Hearing none, Beutler motioned for approval of the minutes. Clare seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

Item 4 – West Haymarket Progress Report

Jim Martin, Program Manager with SAIC, came forward and distributed the March Progress Report to the Board. The arena schematic design is moving into design development. Last week there was a schematic design budget review meeting in Minneapolis which went very well. The architects and Construction Team will be updating the Board on that later in the meeting. Work on the 10th and Salt Creek roundabouts has begun and will escalate after the Spring Game on April 16th. That project is on a tight schedule so that it will be done before the fall football season begins. The site preparation and Post Office front end project is out for bid and will open on April 20th. That contract will come before the Board for approval at the May 5th meeting. The M and N Street project is still pending due to some details that need to be worked out. Martin would like to open bids in June and start construction in July. As noted at the last meeting, construction on N Street will be delayed until next year so the new street isn't torn up as dirt is hauled onto the site.

The design on the Charleston Street Bridge continues with work possibly starting in late September. Design is also proceeding on the Amtrak Station, pedestrian bridge, and north

parking lot / festival space. The Remedial Action Plan for the voluntary cleanup program has been submitted to NDEQ for approval and they will be holding an open house for public comment on May 9th. The Environmental Team including Benesch, Miki Esposito and staff from SAIC will be present at the open house. At this point, the program is in great shape. Most of the design costs are now defined and all but two or three design projects are under contract. The next major step will be to compare estimates for construction as the projects are put under contract so we'll know exactly where we stand within the budget.

Snyder asked for comments from the public. Jane Kinsey came forward and asked why students are expected to stand in the arena for entire games. She did not think that was fair and wished to protest that and have the JPA look into other arrangements. Stan Meredith with the DLR Group noted that this was due to a request from the Athletic Department. Clare added that because this is a partnership with the University of Nebraska, their request to have the students stand must be honored. Students do this throughout the country at basketball and football games. Seats could be put in, but the students won't use them. Beutler asked if Kinsey had heard from students who don't want to stand. Kinsey stated that she hasn't but the information was only recently published in the paper. Beutler suggested that she check with some of the students because standing is part of the game ritual. Clare pointed out that he received a phone call from Marc Boehm, Associate Athletic Director at the University, after a drawing was put out showing the arena with only two areas for standing. Boehm expressed that their only request has been to have three areas for the students to stand, that is what the students and Athletic Department specifically wanted in the arena. Kinsey asked if the Athletic Department has polled the students. Clare advised Kinsey to contact Boehm to discuss the matter further.

Item 5 – Approval of Payment Registers

Don Herz, City Finance Director and JPA Treasurer, came forward to review the payments that were made in March. The payments made to the University of Nebraska were for geological testing. The first payment to SAIC was for work through November. Their December billing will come through in April. Herz pointed out that Snyder had previously asked about amounts that show a negative, those are there because a payment was entered and reversed. Instead of deleting it the report shows the entire results of the transaction. There was a payment made to Great Plains Appraisal for appraisal work on various projects. Gilmore & Bell were paid for the legal services they provided for the second bond issue. A payment was made to Fred Briggs Real Estate for property work at 10th and Salt Creek. A $6,000 payment was made to The State of Nebraska related to the voluntary cleanup project and Midwest Right of Way Services was paid for work involving the Jaylynn property. The rest of the transactions have been before the Board previously.

Clare inquired if the amount of the Qwest payment for fiber relocation is the same amount that was in their contract. Herz believes that is correct but he will confirm that for the Qwest and MCI payments. Beutler asked if Herz had reviewed all of the transactions and if they seem reasonable and legally appropriate. Herz answered that they were.

Beutler made a motion to approve the payment registers. Clare seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

Item 6 – Review of the March 2011 Expenditure Reports

Herz explained that these reports show the total budget with expenditures and encumbrances being added as additional obligations are incurred. The first line item which does not have a budget is for costs that will be allocated to various projects. For example, the payment to SAIC was charged to that line item but their fee will be allocated to various projects. Herz will have that completed when he brings forward the April reports. Overall, everything seems to be in good shape.

Snyder asked for comments from the public. No one came forward.

Item 7 – Mortenson White Paper Update on Davis-Bacon

Dan Marvin introduced Derek Cunz from Mortenson and Bob Caldwell from Hampton Enterprises to the Board. At the last meeting, Marvin indicated they would release a report that quantifies the impact of Davis-Bacon on the project. The analysis that Cunz has done will hopefully help calm some of the concerns that have been expressed.

Cunz distributed a report that will be posted on the website later today. As part of their estimative process, Cunz also analyzed the impact of Davis-Bacon prevailing wages on the overall project budget. They reached out to approximately 200 suppliers and subcontractors to get their input on the budget, the cost of commodities, the timing of the project, the schedule of the project, and the scope of work that has been developed. One of the things asked of all the subcontractors and suppliers is what they would estimate the impact of Davis-Bacon to be on their work for the project. After gathering that information, Cunz estimates that the cost impact associated with utilizing Davis-Bacon prevailing wages for Lancaster County to be between $650,000 and $1 million. Included in the report is a detailed synopsis of subcontractors and suppliers by trade and scope of work indicating which noted a cost increase. That information was then used in the overall estimating process to determine the impact of Davis-Bacon. The last page of the report outlines the savings that the JPA realized by using the Recovery Zone Bonds, which shows a present value of $4 million. Using the high number that was estimated for the cost of Davis-Bacon, the JPA will save $3 million by using Recovery Zone Bonds on the project. Cunz noted that a key part of putting their budget together was to take into account local suppliers and the amount the local subcontractors pay their workforce so that the estimate is accurate for the community. Caldwell added that there was a high level of local participation in this estimating process.

Clare questioned if the analysis took into consideration the penalty if the bonds were paid off early as has been suggested. Cunz indicated that it did not. If their analysis had shown a huge cost that was over and above the savings, they would have then looked at the cost of buying the bonds down. Dan Marvin noted that he and Don Herz had discussed paying off the bonds and determined that due to the changing market conditions, the interest cost would have been significant. He also indicated that he will be active in terms of applying for energy savings grants, environmental cleanup grants and other opportunities for savings on this project.

Snyder asked for comments from the public. Jane Kinsey came forward and asked if there is any chance the guaranteed bonds would be withdrawn by the US Government in light of the budget problems. Herz advised that the only risk would be if the Federal Government went bankrupt.

Item 8 – Bill No. WH 11-26 Resolution to approve the Land Exchange Agreement between the West Haymarket Joint Public Agency, City of Lincoln, Nebraska, and Star City Federal LLC, pertaining to an exchange of land between the parties to accommodate construction of the 10th and Salt Creek Roadway Project including construction of certain parking lot improvements on property Star City Federal is acquiring in order to make Star City Federal whole from any loss of parking and functionality at its existing parking lot operation.

Rick Peo informed the Board that this agreement arises out of a need to acquire land from Star City Federal for the 10th and Salt Creek road improvement project. This agreement provides for surplus property to the west of their existing parking lot to be utilized to reconstruct parking that they will be losing. It was determined that the best thing to do was enter into a land exchange agreement in order to make them whole. A boot payment will also be made to Star City Federal because the amount of land they are giving to the JPA is greater than what they are receiving.

There is a substitute agreement before the Board today due to some minor clarifications that Star City Federal's investors requested. They asked for a better description of what the sidewalk improvements might be as they are concerned about the size of the sidewalk on the east side of their property. The JPA has elected to forgo those improvements but if they are done in the future Star City Federal will not be responsible for the maintenance or snow removal on that sidewalk.

Clare inquired as to how many more land exchange agreements will come forward in order to complete the arena site. Peo noted that there will be another with an agency that operates a parking facility to the west of Star City Federal, a land exchange or lease with the Post Office and a couple more conveyances between BNSF, the City and JPA.

Snyder asked for any comments from the public. Hearing none, Beutler made a motion to approve Resolution WH 11-26. Clare seconded the motion. Clare then made a motion to amend No. 1 to adopt the substitute agreement. Beutler seconded the motion. Motion to amend carried 3-0. Motion to approve Resolution WH 11-26 carried 3-0.

Item 9 – Bill No. WH 11-29 Resolution to approve DLR's Schematic Design drawings for the Arena

Dan Marvin introduced Stan Meredith from DLR Group to review the schematic designs with the Board. The floor plans have also been posted to the www.haymarketnow.com website.

Stan Meredith explained that the schematic design submittal is comprised of a number of documents including written narratives on the mechanical systems, electrical systems, and other systems. These drawings are the culmination of all of these systems. The site layout drawing shows the entire site with the arena in the middle. There is a ramp going up the east side to

parking in the northwest quadrant. With the public's input a parking garage containing 280 stalls has been included along with another 250 parking stalls that the University will utilize in the northeast corner. The main entryway is located in the SE quadrant. There is a shipping and receiving area for touring shows to load and unload as well as a separate shipping and receiving area for food services and concessions.

The event level will be located about 2 feet above the 500 year floodplain. Fans will come in through the main entryway and use escalators or elevators to access the main concourse. The University Athletic Department has worked closely with the design team to accommodate the students. They will have their own entry and area to cue up before basketball games so that when the doors open they can rush in. The students are well accommodated for with their own area for restrooms and concessions. Moving around the event floor, there are three auxiliary dressing rooms, green rooms and hospitality areas for acts and talent coming in from around the country. The accommodations for the men's and women's basketball program are in the northeast corner. The arena will have the ability to quickly change out uses of the event floor so that there could be a Sesame Street Live production in the afternoon and a basketball game later that evening.

The main concourse level will be the main entry from the pedestrian bridge. Fans will come to this level by stair, escalator or elevator and descend to their seats. The entire facility will be ADA accessible. The roof deck area on the south side has been extended and opened up to the general public. They will be able to go out there to enjoy the view of the State Capitol Building and West Haymarket development below them. Clare asked if there would be areas on the concourse for kiosks and vendors to set up. Meredith answered yes and pointed out that SMG and Caruso, a company internationally known for food service designs, are developing state of the art areas to service the fans.

The premium level is where the suites and loge level seating will be located. The Upper Concourse will hold restrooms and concessions. The team has utilized the design of the Xcel Energy Center in St. Paul as it has an elevated upper concourse so that when a fan leaves their seat to go to the restroom or concession, they can look back and have a view into the event level. Finally, the upper deck drawing shows all 16,000 fixed seats and an open area that can accommodate future growth of about 2,500 seats.

Clare inquired if there will be gathering places for people to visit on the various levels. Meredith indicated that there is unprogrammed space on the north side of the concourse level that could be set up with lounges as well as the hospitality areas located on the event level. There are several options available depending on the creativity of the operator, SMG.

Paula Yancey with PC Sports came forward to discuss the design from a budgetary standpoint. PC Sports was tasked with ensuring that the design is within the budget that was set forth by the JPA. Yancey distributed information showing the total construction estimate for the arena at $139.8 million and the parking garage at $10 million. There are $21.3 million in soft costs and $6.9 million in contingency, bringing the overall project budget for the arena and garage to $178 million. $1 million of preoccupancy expenses are not included in those numbers.

Beutler inquired if the $6.9 million is the owner's contingency. Yancey stated that it is and there is also a contingency within the Mortenson estimates which will be refined as they go through the design development and construction document phases.

Snyder asked for any comments from the public. Hearing none, Clare made a motion to approve Resolution WH 11-29. Beutler seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

Item 10 – Bill No. WH 11-30 Resolution to approve Amended and Restated Construction Manager at Risk Contract with M.A. Mortenson Company

Paula Yancey informed the Board that this resolution is to approve the final version of the Mortenson Construction Manager at Risk contract. This has been reviewed over the past several weeks by several different entities and they are recommending approval of the contract. Buetler questioned if Yancey has reviewed contracts of this nature in the past and if everything in the contract is fair, reasonable and within the budget. Yancey answered that she is in the business of reviewing these kinds of contracts and believes it is a good well balanced approach to the construction of the arena. It covers everything it needs to cover and protects the owner, the contractor and the public in the construction of this building. Beutler asked if it contained any different or unusual provisions. Yancey noted that they had to follow the BNSF Railroad guidelines but other than that it is a fairly standard agreement.

Snyder asked for any comments from the public. Jane Kinsey came forward and stated that a major issue in getting the voters to approve this project was that there were going to be local jobs. She asked how the Davis-Bacon wage issue, which will bring in outside people, will fit with the promise to create local jobs. Dan Marvin advised that Davis-Bacon will have no impact on whether there are locals or nonlocals on the job. There has been a great effort to try and inform local subcontractors about what the tasks will be so they can respond to the bid packages when they come out. The West Haymarket website also shows those people who have procured contracts with the JPA, the dollar amounts of those contracts and if they are local or nonlocal businesses. At the last check the percentages were 88% local to 12% nonlocal. Those numbers may be a slightly different due to the SAIC contract which would be counted as nonlocal as well as the double roundabout contract that went to TCW which would be counted as local.

Hearing no other comments, Clare made a motion to approve Resolution WH 11-30. Beutler seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

Item 11 – Bill No. WH 11-31 Resolution to approve Consultant Agreement with M.A. Mortenson Company to provide additional scheduling services for the overall West Haymarket Project for a lump sum of $500,000.00 including expenses

Paula Yancey explained that this agreement authorizes an additional component to the Mortenson/Hampton scope which allows for scheduling of the entire West Haymarket project. It creates one point for scheduling so that every project will be kept on one schedule. The cost of these services is estimated at $500,000. It is a not to exceed amount and includes all of the personnel and expenses to last the duration of the entire project. Snyder inquired if it goes over

budget would Mortenson make up the difference or come back to the Board. Yancey answered that it won't go over budget and if anything will be under budget.

Clare received comments from people who were concerned that this would be an added cost to the arena. He has been told that it is not an added expense and that the SAIC contract was reduced to shift the responsibility and cost to this contract. Yancey agreed and stated that the arena scheduling will be compensated within the arena budget. This is outside of the arena and will be spread across the various infrastructure projects throughout the entire West Haymarket.

Snyder asked for any comments from the public. Hearing none, Beutler made a motion to approve Resolution WH 11-31. Clare seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

Item 12 – Bill No. WH 11-32 Resolution to approve Amendment No. 5 to SAIC Consultant Agreement to amend the Scope of Services to include peer review

Jim Martin reminded the Board that some of the previous reports stated that the soil in the arena site is not great. In fact, they are worse than first anticipated which will impact the type of foundation that is put under the arena. After meeting with Mortenson/Hampton they agreed that getting a second opinion could bring an opportunity for cost reduction in the site preparation geotechnical work or in the structural foundation systems for the arena. Martin would like Geiger Engineering, a firm well known for long span truss design, to look at the structural engineering for a cost not to exceed $5,500. He would also like to contract with Thiele Geotech for a cost not to exceed $7,900. The team agreed this would be a smart thing to do as there is a potential to save hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The poor soil on site is not associated with a pollution or environmental problem. The issues have to do with finding patches of sand in one area and clay a few feet over. The ultimate goal is to figure out how to get the most efficient and substantial foundation for the least cost. Beutler asked if this review is being requested to determine if the data gathered is correct. Martin stated that the data is correct. This type of soil will require a deep foundation and it is being recommended that they use auger cast piles. Those are formed by drilling down with a hollow auger, pumping cement down the middle, pulling the auger out and putting steel in to reinforce it. The question lies with how many piles are needed and if it is the best solution. Geiger and Thiele may look at the data and come up with a new idea or validate that this is the best foundation system.

Beutler inquired how Martin determines which operation or function will be peer reviewed. Martin explained that it could be cost driven but is usually based upon experience. Derek Cunz added that the big driver on this issue is that the team looked at other facilities they have built and determined that this was an outlier that didn't look right and they should get a second opinion to try and drive down the cost and get the best solution for this project.

Beutler asked if this was the first peer review done on this project and if there could be more. Martin answered that it is the first and it is possible there may be more. Beutler then asked who would be the liable and responsible party if the team builds on the information provided by the peer review group. Paula Yancey explained that the review group will make recommendations

that the structural engineer will incorporate if the recommendations are valid and acceptable. DLR is ultimately the Architect of Record and will be stamping and sealing the drawings. Stan Meredith added that anything that happens in the confines of this project has to be run through the Engineer of Record and the liability and ownership lies with that one individual. There will be no shifting of responsibility from the engineer who is responsible for the project.

Clare asked where Geiger and Thiele are located. Martin stated that Geiger is from outside of Nebraska and Thiele is located in Omaha. Geiger has created some of the lightest weight and most effective long span trusses in the world and are specialized in this type of project. Thiele does a lot of work in Lincoln and is very familiar with the type of soil on the site. Martin emphasized that this is nothing more than a second opinion to make sure the structure is done right and for the best cost.

Snyder asked for any comments from the public. Hearing none, Beutler made a motion to approve Resolution WH 11-32. Clare seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

Item 13 – Set Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held on Thursday May 5, 2011 3:30 P.M. in Room 303.

Beutler made a motion to adjourn, Clare seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Prepared by: Melissa Ramos-Lammli, Engineering Services

Davis Bacon White Paper
West Haymarket Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska
April 11, 2011

Mortenson | Hampton recently completed the Schematic Design estimate for the West Haymarket Arena. From the onset of the estimating process, we understood that the project would require all work to be performed in accordance with the Davis Bacon Act. We utilized the Davis Bacon Determination for Lancaster County dated 10/29/2010 when calculating labor prices.

As the JPA had requested, an evaluation of the estimated impact of Davis Bacon wages on the project was performed concurrent with the estimating process. Mortenson | Hampton engaged over 200 subcontractors in the estimating effort to ensure that we received current pricing information from the local, regional, and national subcontractor markets. While discussing the Arena project with subcontractors, we requested the anticipated impact of Davis Bacon wages, if any, on their labor estimates for the arena work. Only a handful of subcontractors reported that Davis Bacon wages may have an impact on their pricing.

This survey provides a reasonable snapshot of the estimated impact of Davis Bacon wages on the project budget, but is not an absolute, considering that this is the first formal estimate of the arena, the design has only progressed to the schematic phase, and subcontractors that provided pricing information may or may not be the best value subcontractors that ultimately are selected to build the project.

At a summary level at this phase of the estimating process, our survey of the market suggests that the impact of Davis Bacon wages is between $650,000 to $1,000,000. The trades that indicated a potential increase due to Davis Bacon wages were: reinforcing steel, mechanical systems, electrical, overhead doors, drywall, carpet, scoreboards, and seating installation.

The majority of subcontractors that were surveyed did not advise us of an impact due to Davis Bacon wages. We believe this is largely due to the following: The Lancaster County wage determination is already very competitive with the local prevailing wages; the size and complexity of the arena project will attract larger subcontractors; larger subcontractors have the necessary bonding and insurance requirements required of the arena project; and larger subcontractors tend to pay a higher wage to retain their skilled employees. We also note that many of the local civil subcontractors already pay Davis Bacon wages, or higher, due to the requirements of other contracts on which they are working.

In conclusion, the JPA estimates it will save $7M over the life of the bond issue by taking advantage of bonds that require Davis Bacon wages to be paid on the arena. The present value of the bond savings is $4M. Using the conservative higher estimate of Davis Bacon wage impacts ($1M), less the $4M present value savings results in an overall savings to this project of $3M.

Mortenson construction | HAMPTON CONSTRUCTION

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska
Schematic Design Estimate Davis Bacon Sample Group

Description Subcontractor / Supplier	Comments
EARTHWORK	
A	All of these contractors have been paying Heavy / Highway Davis Bacon Wages for the Nebraska DOT work.
B	
C	
D	
E	
AUGER-CAST PILES	
A	All of these contractors indicated that they pay above the Davis Bacon Wages for Lancaster County.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
H	
I	
J	
SITE CONCRETE	
A	All of these contractors have been paying Heavy / Highway Davis Bacon Wages for the Nebraska DOT work.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
FENCES & GATES	
A	Company A pays more than Lancaster County DB, Company B unconfirmed.
B	
LANDSCAPING	
A	All four currently pay at or higher wages than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
CONCRETE FORMING	
A	Both pay higher wages than Lancaster County DB.
B	

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska
Schematic Design Estimate Davis Bacon Sample Group

Description Subcontractor / Supplier	Comments
CONCRETE REINFORCING	
A	Company E indicated Davis Bacon was a premium. Other four are pay at or above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
STRUCTURAL PRECAST (STADIA, RAKERS, COLUMNS)	
A	All installation contractors pay above Lancaster County DB.
B (Fabrication Only)	
C (Fabrication Only)	
D (Install Only)	
E (Install Only)	
ARCHITECTURAL PRECAST	
A	All installation contractors pay above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
MASONRY	
A	Three companies pay at or above Lancaster County DB. The fourth company is unknown.
B	
C	
D	

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska
Schematic Design Estimate Davis Bacon Sample Group

Description Subcontractor / Supplier	Comments
STRUCTURAL STEEL	
A	All installation contractors pay above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
G (Fabrication Only)	
H (Fabrication Only)	
I (Fabrication Only)	
J (Installation Only)	
K (Installation Only)	
L (Installation Only)	
M (Installation Only)	
N (Installation Only)	
MISCELLANEOUS METALS & METAL STAIRS	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
METAL RAILINGS & ORNAMENTAL METAL	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
FINISH CARPENTRY & ARCHITECTURAL WOODWORK	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska
Schematic Design Estimate Davis Bacon Sample Group

Description Subcontractor / Supplier	Comments
MFG. ROOFING & WALL PANELS	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
G	
SINGLE-PLY TPO MEMBRANE ROOFING	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
G	
DOORS, FRAMES & HARDWARE	
A	Estimate install includes wages higher than DB wages.
B	
OVERHEAD COILING DOORS	
A	One indicated a premium for Lancaster County DB. All other pay at or above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
STOREFRONT, WINDOWS & CURTAIN WALL	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
G	

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska
Schematic Design Estimate Davis Bacon Sample Group

Description Subcontractor / Supplier	Comments
GYPSUM BOARD FRAMING SYSTEMS & ACT	
A	One indicated a premium for Lancaster County DB. All other pay at or above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
TILE & TERRAZZO	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
FLOOR TREATMENT & SPECIAL FLOORING	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
G	
CARPET & RESILIENT FLOORING	
A	One indicated DB was a premium. Other two pay at or above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
ACOUSTICAL WALL TREATMENT PANELS	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska
Schematic Design Estimate Davis Bacon Sample Group

Description Subcontractor / Supplier	Comments
PAINTING	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
WALL PROTECTION	
A (supply only)	Estimate install included wages higher than DB wages
B (supply only)	
C	
D	
SCOREBOARDS & MATRIX DISPLAYS	
A	One indicated DB was a premium. Other three pay at or above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
MULTIPLE SEATING & PLATFORMS	
A	One company indicated Lancaster County DB would be a premium. All other pay at or above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
E	
F	
G	
ICE RINK	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska
Schematic Design Estimate Davis Bacon Sample Group

Description Subcontractor / Supplier	Comments
ELEVATORS & ESCALATORS	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
MECHANICAL	
A	One indicated DB was a premium. Other three pay at or above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	
FIRE PROTECTION	
A	All pay at or more than Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
ELECTRICAL	
A	One indicated DB was a premium. Other three pay at or above Lancaster County DB.
B	
C	
D	

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Civic Arena | Lincoln, Nebraska
General Obligation Facility Bonds, Taxable Series 2010C
(32,035,000 Par amount Recover Zone Economic Development Bonds)

Year	Interest expense	Recovery Zone % subsidy	Build American Bond	Net cost of recover zone	Net cost of build America bonds	Savings
2011	2,246,454.38	(1,010,904.47)	(786,259.03)	1,235,549.91	1,460,195.35	(224,645.44)
2012	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2013	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2014	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2015	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2016	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2017	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2018	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2019	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2020	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2021	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2022	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2023	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2024	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2025	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2026	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2027	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2028	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2029	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2030	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2031	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2032	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2033	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2034	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2035	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2036	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2037	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2038	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2039	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2040	2,162,362.50	(973,063.13)	(756,826.88)	1,189,299.38	1,405,535.63	(216,236.25)
2041	1,833,975.00	(825,288.75)	(641,891.25)	1,008,686.25	1,192,083.75	(183,397.50)
2042	1,494,450.00	(672,502.50)	(523,057.50)	821,947.50	971,392.50	(149,445.00)
2043	1,141,762.50	(513,793.13)	(399,616.88)	627,969.38	742,145.63	(114,176.25)
2044	775,575.00	(349,008.75)	(271,451.25)	426,566.25	504,123.75	(77,557.50)
2045	395,212.50	(177,845.63)	(138,324.38)	217,366.88	256,888.13	(39,521.25)
Total				38,827,768.03	45,887,362.22	(7,059,594.19)
Savings by using recover zone bonds over BAB's						(7,059,594.19)
Net Present Value						($4,034,987.95)

West Haymarket Joint Public Agency
West Haymarket Civic Arena
Lincoln, Nebraska

Mortenson construction

HAMPTON CONSTRUCTION

Schematic Design Estimate
April 5, 2011

Start Date 8/31/2011
Completion Date 9/4/2013

	West Haymarket Arena	Arena Parking
Foundations	$11,527,000	$1,420,000
Structure	$39,102,000	$2,770,000
Exterior Skin & Interior Construction	$34,590,000	$1,560,000
Plumbing, Electrical, Heating Cooling & Elevators	$44,296,000	$1,685,000
Scoreboard, Seating & Other Equipment	$9,735,000	$27,000
Sitework	$630,000	$2,582,000
Total Construction	**$139,880,000**	**$10,044,000**

Project Budget - Lincoln Arena

	Description	I Original Project Budget	II Approved Change Orders	III Project Budget plus Approved Change Orders	IV Proposed Changes from Project Budget	V Current Estimate of Total Project Cost	VI Invoices Approved to Date	VII Amount Left to be Paid
	TOTAL PROJECT SUMMARY							
	Soft Costs							
A.	Design and Engineering	$10,291,612.00	$0.00	$10,291,612.00	$0.00	$10,291,612.00	$1,222,207.05	$9,069,404.95
B.	Testing and Inspections	$900,000.00	$0.00	$900,000.00	$0.00	$900,000.00	$0.00	$900,000.00
C.	FF&E / Preconstruction / Permits / Foodservice	$6,369,794.00	$0.00	$6,369,794.00	$0.00	$6,369,794.00	$62,222.24	$6,307,571.76
D.	Insurance	$214,125.00	$0.00	$214,125.00	$0.00	$214,125.00	$0.00	$214,125.00
E.	Sponsorship Consultant	$1,523,918.00	$0.00	$1,523,918.00	$0.00	$1,523,918.00	$117,616.00	$1,406,302.00
F.	Project Administration	$1,913,500.00	$0.00	$1,913,500.00	$0.00	$1,913,500.00	$0.00	$1,913,500.00
G.	Operations Consulting	$115,141.00	$0.00	$115,141.00	$0.00	$115,141.00	$42,390.18	$72,750.82
	Total Soft Costs	$21,328,090.00	$0.00	$21,328,090.00	$0.00	$21,328,090.00	$1,444,435.47	$19,883,654.53
	Hard Costs							
I.	Arena and Parking / Garage Construction	$149,923,960.00	$0.00	$149,923,960.00	$0.00	$149,923,960.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Total Hard Costs	$149,923,960.00	$0.00	$149,923,960.00	$0.00	$149,923,960.00	$0.00	$149,923,960.00
	Contingency							
J.	Contingency	$6,995,650.00	$0.00	$6,995,650.00	$0.00	$6,995,650.00	$0.00	$0.00
	Total Contingencies	$6,995,650.00	$0.00	$6,995,650.00	$0.00	$6,995,650.00	$0.00	$6,995,650.00
	Total Project Costs	$178,247,700.00	$0.00	$178,247,700.00	$0.00	$178,247,700.00	$1,444,435.47	$176,803,264.53