

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
JANUARY 5, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, G. Benson, D. Cady, P. Curran, C. Crandall; (*Absent: D. Russo*)

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Armstrong and M. Balling (Bovis), D. Button, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, J. Hopkins, T. Hopkins, J. Margeson, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, T. Ross, F. Sinclair, R. Starks, R. Whitney, D. Wildrick-Cole; **Media:** B. Quinn, Wellsville Daily Reporter

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of December 1, 2010, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Balling and Mark Armstrong from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Work in place through November was 70 percent (December's figures weren't available yet); and construction contingency usage through December was 46 percent. There was nothing new to report under incidental costs, but Mr. Balling felt that we would be under-budget for materials testing and there hasn't been much of the incidental contingency used.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

Approved Revisions:

- #25 – Fire Rated Material between Subbasement Roof and CB-1 and 2 per CB-020 – (negotiated down a little) – \$1,683.63
- #40 – CB-028, Revise Door Hardware at Door 202A – \$1,174
- #53 – Added Access Doors and Frames at Corridor 120, 214, and 327 per CB-46 – \$3,737.04
- #63 – Adjust Ceramic Wall Tile Elevations in Toilet Rooms per RFI #140 – no cost
- #64 – Provide Wood Window Sills in the Addition, Electrical Changes per RFI #146, and Additional Stair Railings per RFI #148 – involved added wood windowsills in addition – original design just had drywall finished returns to the windows – better to look at a solid surface material, got pricing on three different options – had some electrical changes – on the two stairs at the bottom of the stairs added rail returns to block people from going under the stairs - \$11,390.55
- #65 – Delete IT Network Switches from the contractor's scope of work because the County wanted to purchase what was used elsewhere – shifted money from the contract to the incidental budget – credit of (\$6,594)
- #71 – Provide an SB-1 Floor Sink with Related Faucets in Room 254A – shown in the drawings but not specified – also wasn't piped, but added piping at no cost - \$1,286.53

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #66 – Revised Wood Door Trim at Door 235A and 336A; Provide Wall Infill in room 315/316; and Provide Epoxy Flooring in Lieu of Epoxy Terrazzo (outside prisoner holding room) – estimated credit of (\$8,000)
- #67 – Spare Conduits Added to Holding Cells – there's a secured ceiling there that will be difficult to access above later – if the County wanted to add electric hardware to those doors at a later date, it makes sense to have the conduit – estimated \$1,500
- #68 – Exterior White Cornice Joints around Top of Addition – it wasn't called out to have the control joints aligned with the masonry control joints – estimated \$1,800
- #69 – Replace the Existing Boiler Room Pumps with New 7.5 HP Pumps per Frank Langley Co. Scope of Work - issues with leaking and lack of power – estimated \$5,500
- #70 – Add Lighting and Outlets in Rooms 147, 155, and 157 to Emergency Generator Circuits per CB-60 – not originally called for, but made sense to add – estimated \$3,000
- #73 – Power to Fire Pump per RFI 154 – (not shown on drawings) – estimated \$1,200
- #74 – Metal Deck Support at Existing Chimney and Elevator Shaft Steel Modifications per CB-62 – issue with shaft hoistway that needs to be discussed with contractor, car doesn't rise properly – steel needs to be adjusted – unsure of cause – estimated \$4,000
- #75 – Elevator Operator for High Density Shelving Delivery on Monday, January 10 – the elevator hasn't been turned over and you have to have an operator run it - one day – cost for operator and use of elevator car – no alternative – estimated \$1,200

**Site Overview – Safety Report:**

Mark Armstrong reported they are doing very well; there haven't been any issues in the last two months. As of January 5, they have had 221 workers on site.

**Work Performed in the Past Month (December):**

- Installation of roof flashing system continues.
- Exterior concrete pads completed.
- Ceiling grid completed.
- Ceiling tiles on main and second floors completed.
- Epoxy flooring underway.
- Vinyl flooring on main and second floors completed.
- Elevators awaiting inspection.
- Finish painting on main and second floors completed.
- SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan) fencing and inspections.
- Generator installed.
- Finish of interior electrical, HVAC, and plumbing work continues.
- Hearing Room millwork underway.
- Sallyport overhead door installed.
- Interior wood doors and hardware underway.

**Sixty-Day Look Ahead (January and February):**

- Certificate of Occupancy.
- Break-through from addition to existing Courthouse.
- Completion of roofing flashing system.
- Completion of HVAC testing and balancing.
- Completion of sprinkler system.

- Completion of plumbing fixtures.
- Completion of electrical fixtures and devices.
- IT tele-data lines installed and tested.
- Security and fire alarms installed and tested.
- Completion of elevator.
- Completion of ceiling tile.
- Completion of millwork.
- Completion of flooring.
- Completion of punch list.
- County and OCA furniture delivered and installed.
- County and OCA relocation underway.
- Start of Phase 3 underway.

**Discussion:**

Committee Chairman David Pullen stated that this project has been such a major focus for the Board and this committee, and in looking at the transition, he asked if there were any issues or concerns that need to be dealt with. He questioned if there would be any issue with obtaining the Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Balling replied that the tentative date for the state walk-through inspection is January 20. The contractor is confident they will be done, but Mr. Balling is looking for some response to concerns about specific items related to just getting done. The main issues for the Certificate of Occupancy are the elevator inspection and the fire alarm system. Both need to be up and running.

Board Chairman Curtis Crandall relayed a question about the placement of a dumpster at the back of the addition below the Judge's window. Mr. Armstrong stated that the dumpster that is there is just temporary, but that is the location shown on the drawings for a dumpster to be placed. The County can place it wherever they want, considering maneuverability around the building.

Mr. Pullen asked about access to and disruption for the remaining agencies in the Courthouse during the renovation phase, particularly access for the handicapped. Mr. Armstrong noted that they have requested the sequence of operations from the contractor, but they haven't received a breakdown for Phase 3 yet. The contractor is aware of what's remaining open in the Courthouse (County Clerk/DMV and Probation), and they realize they have to maintain entrances and fire exits according to code. The second floor will be closed off, because that's where most of the work will be taking place, but all three floors will have some asbestos abatement. Mark Kukuvka, from LaBella Associates, noted that in addition to maintaining the entrances and handicapped accessibility, the contractor will be sensitive to the operations of the remaining offices regarding dust and noise. There will be a detailed game plan. Mr. Balling pointed out that there will have to be some co-mingling of workforce and public, but some work can be done during off-hours and they will try to schedule some deliveries before the building is open to the public.

In response to questions from Probation Director Robert Starks and Treasurer Terri Ross about public access during Phase 3, Mr. Kukuvka and Mr. Balling explained that public and staff access for County Clerk and Probation will be the main front entrance, and then down the stairs near the grand staircase for Probation. The side entrance of the Courthouse that will be the new handicapped entrance will have construction going on; that may be done during off-hours and will probably be accelerated in order to have it operational early in the schedule. Temporary public and staff access for the County offices being relocated to the addition

(Treasurer, Real Property Tax, and Information Technology) will be the solid door near the front of the addition just behind the Courthouse. County Attorney Tom Miner voiced concern about that entrance having a solid door; it should have a glass view-through, at least temporarily, for safety reasons. Mr. Balling noted that it's a fire door, and the glass would have to be fire rated, but he will look into that; it can be done. Chairman Crandall pointed out that the two handicapped entrances will be either the County Office Building, using the elevator to the first floor, and crossing the overpass to the main floor of the Courthouse or the temporary security entrance near the back of the addition near the Sallyport, depending on what their business is. Mr. Armstrong explained that security personnel will be monitoring the temporary security entrance area and will assist.

Ms. Ross asked how to direct the public about driving and traffic to the back lot near the addition during the renovation phase when there will still be construction activity out there. Mr. Kukuvka noted that the driveway will be accessible, but the public will either have to walk through or vehicles can drop people off. There will be no public parking or standing. We will need temporary signage. A little more of the parking lot will be available during Phase 3, but that will still be for County parking and will still be used for construction and delivery access.

Mr. Pullen noted that courtrooms will still have to be juggled during the renovation phase because of the unavailability of the courtrooms in the existing Courthouse. Support Court will still be using the former Room 8 in the County Office Building until the renovations are completed.

County Judge's Secretary Dawn Wildrick-Cole requested that information on the size of the high density storage unit be forwarded to her so they can plan what records are going where. Mr. Armstrong will provide that information, and he reported that the units, including the Treasurer's, will all be delivered Monday, January 10, and will take a few days to set up.

Mr. Pullen commented that no project goes without some glitches and unexpected issues, and this project has been no different, but overall it has gone extremely well. He commended Mark Kukuvka, from LaBella Associates, architect, and Mark Balling and Mark Armstrong, from Bovis Lend Lease, construction manager. The cost of the project, though more than the County wanted, came in much lower than the estimates, and that didn't happen by accident. Hopefully, it will be a very good end result for the benefit of the public, the Courts, staff, and to get us in compliance with the Court Facilities Act, Americans with Disabilities Act, and building codes. There are a lot of things that will be resolved by getting this project behind us. Hopefully, it will be something that we can then take advantage of and enjoy without having to think about it every time we have an issue arise. He extended thanks to all those who made it possible.

#### **Tour of the Courthouse Addition (Scheduled for after the meeting)**

#### **SPACE NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT/RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Copies of the County Space Needs Study Report and Recommendations prepared by Deputy County Administrator Mitchell Alger were distributed at the last meeting. Committee members were also provided with copies of floor plans.

#### **Discussion:**

**BOARD OF ELECTIONS** – Chairman Crandall reported that there was discussion in Personnel Committee about Board of Elections’ needs in relation to Mr. Alger’s study. He suggested that the Election Commissioners meet with Mr. Margeson and Mr. Alger about particular needs, in addition to what the study addressed, in order to expedite the process and not just leave it with the committee of jurisdiction or this committee. They can “boil down” these particular needs, see how they relate to the recommendations, and possibly add them to the study. Mr. Alger noted that he realized there would need to be further discussions on Board of Elections’ needs, since the building hasn’t been built yet. Legislator Don Cady commented that it’s difficult to know who is moving where until after the dust settles on all of this.

**COUNTY HISTORIAN / SOCIAL SERVICES** – Legislator Fred Sinclair reported that as Chairman of the committee of jurisdiction for the Historian, he spoke with County Historian Craig Braack and also with the Historical Society. In looking at the amount of activity at the current County Historian’s Office/Museum, and the suggestion in the report of moving the Historian to the Support Collection Building, he considers that building as an important part of the move for the housing of critical needs. The needs of the Historian are minimal: office space and room to store artifacts until we figure out if there will be a County Museum. Mr. Sinclair felt that having exhibits on display in that building was not a good use of the space. That building could allow some decentralization of traffic coming into the County Office Building if some unit in Social Services or elsewhere that involves a lot of traffic could also be moved there. Although historic activities are important, they shouldn’t be the paramount theme for utilizing that building. Mr. Sinclair relayed a comment on the records stored in the basement of the Support Collection Building. That space could be usable office space. He asked if another space, such as the former jail floor, could be utilized for temporary storage of these records until the Records Storage Building is completed. Mr. Margeson replied that could be done.

Committee Chairman David Pullen remarked that the three departments mentioned, Board of Elections, County Historian, and Social Services, are the departments indicated in the study with the highest needs. The Election Commissioners, Mr. Margeson, and Mr. Alger will be addressing Board of Elections’ needs. The Historian and Social Services have been touched on with the suggestion of utilizing the Support Collection Building, and Mr. Alger’s report includes the recovery of part of the County Office Building ground floor for Social Services programs. That would also lessen the elevator usage in this building. That will have to await conclusion of the Courthouse renovation. Mr. Pullen asked if there had been conversations with the new DSS Commissioner regarding their expectations and possible changes on space needs. Mr. Alger stated there hadn’t been any changes, and they are still interested in the space on the ground floor. There have been no conversations about using space in the Support Collection Building. Mr. Sinclair suggested that DSS be approached to see if they could use the space and if it fits, although there are decentralization and security issues. Mr. Pullen noted the lack of handicapped accessibility and unknowns, such as heating and cooling efficiencies and electrical. Mr. Alger can follow up on the most effective use of the Support Collection Building.

Mr. Pullen questioned the status of the Historical Society and County Museum. Mr. Sinclair reported that they are evaluating size and location for a museum where they will establish their records. It boils down to resources, which they are investigating. The project is probably years away. They have excellent genealogy records and a good collection of information, in addition to the County’s and in addition to DAR’s, the museum could offer an opportunity to combine resources. At the present time, the County is not looking at setting up a museum. Our artifacts could go into storage until such time as the Historical Society’s Museum is determined.

Mr. Pullen requested that committee members and department staff consider how to move forward on the space study. It will be discussed further in February. We need to plan it through before moving. Some things have to wait until the Courthouse renovation is complete, but hopefully we can have a plan in place over the next two to three months.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, February 2, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Curran and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 2, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, G. Benson, D. Cady, C. Crandall; *Absent:* P. Curran

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Armstrong (Bovis), D. Button, A. Finnemore, K. Graves, M. Healy, T. Hopkins, J. Margeson, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, T. Ross, R. Starks;  
**Media:** B. Quinn, Wellsville Daily Reporter

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of January 5, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Cady and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Armstrong from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Work in place through December was approximately 73 percent, and use of construction contingency through January was approximately 60 percent. All other budget line items are trending on or under budget at this point.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

Approved Revisions:

- #41 – Revised Flashing Detail at Existing Courthouse Roof Tie-in – credit of (\$1,445)
- #46 – Data and Telephone Revisions – total cost applied \$44,371.40; OCA will reimburse about \$34,000
- #50 – Minor Modifications in Restrooms #123, 219, and 329 – \$3,174
- #52 – Additional Drywall in Rooms #359 and 360 Partition and Drywall Ceiling in Lieu of ACT in Room #360 – LaBella’s decision for sound and fire control – \$486
- #55 – Relocate Emergency Generator and Delete Dumpster Pad and Fencing – credit of (\$660)
- #60 – Installation of Remote Water Meter Reader – \$272.12
- #61 – Revision of Door Hardware – implemented by LaBella – \$6,190
- #67 – Installation of Spare Conduit in Holding Cell Area – for future electronic door hardware if ever needed – \$1,102.09
- #70 – Added Lighting and Outlets in Rooms #147, 155, and 157 to Emergency Generator Back-up System – \$7,374.02
- #73 – Power to Fire Pump – code required issue – \$593.73

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #76 and 77 – Changes to Exterior Door (temporary entrance to Addition during Phase 3) – Solid door was changed to a door with glass, and the stairs were changed to a temporary ramp for handicapped access (this issue was discussed at the last meeting). A temporary enclosure was eliminated due to the cost – \$6,750

- #78 – Raise Emergency Lighting in Room #214 (interfered with the high density shelving units) and Revised Light Fixture Types – lights included in the specs for that area were not correct; also received credit for the wrong lights – \$8,200
- #79 – IT Electrical Panel Phasing Issue – \$3,000
- #80 – Revised Countertop in Room #215/223 – \$900
- #81 – Backcharge for Delayed Furniture Deliveries – credit of (\$3,016)
- #82 – Modifications for Department of Motor Vehicles (move to current Surrogate Court Clerk and Treasurer's Accounting areas) – just received price at \$177,000. Mr. Balling felt he could get the price down, but unsure how much. This bid is from the current contractor. The County could decide on other options. A decision will have to be made within the next few weeks on whether to move forward.
- #83 – Control Wiring for Fire Pump Back to Emergency Generator; Room #134 Paint Change; Door #129A Combination Lock; Wall Tile Modifications – \$7,000
- #84 – Boiler Flue Revisions – credit of (\$1,500)
- #85 – Temporary IT Connection between Rooms #128 and 156 – necessary because fiber optic connections were on back order, so copper wiring was used to get it up and running. (The wire installed will stay there.) – \$500
- #86 – Provide Smoke and Heat Detector in Space Above Existing Boiler Room - per code requirements - \$1,500

Comments were made on the high amount of some of the change events. Mr. Armstrong noted that Mr. Balling negotiates to keep those numbers down. Legislator Fanton asked if the construction contingency usage percentage mentioned earlier included these changes with the exception of the \$177,000 for the DMV changes which haven't been approved. Mr. Armstrong responded that everything is included except the DMV changes. There is approximately \$288,000 left in contingency.

#### **Change Order Summary Report:**

The only change on this report is Change Order #15 which includes Change Event #46 for the data and telephone revisions that OCA will be reimbursing a portion of.

#### **Site Overview – Safety Report:**

Mr. Armstrong reported that there were no safety issues during this reporting period.

#### **Work Performed in the Past Month (January):**

The following work was conducted during this reporting period (progress photos included):

- Installation of roof flashing system completed.
- Second floor break-through continues.
- Ceiling grid and tiles completed.
- OCA furniture delivered and installed.
- Vinyl and carpet flooring completed.
- Elevators inspected.
- Finish painting completed.
- SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan) fencing and inspections.
- Security system installed and tested.
- Interior electrical, HVAC, and plumbing work continues.
- Courtroom millwork installed.



- Space saver mobile systems (high-density file storage) completed.
- Completion of HVAC testing and balancing.
- Window shades and window stools installed.
- Signage installed.

### **Sixty-Day Look Ahead (February and March):**

The following list provides an idea of what's scheduled, and the report included estimated start and finish dates for each activity:

- Security system installed and tested.
- County supplied furniture delivered and installed.
- Certificate of Occupancy.
- Break-through from Addition to existing Courthouse completed at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.
- County and OCA relocation completed.
- Completion of punch list.
- Start of Phase 3.
- Asbestos abatement underway on the Courthouse 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.
- Demolition underway on the Courthouse 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.

Legislator Graves questioned total budget projections. Mr. Armstrong referred back to the anticipated cost report. The project is significantly under budget, even with all the change events listed today. There are still unknowns related to asbestos abatement in the renovation phase, but the contractor believes that's all been addressed. Mr. Pullen related a little of the history of the project. When considering a different site involving building full facilities and not using any of the existing Courthouse for the courts, we were looking at \$35 million. Then we got it down to \$21 to \$23 million when other options were looked at with nothing included for renovation of the former jail. On the anticipated cost report, this project was budgeted at \$14,480,700, but actual costs came in estimated at \$12,387,785, or \$2,092,915 under budget, and we still have \$288,272 remaining in construction contingency. The project will not be considered out of balance unless we exceed the \$14 million figure. We have done a very effective job and are nowhere near being over budget.

### **ISSUES RELATED TO MOVING INTO THE ADDITION:**

Mr. Armstrong reported on the status of the Certificate of Occupancy. The rescheduled state inspection date is Tuesday, February 8, still subject to the weather. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske has a meeting set for Friday, February 4, with the departments involved. He's hoping to have boxes and files moved ahead of the Certificate of Occupancy, but personnel won't be able to move. Public Works will try to accommodate departments as best as they can. They are hoping that the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor break-through will be completed in time to allow moving some of the bigger items and delicate equipment without going outside.

Temporary public and employee access during Phase 3 will be the first side entrance of the Addition, just behind the existing Courthouse. Mr. Roeske will have signs installed. The ramp for that temporary entrance is finished.

***The Courthouse Addition Open House scheduled for Friday, February 11, has been postponed until a later date, due to the ongoing move and the fact that the offices will not be unpacked and set up. A better time would probably be at the end of the summer when the entire project, including Phase 3, is done and we have the ribbon cutting and official opening.***

## **REQUEST FOR COURTHOUSE ADDITION TOUR FOR GOVERNMENT INTERNS:**

Government Intern Instructor Warren Schmidt had requested a tour for Monday for approximately 25 interns. Given the issues of the delayed Certificate of Occupancy, moving of files, and the continued presence of workmen, the Committee decided it would be best if they wait awhile.

## **SPACE NEEDS ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION:**

### **Review of Committee Chairman's Proposal for Space Needs Related to Courthouse Renovations and Resulting Space Adjustments:**

Committee Chairman David Pullen distributed copies of his proposal, along with some floor plan drawings (copies attached to original minutes). He met with Deputy County Administrator Mitch Alger to look at options for solving the most problems for the most departments in the best way possible. Previously, the Committee looked at County Clerk Robert Christman's proposal to move the Department of Motor Vehicles into the space currently occupied by the Surrogate Court Clerk and Treasurer's Accounting Offices. There are disadvantages to DMV using that space, one being that DMV customers will have to go through security screening. Mr. Pullen proposes moving the District Attorney Offices to that space. His proposals are summarized below.

**Proposal 1 – Use of the Surrogate Court Clerk and Treasurer's Accounting Offices (total of 1,412 sq. ft.) for the District Attorney's Office, including the Crime Victim Coordinator (total in current DA and Crime Victim Coordinator spaces is 820.5 sq. ft.). DA would work with architect to lay out space.**

#### Pros:

- District Attorney's Office would be closer to the Courts.
- District Attorney's Office would be in a secure "screened" area.
- District Attorney's Office would be across the hall from the Security Center.
- This would resolve most of the District Attorney's Office space concerns, increasing their space by approximately 70 percent.
- The District Attorney has indicated some concern about this proposal, but Mr. Pullen is hopeful of obtaining agreement, subject to a floor plan and exact space availability.

#### Cons:

- Use of this space by the DA means that another space will be needed for DMV.
- Most of the DA's involvement with the courts relates to criminal matters that would be taking place on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Courthouse. This space is on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor, but it is significantly closer to the courts than the present DA location.

**Proposal 2 – Use of the Support Collection Unit Building at the Corner of the Main Parking Lot for Department of Motor Vehicles. The Support Collection Unit is scheduled to move into the basement of the existing Courthouse following renovations.**

#### Pros:

- Allows one of the highest traffic agencies to remain outside the security screening area. Concern had been expressed previously about whether locating the County Historian in the Support Collection Building was the best use of that space.

- Provides DMV sufficient space to meet its needs, at least as much space, possibly more, than the recent proposal to use the Surrogate Court Clerk area. Allows DMV to vacate space needed for proposed changes in County Clerk's Office.
- Appears more convenient for most individuals than requiring them to enter the Courthouse facility.
- Frees up more critical space for use by an agency (DA's Office) that really needs to be in the Courthouse complex.
- DMV would not need the basement of the Support Collection Building, so it could be renovated and used for other purposes.

Cons:

- Separates DMV from other County Clerk's facilities. May not be much of a problem. Need additional information about this aspect of any move.
- Support Collection Building needs to have handicapped access added. May be able to be done with an outside ramp. Requires architectural review and confirmation.

**Proposal 3 – Use of Current District Attorney's Office Space to Expand County Attorney's Office which is Located Adjacent to it. County Attorney's Office is very short on office space, meeting room space, and storage space.**

Pros:

- Meets pressing needs of County Attorney's Office by providing about 600 sq. ft. in current DA Office area; provides more than one entrance/exit point for emergencies.
- Would provide for a needed confidential meeting room, which is currently lacking.
- Would provide small offices for each Assistant County Attorney. Several attorneys are currently sharing a single office, which is disruptive to them and those they serve.
- Would keep the County Attorney's Office in close proximity to Board of Legislators, County Administrator, and other County departments (DSS) that frequently need to work together. The District Attorney's Office does not really need to be in the County Office Building, and its move, as outlined above, frees up space for the County Attorney's Office, an agency that does need to be in the COB.
- County Attorney's Office is maxed out for storage space. This provides for additional storage space, possibly using the same type of high-density storage units purchased for the Courthouse Addition.
- Proposal has been discussed with County Attorney and tentatively approved in concept, subject to final plans and layout proposals.

Cons:

- None noted.

**Proposal 4 – Use of the Current Crime Victim Coordinator's Office (COB Room 218) for the County Historian, contingent on relocation of Crime Victim Coordinator with District Attorney as outlined above.**

Pros:

- Reunites Crime Victim Coordinator with District Attorney's Office.
- Frees up space in COB for use by another agency, such as the County Historian.

Cons:

- If used by the County Historian, it would not provide enough space for all of the files, records, and other artifacts currently managed by that official. Those materials would need to be stored elsewhere, as addressed in a following section.

**Proposal 5 – Use of Space on Ground Floor of County Office Building Currently Occupied by Support Court and Related Offices (that will be moving after Courthouse renovations) for Social Services Foster Care Unit; Current Foster Care Area to be Absorbed by Social Services. Also proposing that Health Department be approached about any additional space that could be made available for use by DSS.**

Pros:

- Provides a large, consolidated space to DSS, one of the departments with the most critical space needs.
- Space is in close proximity to existing DSS facilities.
- Some of the space could be used for “intake” purposes, a high-need area. DSS would need to analyze and decide on this.

Cons:

- Unsure whether this will meet all space needs of DSS, but represents a major step toward solution.

**Proposal 6 – Board of Elections (BOE) Space Needs – Current proposal will relocate records and voting machines to the new storage building being constructed near the landfill property.**

Pros:

- The County is already planning on building the storage building, and it should be more than adequate for current record and storage needs.
- Relatively low-cost solution for the major part of the BOE’s space needs.

Cons:

- This plan does not resolve the space shortage that occurs on days when there is high traffic in the BOE (4 or 5 days per year around election times). Other solutions to that challenge need to be identified.

**Proposal 7 – Temporary Use of the Shell Space Area in Courthouse Addition (2<sup>nd</sup> Floor) – for storing County Historian materials, miscellaneous County supplies and equipment, or other purpose identified by the Board (this area may ultimately be claimed by OCA for court use).**

Pros:

- We have constructed and paid for this space, and there is no requirement that it be surrendered to OCA immediately. The space could provide safe and appropriate storage, with elevator access, for several years.
- This space is available immediately with little or no expenditure or work.

Cons:

- None noted.

**Comments:**

Chairman Crandall commented regarding use of the shell space and the previous proposal to free up space for the County Attorney by moving the District Attorney’s Office. That shell space could be a good space for the District Attorney. Mr. Pullen noted that he hadn’t thought of that, and it could work, but to make a change that would be relatively permanent may be a problem if OCA makes a claim on the space in the future. Chairman Crandall stated that if the courts have a program that comes up for which they need that space, it would probably be for offices. He still feels it’s worth looking into.

Legislator Cady suggesting that moving the DA's Office into the shell space locates the legal agencies in the same area. Moving DMV to the Surrogate Court Clerk/Treasurer's Accounting area was proposed at an earlier meeting by County Clerk Rob Christman. If the Support Collection Building was to be used for DMV, it would practically have to be rebuilt, which would cost more than renovating the Surrogate Court Clerk/Treasurer's Accounting area.

Public Works Superintendent David Roeske noted that there is enough square footage in the shell space to house the DA's Offices and still have storage space. He also commented that we may still want security screening for DMV, and the Support Collection Building may not be the best location for them. That building will be difficult to renovate and should be looked at for lower traffic departments. Mr. Roeske would like to see the County Historian located there and also move Workers' Compensation, Weights and Measures, and the Youth/STOP-DWI offices there from the Cooperative Extension Building, which would allow the County to sell that building. He likes the idea of locating the District Attorney in the shell space.

Chairman Crandall stated that until we know what and where we have to move or store, we shouldn't forget the former Jail floor. That space should be utilized, even if just for storage. Mr. Roeske urged caution, as that floor was not designed for heavy loads. The weight of the steel was supported and evenly distributed, but that weight is different than what's involved with heavy file storage.

Mr. Armstrong suggested that a decision for the Surrogate Court Clerk/Treasurer's Accounting area will be needed as soon as possible so it can be planned and executed within the next six months. The first stages of Phase 3 will be asbestos abatement and demolition in February and March. Legislator Cady asked how the DMV renovation estimate of \$177,000 mentioned earlier was arrived at. Mr. Armstrong noted that LaBella Associates developed a tentative plan to arrive at that figure.

The consensus of the Committee was to leave the Support Collection Building for other purposes and move the District Attorney's Offices into the Courthouse shell space. The necessary portion of the shell space will have to be finished off. That deals with proposals one and two, and regarding the other proposals, concern was expressed about Elections. It was pointed out that the present design of the new storage building at the landfill property will allow for the necessary storage space for the voting machines and records and access when needed, which should leave them enough room where they are. Public Works storage space is cramped, because they gave some of the current District Attorney space that could have been opened up to them to the County Attorney. The DA and County Attorney were not previously addressed in the space assessment, and this plan gives them both additional space. The County Historian could still be relocated to the former Veterans' Services Office which the Crime Victim Coordinator is presently using, depending on the plan for the Support Collection Building. We will still use the County Office Building ground floor space for DSS. The Support Collection Building should be used for departments with less intense traffic.

Legislator Cady asked if relocating the District Attorney to the shell space would involve more computer wiring. Information Technology Director Deborah Button replied that the wiring is all in place, and they'd just have to drop lines.

Mr. Armstrong questioned if the Committee intended to include finishing off the shell space in Phase 3. Chairman Pullen responded in the affirmative. When asked about a resolution request for the DMV renovation, Mr. Pullen noted that approval for that proposal was never formalized. The Committee authorized Mark Balling to negotiate a price for the DMV

proposal presented by County Clerk Rob Christman. A question was raised about the need to have approval from the NYS DMV.

***A motion was made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Cady and carried to relocate the District Attorney's Offices, including the Victim Service Coordinator, into the Courthouse Addition shell space; the District Attorney will assist with the layout and design to be developed. The current District Attorney's Office space will be split between the County Attorney (12.5 ft. x 40 ft.) and Public Works (7.5 ft. x 12 ft.); Public Works to design in-house.***

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, March 2, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Cady, seconded by Legislator Fanton and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
MARCH 2, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, G. Benson, D. Cady, P. Curran, K. Graves, C. Crandall

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Armstrong (Bovis), D. Button, R. Christman, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, T. Hopkins, M. Kukupka (LaBella), J. Margeson, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, T. Ross, F. Sinclair, R. Whitney; **Media:** B. Quinn, Wellsville Daily Reporter

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of February 2, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Curran and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Armstrong from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes). Mark Balling was unable to attend the meeting.

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Work in place (total invoiced by contractor) through 12/31/10 was approximately 72.12 percent. (No payment applications have been submitted since the end of December, although work has been progressing.) With the current changes that have been applied and approved, use of construction contingency through February was approximately 77 percent, including the proposed Department of Motor Vehicles relocation and all change events up to this point. The balance in construction contingency is \$167,023.67 or 23 percent. Mr. Armstrong noted that even though the DMV change hasn't been approved yet, the estimate was included to show what would remain afterward. The contractor breakdown for that estimate has not been received yet, so it is subject to negotiation.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

Approved Revisions:

- #38 – Security Revisions – add extra cameras in corridor and elevator area, intercom system and duress buttons for DMV – \$8,780.10
- #42 – Revision to Door 331 – move masonry door opening and add ADA push pad to open door to meet code – \$9,352.10
- #57 – Add Two Flood Lights to East Elevation, Add Two Outlets to Room 149, and Revise Requirements for Room 142 – request from the County - \$3,620.09
- #72 – Add Lights, Switches, and Smoke Detectors in Closets, Change Light Fixtures in Corridors 164 and 167 – code issue - \$5,877.35

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #82 – Modifications to DMV – estimate \$177,980
- #87 – Electrical Changes in Room 227, Security Partition in Room 341, Coax Cable for Room 156, Sprinkler Heads in Added Closets, and Signage Contract – the first part was a code issue; the closets involved changes made to the enclosed spaces behind the

elevator shaft, originally to be chases, but now maintenance closets, resulting in different code requirements – estimate \$10,000

- #88 – Add Fire Dampers in Room 156 (Server Room) (Ansul System – these were reported to have been inspected and passed), Smoke Detector in Room 238, Revised Millwork in Room 131 and 215/227 – the first part was a code issue; without some of these things, we would have failed the state inspection for occupancy – estimate \$7,500
- #90 – Oil Tank Heater for Elevator 1 – estimate \$300
- #91 – Add Two Power Strips to Post Racks in Room 156 (Information Technology request) and Relocate Ceiling Mounted Camera in Room 230 (column blocking part of view) – estimate \$1,500
- #92 – Provide Flip-Up Counter Door Revision in Room 127 (Treasurer) (redesigned to be lighter) and Vertical Shelving in Room 135 – estimate \$2,200
- #94 – Provide Locksets for Three Doors – estimate \$1,500
- #95 – Add FRP Panels in Three Janitor Closets (at back of floor sinks to prevent moisture damage) – estimate \$1,500
- #96 – Occupancy Signage in Courtroom – code requirement – estimate \$400
- #97 – Provide Duct Detectors on Return Air Side (detectors will be on both the supply and return sides) – code issue (conflict between electrical and mechanical codes) – estimate \$2,500
- #98 – Add Data Drop in Room 359 (Judge's Office) and Wire Mode for Some Duress Buttons (Court request) – estimate \$750

#### **Change Order Summary Report:**

- Approved to-date – \$250,949.53
- Pending to-date – \$307,026.80

#### **Site Overview – Safety Report:**

Mr. Armstrong reported there have been no safety incidents to-date.

#### **Work Performed in the Past Month (February):**

- Second floor break-through between buildings was completed.
- OCA furniture delivered and installed.
- County supplied furniture delivered and installed.
- Vinyl and carpet flooring completed
- SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan) fencing and inspections.
- Security system installed and tested.
- Finish of interior electrical, HVAC, and plumbing work completed.
- Courtroom millwork installed.
- Sprinkler system inspected.
- Security system training underway.

#### **Sixty-Day Look Ahead (March and April):**

- Temporary security entrance and check point set-up.
- Certificate of Occupancy for Phase II issued.
- County and OCA relocation completed.
- Completion of Phase II punchlist.
- Phase II changes completed (late items).



- Asbestos abatement underway on the existing Courthouse second floor.
- Demolition underway on the existing Courthouse second floor.

Mr. Armstrong reported that they have a work plan in place for asbestos abatement and the contractor's work for Phase 3; he will be reviewing it with the state inspector on Friday. The Certificate of Occupancy should be issued on Friday, barring inclement weather. The move is scheduled to begin Monday, March 7. Millwork repairs, touch-ups, corrections, and cleaning are still in progress, but the contractor is fully aware it has to be done before Monday.

Legislator Graves questioned the new furniture and use of existing furniture. Mr. Armstrong stated that the Courts on the second floor and main floor got most of the new furniture, although they will be using some of their old furniture. On the ground floor, the new furniture is mostly in the common areas. Unused surplus items will be put in storage.

Legislator Graves asked if there were any more unexpected issues coming up. Mr. Armstrong didn't expect any more for the addition. Mark Kukuvka, from LaBella, pointed out that there will be some during the renovation phase. They budgeted a larger construction contingency for that, due to the asbestos abatement, dropping ceilings, things not being where they're expected, and so on. Mr. Armstrong noted that a major change event for Phase 3 involving a problem with asbestos abatement in the entrance vestibule has already been issued during Phase 2, and they have been working in the boiler room on Phase 3 issues. The schedule is running a little behind. Right now, we're looking at the end of August for completion.

#### **MOVE INTO NEW FACILITY; CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY STATUS:**

Public Works Superintendent David Roeske reported that the move is scheduled to begin Monday, March 7, if the Certificate of Occupancy is issued.

Committee Chairman David Pullen asked about downtime for agencies due to the move and when the public could access the addition. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske replied that the addition won't be open to the public until March 21, although the Courts will be holding a couple of hearings and one trial in the new building next week.

#### **PROPOSED RELOCATION OF DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES:**

Legislator Cady questioned the approval process for the proposal to relocate Department of Motor Vehicles to the current Surrogate Court Clerk/Treasurer's Accounting Office area. County Administrator John Margeson noted that it just needs Committee approval. Mr. Cady asked if additional contingency would be needed for that, over and above the estimated \$178,000. Mr. Armstrong felt that the \$178,000 would be the worst case scenario. They are waiting for the detailed pricing documentation. He suggested that if this is something the County plans to do, the Committee should approve it so that LaBella can revise the drawings for the present contractor to firm up the estimated price for the change order, and as an option, we could even put it out for a separate bid. The bidding wouldn't be legally necessary, because it's just a change order. We would have to exceed 10 percent of the original bid before having to bid out separately. Mr. Pullen asked what LaBella needs if we were to put this out for separate proposals from other contractors. Mr. Kukuvka replied that from a change order perspective, he could just put together some very edited documents for the contractor to use to establish a price, because the contractor already has a contract with all the specs, costs, and furniture requirements. To actually put it out to bid, they would have to create a bidding package and then take it to another level of detail to define the bid. You can negotiate with the present contractor, but you can't with a low-price bidder. Mr. Armstrong noted that we

might end up right where we're at now with the extra cost for the bidding. Mr. Fanton stated that he would like to have Mr. Balling negotiate with the present contractor before going to an outside bidding process. Mr. Cady noted that he wouldn't approve it yet. Mr. Armstrong reported that they've been waiting to get detailed breakdowns from Javen Construction (the contractor). Apparently they're having trouble getting information from their subs. Mr. Fanton asked if the Committee should wait to get that breakdown and final estimate before moving forward. Mr. Armstrong responded that we should move it forward so LaBella can bring the drawings up to construction level. They'll continue to push for the detailed pricing. The County can always cancel. Mr. Fanton asked County Clerk Robert Christman if a cost/benefit analysis had been done; Mr. Christman answered that it had not.

County Clerk Robert Christman reported that there are three major issues involved with relocating Motor Vehicles. The current office is not in compliance with the state. NYS DMV has been put off for the past few years because Mr. Christman told them we were contemplating changes. The state has already seen some preliminary plans for this proposal, and they're holding off on sanctions. Another big thing is that the department will be going from a two-stage process to a one-stage process which will be very beneficial for the customer. They will be able to complete a transaction at one station. Employees are working in conditions that are not conducive to high productivity. The most important thing is the security aspect of the change. If you tried to modify the existing space to meet NYS DMV requirements, it would cost a lot more than this proposal. There are a lot of factors that make this a good, cost-effective solution. Mr. Christman noted that LaBella does have to work with NYS DMV to get approval for the proposal. Once they sign off, we're ready to go.

Mr. Kukupka related that the approach they took was to give a simple sketch to the contractor so they could give us a price. If that looked good to the County, they would have to recirculate the plan, get approval from DMV, detail the plans, and finalize the price for the contract. The process was derailed when the price came back so high. Mr. Fanton asked if complete plans would help establish a better estimate; Mr. Kukupka replied that it would. The County would still have the option to say no.

Legislator Cady stated that for \$90,000, it sounded like a good idea for customer convenience and workstation efficiency, and he would have gone for it. At nearly twice that price, he has to think twice. Until we get fewer cars in the parking lot, he didn't think Mr. Christman would get the level of business he expects. Mr. Christman commented that for the next two years, we will see an increase, and the third year, a decrease of maybe five to eight percent due to the driver's license cycle. NYS DMV will be hurting because there will be a drop in revenue due to taking the money up front on licenses on this eight-year program. Counties of our size usually have two DMV locations; we have one central location. We're not lacking for business. The new set-up will make it quicker, and maybe the efficiency will bring more business. The parking is a major issue, and Mr. Christman pointed out that his employees are parking at the Legion to make room for the customers. The big issue is that the department is out of compliance. Mr. Fanton stated that he would like to move the proposal forward.

Mr. Kukupka suggested that he takes what we have, meets with NYS DMV, modifies the plan, re-issues it to the contractor, re-prices it, and then he will come back to the Committee. That way the County hasn't agreed to a number, it gives Bovis Lend Lease more time to scrutinize the numbers, we'll have better plans, and this Committee will have a firmer number to go by. Mr. Cady asked if there would be any state funding. Mr. Christman replied that there never would be. They pay us 12.9 percent for each transaction. This office is virtually self-sufficient. They won't give any additional funds, but if we refuse to come into compliance, they

could de-certify us, and our customers would have to go to another county. The taxpayers have to have an office to go to. The physical layout hasn't had any updates since the early 60s.

***The consensus of the committee was to authorize moving forward with the process as outlined above.***

**OFFICIAL NAME FOR THE COURTHOUSE ADDITION:**

Committee Chairman Pullen suggested a decision be made for an official name for the Courthouse addition to differentiate between buildings for the public and for deliveries. Mr. Kukuvka reported that for signage purposes, the addition was referred to as the North Wing. (Signs were ordered a couple of months ago.) They are viewing it as one Courthouse with a South Wing (existing) and North Wing (addition). At the end of the entire project, all access to the entire Courthouse building will be through the front (South Wing).

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, April 6, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Cady, seconded by Legislator Graves and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
APRIL 6, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, G. Benson, D. Cady, K. Graves, C. Crandall; *Absent:* D. Fanton, P. Curran

**Others Present:** M. Armstrong and M. Balling (Bovis), D. Button, R. Christman, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, T. Hopkins, J. Margeson, A. McGraw, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, T. Ross, F. Sinclair, R. Starks, D. Wildrick-Cole; **Media:** B. Quinn, Wellsville Daily Reporter

**Call to Order:** 3:07 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of March 2, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Balling and Mark Armstrong from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Mark Balling reported that work in place (total invoiced by contractor) through February was approximately 79 percent. They have added another \$75,000 to construction contingency for the County enhancements, namely the DMV and potential DA space renovation added scope cost, although it may not be needed. They are into the renovations now, and they are discovering some unforeseen issues relating to asbestos and ceilings. There are some adjustments under incidental costs: Bovis Lend Lease has a two-month extension on their contract due to the delay caused by the lawsuit to stop the project and the General Contractor contract award delay (project now slated for completion in August instead of June) – \$60,750; LaBella Associates also has a two-month extension – \$10,000; Materials Testing reduced (previously increased to \$75,000, but don't need more than the original \$50,000) – (\$25,000); Utility Company Connection Charges voided – (\$50,000); Builders' Risk reduced, and may come down even more – (\$25,000). The project is still more than \$2 million under budget.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #46A – Telecommunications Ductbank between County Office Building and Addition – proposal was \$19,230; just this morning agreed on a little over \$18,000
- #69 – Replace Existing Boiler Room Pumps with New 7.5 HP Pumps – original change event was just for replacement of pumps at an estimate of \$5,500; it turned out that the electrical changed as well, increasing the estimate to \$8,300 (no final price yet)
- #82 – DMV Modifications – the estimate for asbestos abatement is the only thing that needs to be acted on at this point – Javen's proposal is \$21,396, which Mr. Balling is presenting as the worst case price (he is waiting for labor rate information, and may get the price down to \$20,000). Javen hasn't supplied a revised proposal for the entire scope of work that takes into account the revised drawings and the comments Bovis gave them. Bovis recommends doing the abatement in that area, whether we do the

DMV modifications or not, because it would cost more to do it later. The contractor is already here and set up. Mr. Balling will continue to push for the pricing for the balance of work and review those prices to get the best value.

**A motion was made by Legislator Graves and seconded by Legislator Benson to proceed with the asbestos abatement in the former Surrogate Court Clerk and Treasurer's Accounting area with Javen Construction at a price not to exceed \$21,396.** Discussion: Chairman Crandall commented that it makes sense to do it now. Legislator Cady questioned if the \$21,396 comes out of the construction contingency. Mr. Balling explained that the estimate of \$177,980 for the DMV change is already included on the anticipated cost report as a potential change order cost, and the \$21,396 would be part of that, not in addition to it. **The motion carried.**

Legislator Cady asked if when Bovis talks with Javen about the estimated price, might there be alternate ways to reduce the price? Mr. Balling pointed out that the design is pretty much bare-bones. County Clerk Rob Christman already revised the sketches to save some money. Bovis just hasn't received a revised proposal yet to review and negotiate with. Mr. Christman reported that he's had security people and NYS DMV look at the plan, and everyone is comfortable with it, with just some minor changes. The state is looking for a timeframe for the change. Mr. Christman pointed out that it's purely a functional space that will be good for management, observation over the crew, and good for the consumer. We can't do much differently in utilizing older construction. Mr. Balling commented that it all comes down to the value. When he gets the revised proposal, he'll come to committee and say it's the best he can do and recommend either we go with it, or we don't go with it, at which point we could request bids.

- #99 – Added Chair Rail in Main Courtroom and Hearing Room – to protect walls; after the report was run, they approved a figure of approximately \$1,200
- #100 – Add Space Temperature Sensor in Janitor's Closet – it was prone to overheating – estimated \$600
- #101 – Remove Plaster Ceilings in Existing Courthouse, Rooms 104, 308, and 309; Modify Cornice Requirements in Rooms 105, 209, and 301; Revise Lighting Fixtures in Room 317 – they had to remove more plaster ceilings than called for due to needing access above them and exposed edges of asbestos; also in the Hearing Room, plans called for 6 new lights to replace the existing 4, and rather than abate the ceiling for the 2 additional lights, they're leaving it as is – estimated \$23,000 includes savings on lights
- #102 – New Ceilings with Lighting Modifications in Rooms 103, 104, and 308 – estimated \$2,500

Legislator Sinclair questioned if the cancelled change event for the water meter meant we used the old one. Mr. Balling explained that the County bought the new meter directly, because it was cheaper than Javen's quote. The price the County paid is part of the incidental budget cost-to-date for contingency. The old meter was turned over to the County.

#### **Site Overview – Safety Report:**

Mr. Armstrong reported that the project continues to have a clean safety record. To date, they have had 236 workers on site.

#### **Work Performed in the Past Month (March):**

- Temporary security entrance and check point set up
- Certificate of Occupancy for Phase II issued
- County and OCA relocation completed

- Completion of Phase II punch list
- Late Phase II change events ongoing
- Asbestos abatement air monitoring underway
- Asbestos abatement underway on the existing Courthouse second floor
- Demolition underway on the existing Courthouse second floor
- SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan) fencing and inspections

**Sixty-Day Look Ahead (April and May):**

- Phase II changes completed (late items)
- Asbestos abatement and air monitoring complete on all floors
- Demolition completed on all floors
- Metal studs completed on all floors with drywall underway
- Electrical rough-in underway on all floors
- Plumbing rough-in underway on all floors
- HVAC rough-in underway on all floors
- SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan) fencing and inspections

Chairman Crandall asked if the number of issues on the punch list for the addition were within the normal range for this type of project. Mr. Balling replied that most of the corrections are complete, but the millwork still needs to be done. Javen called in a representative from the American Woodworking Institute, and the sub-contractor has agreed to correct the millwork and provided a schedule (it will have to be done off-hours). The County is holding money to cover that.

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE SPACE:**

There has been some discussion on developing the shell space on the second floor of the addition for use by the District Attorney. County Administrator John Margeson presented a proposed floor plan drafted by LaBella Associates. The proposal was reviewed by District Attorney Keith Slep, and it has been forwarded to Andrew Isenberg from Office of Court Administration. The space is about 1,300 square feet, counting the hallway. Committee Chairman David Pullen noted that the doorway from the Judge's Chambers in the existing Courthouse into the shell space to provide secure access by the visiting Judge will have to remain there, and Mr. Isenberg may have an issue with building this area out for the District Attorney. Discussion took place on possible security issues with DA staff use of the public restrooms and whether another door could be cut through from the shell space storage area on the south end to the corridor (not possible due to the sloped corridor and security issues). Public Works Superintendent David Roeske pointed out that the area would probably only be used for paper storage, and access through the reception area would be practical since it wouldn't be that often. If that area is ever used for office space, it would probably be used by the DA, not another department. It's only about 250 square feet. Mr. Margeson noted that Mr. Kuvka from LaBella is working on a price for the proposal. When asked if the plan fulfills the identified space needs for the DA, Mr. Margeson stated that it didn't meet the needs of the previous DA, but the current DA has scaled those back. This plan has been approved by DA Slep. The consensus of the Committee was to move ahead; LaBella is working on the estimate.

**PROBATION DEPARTMENT SPACE NEEDS ISSUES:**

Committee Chairman Pullen noted that Probation and County Clerk/DMV are the only two departments remaining in the old Courthouse space. Probation is not slated for major

changes, but there are some issues. Probation Director Robert Starks commented that how some of those issues came to light was when his staff and County Clerk/DMV staff voiced concerns about asbestos during the renovations. LaBella representatives did a presentation about the abatement process and explained that daily air readings are taken to assure safety. One of the reps was concerned about cracked and chipped asbestos floor tile in Probation and stated the floor should be covered, i.e. with layers of floor wax or carpet. A NYS Department of Labor representative also made an unannounced visit and said the same thing: the floor tile should be covered, and carpet was also his suggestion. When discussing this with Mr. Margeson, Mr. Starks also asked about purchasing a high density filing system for Probation. The existing files "serpentine" though much of the area and block access. Some files are stored in bookcases, and confidentiality is an issue. The high density files could be put in one room, freeing up space in the other rooms.

Mr. Pullen suggested looking at the entire floor plan and possibly re-partitioning to increase space and utilize existing space more efficiently. Mr. Pullen noted that while looking at space, everything touches everything else, for example, Probation needs a meeting room for their own staff and for group counseling meetings required by the Courts. These have been held in the Historian's area, but that may not be available much longer. Meeting room space in Probation would be more appropriate. Possible elimination of some of the restrooms on the ground floor to free up space was also discussed. Public restrooms were located there because there weren't any on the main floor. When the renovation is done and the break-through is made, restrooms will be available on every floor. Legislator Cady felt the restrooms should remain to retain the structural and historic integrity of the building. While addressing the concerns, maybe consideration should be given to some other changes, whether completed as an in-house project or a contracted service. Chairman Crandall questioned the recent space needs assessment completed by Deputy County Administrator Mitchell Alger, and what was identified for Probation. Mr. Starks stated that he only spoke to Mr. Alger about the room containing County Clerk's records. He will eventually get that back, and it would be useful for a conference room, although it's not very big. Mr. Roeske noted that Public Works has completed projects in the County Office Building, but not in the Courthouse due to the asbestos. If renovations are going to be done in Probation, Mr. Roeske recommended not putting in carpet right now to cover the asbestos flooring; waxing or a sealant on the tile will make it safe for the interim. Mr. Roeske offered assistance with the floor plan.

Chairman Crandall suggested that now is the time to make the changes, so we can tie some things in together and clean everything up. He's not opposed to seeing what can be done with the floor plan, filing needs, and carpeting. Mr. Roeske will come back with suggestions. Legislator Graves commented that the space was never meant for Probation. Mr. Starks noted that they started with six or seven staff members and have grown over the years. It's a safety concern with so many people in such a small space.

Legislator Sinclair agreed that it was important to deal with these issues, but he wondered if we'd get to the end of the project and run out of money before addressing Social Services, the area with the worst space issues. We need to be mindful of Social Services when moving people and allocating space. Committee Chairman Pullen responded that Social Services will gain access to several thousand square feet of space currently used by Support Court on the ground floor of the County Office Building, most likely for the Foster Care Program. Mr. Pullen explained that the language of the bond resolution adopted in 2009 limits the use of that money to the Courthouse and the Courthouse Addition. Social Services changes would have to be covered 100 percent with County money.

Chairman Crandall pointed out that at the beginning of the Court Facilities issue, we were looking at two different bonds for two projects, one of which was a more comprehensive approach including use of the former jail space to alleviate the space needs of Social Services and others in the County Office Building. That project didn't get the votes to pass. So we're dealing with not just the Court Facilities, but trying to work out other space needs within the budget and out-of-pocket. The consensus of the committee was to have Public Works and Probation work up a floor plan and estimate by the next meeting. It was noted that Mr. Alger would have figures on the high density file storage bids from the addition.

### **PARKING**

Discussion was held on the need to develop a comprehensive parking plan for the main County Campus. Committee Chairman David Pullen noted that there have been complaints and a grievance filed against him related to the lawsuit referred to earlier that claimed the County had a plan to use the two lots purchased on Court Street for parking. Regardless of those issues, the County should have a parking plan, and we need to start thinking about a comprehensive resolution of the parking issues. We need to look at restrictive usage, who will be parking where, short-term in-and-out areas, Public Works operation needs, and Sheriff security needs prior to completion of the project. Chairman Crandall suggested an overall aerial-view map identifying existing areas (including the church lot) and an estimate of the number of spaces. Then we need to consider categories present for both staff and public: handicapped, short-term, and long-term parking. Committee members should be thinking about the parking issues for further discussion next month. Mr. Roeske will prepare a parking map and will e-mail a survey to departments including a request for the number of handicapped employees and how many employees come and go during the work day.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, May 4, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Cady and carried.



**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
MAY 4, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, G. Benson, D. Cady, K. Graves, C. Crandall;  
*Absent: P. Curran*

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Balling (Bovis), D. Button, R. Christman, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, T. Hopkins, C. Knapp, M. Kukuvka (LaBella), J. Margeson, S. Presutti, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, F. Sinclair, R. Starks, D. Vespucci

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of April 6, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Balling from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Mark Balling reported that nothing much has changed since last month. They received a lot of pricing from Javen (the contractor) and were able to resolve some issues.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

Approved Revisions:

- #4 – Building Management System Separation of Courthouse from County Office Building – approved credit of (\$1,600)
- #46a – Provide Telecommunications Ductbank between the County Office Building and Courthouse Addition – resolved – approved at \$18,621
- #47 – Structural Support for Exterior Façade at Connection to Existing Courthouse and Revised Interior Column Details – some of this came about through the Code Enforcement Officer – finished – approved at \$13,238
- #48 – Access through Room 320 (Visiting Judge’s Chambers) to Shell Space Room 333 – proposed price of \$17,196 came down almost \$7,000 to \$10,810; just discovered this price will come down even lower, because an HVAC unit won’t have to be relocated
- #66 – Revised Wood Door Trim at Door 235A and 336A; Provide Wall Infill in Room 315/316; and Provide Resin Epoxy Flooring in Lieu of Epoxy Terrazzo (prisoner holding cells) – largest part of this was the change in the flooring – approved credit of (\$7,027)
- #78 – Raise Emergency Lighting in Room 241 and Provide Revised Light Fixture Types in Lieu of the Specified D2 and D4 – estimated at \$8,200, but discovered didn’t have to buy new light fixtures – approved at \$134
- #79 – Information Technology Electrical Panel Phasing Issue – approved at \$1,286
- #81 – Backcharged Javen for Delayed Furniture Deliveries – one month period – approved credit of (\$3,016)
- #82A – Asbestos Abatement in Proposed DMV Space – work is complete – approved at \$21,341
- #90 – Oil Tank Heater for Elevator – no cost change

- #91 – Add Two Strips of Six Outlets Each on the Backside of the Four Post Racks in Room 156 and Relocate the Ceiling Mounted Camera in Room 230 – Information Technology Room in Addition – approved at \$2,601
- #94-#99 and #107 – all negotiated at a little under the proposed cost

Legislator Sinclair questioned Change Events #55 and #59C relating to the Dumpster Pad Fencing and Dumpster Pad. Large construction dumpsters are currently located at the back corner of the addition, and Mr. Sinclair asked if that would be a permanent dumpster location with a pad or if the plan was to continue using a pickup to take trash to the landfill to save space in the lot. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske responded that no final decision will be made until after the Maintenance Building is finished. A lot of trash can be run to the landfill to save space, but if a recycling container is put out there, a pad will be built.

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #82 – Modifications to Proposed Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Space – this is the non-abatement related costs – Javen provided a revised proposal of \$184,000 which included some things not included on their original proposal, i.e. electrical data work, additional marble panel work, additional demo costs.

Javen did reduce some prices Mr. Balling commented on in the first proposal for the DMV work, but despite prodding, they still haven't provided any real back-up on the revised prices so Mr. Balling can critique it in any detail, leading him to wonder how interested they are in progressing with that work. A lot of the prices are high. The Committee will have to decide how to handle the rest of the work.

Legislator Fanton asked if the options would include getting a separate bid. Mr. Balling agreed that the work could be bid out as a separate project. Mark Kukuvka, from LaBella Associates, noted that they did the preliminary design for the DMV work with the assumption that it would be a change order. Bidding it out as a separate bid package would require a new front-end document modifying the specifications and more drawing details. The additional charge for LaBella to work up the bid package for both DMV and District Attorney spaces would be around \$20,000 for design services, bidding efforts, production, bids, bid opening, additional construction administration time, shop drawings, etc., as if it's a stand-alone project. The County has already paid for the preliminary, conceptual design work for DMV. Mr. Kukuvka noted that he could separate the two spaces and do two bid packages if required.

Legislator Graves questioned the original estimate for the DMV work. Mr. Kukuvka replied that Bovis Lend Lease estimated it at \$89,000. Javen's revised proposal is \$184,000, or nearly doubled. Mr. Balling explained that there are mark-ups you wouldn't see in a competitive-bid situation, contractors may be trying to make up for a rough time so far, and they have no competition. They may just not be interested. Chairman Crandall commented that there's roughly a \$90,000 difference between the estimate and proposed cost for the DMV work. To force their hand, he suggested we'd want to go ahead and have the bid documents prepared due to time constraints. Javen would still have the option of bidding. Mr. Balling noted that it would be difficult to have another contractor here working while the current project is still ongoing, but we wouldn't have to time it that way. Mr. Kukuvka remarked that LaBella would need between 30 to 45 days to get the bid package out. Mr. Balling suggested the project could be bid in two months and have a later starting date.

***A motion was made by Legislator Fanton and seconded by Legislator Graves to authorize the preparation of the bid package as detailed above. The motion was then withdrawn.***

***A motion was made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Graves and carried to enter into an executive session to discuss matters leading to the employment of a particular corporation. Following discussion, the executive session was concluded on a motion made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Cady and carried.***

***No further action will be taken at this time on proceeding with the DMV and DA bid package preparation or on Javen's proceeding with either project (only the abatement process already underway will continue).***

- #87 – Electrical Changes in Room 227; Security Partition in Room 341; Coax for Room 156; Sprinkler Heads in Added Closets; and Signage Contract – prices came in, but there are questions – proposed at \$3,255
- #88 – Added Fire Dampers in Room 156; Smoke Detector in room 238A; Revised Millwork in Room 131 and 215/227; and Power to FM200 System – prices came in, but there are questions – proposed at \$11,350
- #92 – Provide Flip-Up Counter Revision in Room 127 and Vertical Shelving in Room 135 – prices came in, but there are questions – proposed at \$4,072
- #93 – Revisions to Door 223A – prices came in, but there are questions – proposed at \$1,126
- #103 – Abatement of Plaster Ceilings and Resupport of Mechanical Trapeze System – questions on price – proposed at \$6,767
- #104 – HVAC Isolation Valves in the Courthouse Tunnel for Heating System – County requested; work close to done – proposed at \$9,389
- #105 – Abate Floor Mastic (glue) in Room 316 (2<sup>nd</sup> floor of Courthouse) – didn't show up on survey – work done – questions on price – proposed at \$4,991
- #108 – Shell Space Fit-Out for District Attorney – Bovis estimated at \$115,000 – issued for pricing, but then held up on it for layout sketch revisions – Committee Chairman Pullen stated that the Committee would like to hold on having Javen work up pricing
- #109 – Revise Soffit Details in Rooms 305, 306, 309, and 316 – relating mainly to abatement; had to account for some existing conditions – estimated at \$1,900
- #110 – Exterior Grade Revisions at Door 160C (coming out of addition) – grade revisions needed to get water to flow properly – estimated at \$5,000
- #111 – Abatement of Black Mastic in Corridor 304 – estimated at \$1,500
- #112 – Partition Revisions in 302 and 304 and Credit for Wall Tile Removal in 302 – architectural revisions relating to unforeseen conditions – estimated at \$1,800

Pending Revisions:

- #89 – Provide Wood Mail Sorter and Smoke Detector in Room 238A – Courts requested the sorter, issued as a change event, and now they don't want it; hopefully we won't have to pay – estimated at \$2,300

**Site Overview – Safety Report**

No safety warnings issued during the past month. Bovis Lend Lease has conducted 254 safety orientations through May 4.

**Work Performed in the Past Month (April):**

- Phase II punch list ongoing (mainly millwork corrections) – will be discussed at the contractors' meeting tomorrow, because there are multiple things that haven't been

addressed yet that need to be – Committee Chairman David Pullen asked if there comes a point where we say it's enough, and Mr. Balling replied that they just keep working with the contractor; the punchlist is in good shape, it's manageable.

- Late Phase II change events ongoing (waiting for parts to get things done)
- Asbestos abatement completed on Second and Main Floors with Ground Floor underway (should be done next week)
- Asbestos abatement air monitoring ongoing
- Demolition underway on all floors
- Metal studs, framing, and drywall underway on Second Floor
- Insulation installed on Second Floor
- Demolition of breakthrough on Ground Floor underway
- Electrical rough-in underway on Second Floor
- HVAC control valves underway in crawl space
- Plumbing rough-in completed on Second Floor
- SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan) fencing and inspections

Some things are ahead of schedule; crews are all over the building now.

#### **Sixty-Day Look Ahead (May and June):**

- Phase II millwork corrections completed
- Phase II changes completed
- Asbestos abatement and air monitoring completed on all floors
- Demolition completed on all floors
- Metal studs and drywall completed on all floors
- HVAC, plumbing, and electrical rough-in completed on all floors
- Painting, ceramic tile, and ceiling grid underway
- Light fixtures underway
- Millwork underway on Second Floor
- Handicap Lift installed on Ground Floor
- SWPPP fencing and inspections

The overall completion is a couple of days into September; the end of August is really what we're looking for.

Committee Chairman Pullen questioned the status of the isolated, restricted areas where abatement was being done. Mr. Balling responded that some abatement is still being finished. There may be some areas that are done, but we need the air test back before the poly can be taken down and the area opened up. Legislator Sinclair noted that there's a lot of dust migrating into the hallway outside the Board Chambers, and expressed concern about whether the abatement adjacent to that area was totally completed or not. Mr. Balling explained that there is no contamination with the asbestos, because all the abatement areas are under negative air pressure, they are sealed, and there are air tests done pre- and post-abatement. What's being seen is just common dust from construction and demolition debris, which they have talked to Javen about. Mr. Sinclair also asked if there is a process for checking that all of the sub-contractors and their workers are legal to work in the U.S. Mr. Balling replied that they get certified payrolls that they have to provide when they're working here. In order to be on a certified payroll and be paid, they have to at least have the legal ability to work here. The fact that it's a public works job protects the County from that anyway.

Mr. Balling noted that we should be nearly finished with most of the unforeseen demolition issues. Once they start putting things back together, potential issues have been flagged and pretty much resolved. Little things related to existing conditions will pop up, but once the abatement is done, the big ticket items will go away. In response to a question, Mr. Balling stated that the project is still under budget by \$2 million, and we should keep in mind that there's \$300,000 in that potential change order column for Javen that's related to the DMV and DA space work, and those are new items that weren't in the original contract.

#### **DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE SPACE**

Committee Chairman Pullen noted that there is a layout that is being looked at, and the Committee decided not to seek outside bids or a bid from Javen regarding that. His understanding is that there are no problems with the design and we're ready to move forward. Mr. Kukulka reported that he had a conversation with Ed Rodman, Office of Court Administration's Head Architect in NYC, and he was OK with the layout. Investigator Dennis Vespucci was present representing the District Attorney's Office. He noted a small change, but it was pointed out that County Administrator John Margeson had a more recent drawing including that change. The District Attorney is pleased with the layout.

#### **PROBATION DEPARTMENT SPACE**

Probation Director Robert Starks reported that Public Works Superintendent David Roeske has hired someone to look over the space, but they've had some issues with the auto-cad software. They're getting it straightened out and will be able to do the drawings and proceed from there. Work is on-going.

Committee Chairman David Pullen offered a suggestion. Extensive renovations would necessitate moving people out and dealing with asbestos abatement. We don't have the extra space for a temporary move. Approximately half of the basement in the Courthouse is currently being renovated to be used by the Support Collection. Possibly that space could be adapted for Probation instead, leaving the present Probation space open, and that space could be finished for Support Collection. Mr. Roeske noted that they've already started the studding for the new Support Collection space, and it would be costly to make changes now. For the work needed in the Probation area, Mr. Roeske feels that a lot of the work can be done while staff is in there, with maybe just a couple of people moved occasionally. Mr. Starks commented that the new Support Collection space was designed for them, and they have a smaller staff. It wouldn't be configured to fit Probation. Mr. Margeson pointed out that there is much more space in the Probation area. Mr. Kukulka noted that all of the Probation offices are enclosed, where Support Collection is only closed off for a couple of offices and the rest is open. There's a difference in client access. Mr. Fanton suggested that when the former Room 8 on the Ground Floor of the County Office Building is vacated, that may provide some flex space.

Mr. Pullen noted that there are departments that feel their needs haven't been addressed, but a lot of time has been spent reviewing prior space analysis and ongoing studies to try to address the needs of every department.

#### **PARKING PLAN**

Committee Chairman David Pullen commented on past discussions on parking issues, about adjusting parking, and running a drive around to the back of the addition to provide a few parking spaces there. Any space we have we will have to look at. There are also issues on what the County said about parking at the time of the vote on the Courthouse Facilities Plan and litigation trying to stop the project. The County's representation at that time and also a comment to the Bar Association more recently was that the County did not have a parking plan. Now we're at the point where we're about to get space back in the back area and possibly around the

addition and we will be looking at some issues. It's time to develop a plan, looking at various issues, gathering input, and sending to the full Board for approval. One concern is that there are people from several departments that come and go throughout the day, and they need access to their vehicles without going up and down the hill multiple times. There are also handicapped employees. We need to know how many there are from each category for each department. Mr. Roeske offered to contact department heads to find out and bring a report back to the committee.

Chairman Crandall stated that a simple survey should be done for the departments within this facility including the number of employees, number of vehicles, number of regular parking and handicapped spaces needed, number of handicapped employees, and number of employees that come and go each day. There are a few categories that need to be surveyed for outside departments that come and go on a regular basis. A lot plan was also discussed, along with updated flyover photos showing existing and potential parking areas. Spaces behind the addition and those to be gained in the possible demolition of the Museum should be included. Then we can lay out areas for all of the different parking categories. The survey will be performed by John Margeson, Mitch Alger, and David Roeske.

Chairman Crandall questioned the parking in the back lot on an interim basis. Mr. Roeske noted that there is very limited parking in back being used by the County Judges, Chief Court Clerks, some County vehicles, and some department heads. They all know that it's temporary, and the area will have to be restricted again when construction necessitates it.

The flyover for the parking areas was addressed briefly. Legislator Sinclair noted that the specifics will be worked out when Emergency Management and Fire Director Jeff Luckey gets back. Mr. Roeske commented that the information from this new flyover can be added to the Pictometry images we already have in order to ascertain the dimensions.

### **COUNTY HISTORIAN SPACE**

Legislator Sinclair questioned if the County Historian should continue to plan toward moving into the soon to be vacated Support Collection building. He was starting to look at doing floor plans. Mr. Roeske stated that the last suggestion was to move the County agencies from the Cooperative Extension building (Weights & Measures, Workers' Comp, and STOP-DWI/Youth) into that space, along with the County Historian. The Ground Floor/Basement of the building could be used for the Historian's storage, and the Main Floor could be split half and half. Mr. Roeske state that he has money set aside for the asbestos abatement. The consensus of the Committee was that plan is still on the table. Mr. Roeske will be able to develop that plan also on the auto-cad program when it's up and running.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, June 1, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE**  
**June 1, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, D. Cady, K. Graves, C. Crandall;  
*Absent: G. Benson, P. Curran*

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Armstrong (Bovis), M. Balling (Bovis), D. Button, M. Healy, J. Margeson, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, F. Sinclair, R. Starks

**Media Present:** B. Quinn (Wellsville Daily Reporter)

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of May 4, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Fanton and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Balling from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Mr. Balling reminded committee members that last month they talked about not including the costs to renovate the DMV and DA in the project so the \$75,000 that was included in the contingency line item has been taken out. Even if all contingency funds are spent, the project is still more than \$2 million under budget.

They have decided not to complete Alternate #1 (see #115 below) which was to polish the brass fixtures because they appear to be in pretty good shape. The Office of Court Administration was going to reimburse the County, and under Alternate #2, \$5,000 was added back in for a net wash.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

**Approved Revisions:**

- #100 – Add a Space Temperature Sensor in Janitor's Closet 125 per CB-79 - approved at \$837.02
- #103 – Abatement of Plaster Ceilings and Re-support of Mechanical Trapeze System per RFI #0186 in lieu of Note #11 on Demo Drawings – approved at \$6,738.27
- #113 – Abatement of Pipe Insulation for Breakthrough in Corridor 107 and Disturbed Duct Tape at Locations TBD – approved at \$830.67
- #115 – Delete the Work of Alternate No. 1 – approved credit of (\$5,000)

**Approximated Revisions (Pending):**

- #082B – Future DMV Area Mech/Elect Removals for Abatement (Mr. Balling indicated that they wanted to leave the area gutted and safe so some holes were filled and some electric was disconnected – estimated at \$2,000
- #114, #116, #117 – Myriad of Issues and Field Conditions uncovered After Abatement – estimated at \$25,500
- #118 – Sanitary Piping Revisions at Toilet Room 104 per CB-92 – estimated at \$1,500

- #119 – Structural Modifications for Ground Floor Entry to Addition and at Plaster Cornice per CB-93 (Mr. Balling explained that the concrete extends all the way up to where they want to put the door, and they couldn't have known that in advance) – estimated at \$7,500
- #120 – Fire Safe Pre-existing Floor Penetrations per CB-94 – estimated at \$15,000
- #121 – Ceiling Height Change in Room 309, Power Change in Room 117, New Window for DA in Shell Space, and Crack Infills in the Existing Courthouse Floors per CB-95 - estimated at \$9,000

Relative to #120, Mr. Balling briefly mentioned unknown factors that will need to be looked at. The County will need to work with Code Enforcement Officials and develop a long-term strategy for addressing these issues. Mr. Balling and Mr. Armstrong indicated that you do not see the penetrations when the floor is in place, but they have been trying to take steps to bring the building up to code. Committee members indicated that they do not want to do more than required unless there is a safety factor. Mr. Balling and Mr. Armstrong will continue to work with the State Code Enforcement Officer and report back to the committee if necessary.

Committee members briefly discussed the ceiling mentioned in #121. The soffits currently cover part of the windows, and they will be removed.

The project is 87 percent complete, and they have used about 79 percent of the contingency. Overall the project is about \$2 million under budget. Legislator Don Cady asked what happens to any remaining contingency funds when the project is complete. Mr. Margeson indicated that it would fall to the surplus of the project, and based on conversations Mr. Margeson has had with bond counsel, it can be used to make debt service payments until it has been exhausted. It was also noted that the money can be used for a project specifically associated with the construction project. Chairman Curtis Crandall noted that there are some people who appear to be confused about the cost of this project, and it would be worthwhile to prepare a financial update. Court Facilities and County Space Needs Committee Chairman David Pullen indicated that he would prepare something and run it by Chairman Crandall and County Administrator Margeson. Legislator Pullen stated that we were facing a much different scenario than when we started looking at the project with estimated costs approaching \$30 million. Our project ended up coming in around \$14 million, and we have \$2+ million in contingency. The news could have been much worse.

Legislator Dwight Fanton thanked the representatives from Bovis for their attention to the project and coordination with the Public Works Department. Mr. Balling noted that the contractor has not come to them regarding any work extensions. They are projecting an early September completion date.

### **Site Overview – Safety Report**

No safety warnings issued during the past month. Bovis Lend Lease has conducted 254 safety orientations through June 1, 2011. Seventeen written safety notices have been issued since the beginning of the project. There have not been any lost-time incidents for the project.

### **Work Performed in the Past Month (May):**

- Phase II punch list ongoing (mainly millwork corrections)
- Late Phase II change events ongoing
- Asbestos abatement completed on Second and Main Floor with Ground vestibule underway (They had quite a few abatement changes, and they are running a little behind schedule. They may try to make up some time, and they should know in a few weeks.)
- Asbestos abatement air monitoring ongoing
- Demolition completed on all floors



- Metal studs completed on all floors
- Insulation installed on Second Floor
- Drywall underway on Second, Main and Ground floors
- Drywall finishing underway
- Demolition of breakthrough at Ground Floor underway
- Electrical rough-in underway on all floors
- HVAC control valves completed in crawl space
- Plumbing rough-in completed on Second Floor
- SWPPP fencing and inspections (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan)

**Sixty-Day Look Ahead (June and July):**

- Phase II millwork corrections completed
- Phase II changes completed
- Asbestos abatement and air monitoring completed on all floors
- Drywall finishing completed on all floors
- HVAC, plumbing and electrical completed on all floors
- Painting, ceramic tile and ceiling grid completed
- Light fixtures completed
- Floor finishes completed
- Millwork completed
- Handicap lift installed on Ground Floor
- SWPPP fencing and inspections (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan)

Probation Director Robert Starks asked if the Ground Floor exit would be available soon, and Mr. Armstrong indicated that it should be ready in about two weeks.

**DMV AND DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE SPACE**

Public Works Superintendent David Roeske stated that Public Works Department employees will be completing the District Attorney's Office space, and they hope to have it done by the end of the project. The DMV space will be a little more difficult, and they have not developed a timetable yet.

**PROBATION DEPARTMENT SPACE**

Probation Director Robert Starks distributed copies of the existing floor plan for the Probation Department and surrounding areas. Mr. Starks noted that because of code restrictions and load-bearing walls, there is not a lot that they are going to be able to do. Mr. Starks and committee members discussed the floor plan and some possible renovations including the removal of certain bathrooms. Mr. Starks indicated that he will be meeting with someone next week to talk about the possibility of installing a high-density filing system.

Once the DMV is relocated, the Probation Department is hoping they may be able to use the County Clerk's storage space. Several people in attendance believe the storage area is used for license plates. Legislator Pullen indicated that he would like to do an inspection of the storage area so he can understand exactly what the usage is. Legislator Pullen noted that the County Clerk's break room space seems to be very generous and suggested that it could be shared with the Probation Department. There was also a discussion about the public and staff bathrooms and whether or not those bathrooms actually need to be separate.

**COUNTY HISTORIAN SPACE**

Planning & Economic Development Committee Chairman Fred Sinclair indicated that he has not had further discussions with the County Historian Craig Braack about the possibility of

relocating to the Support Collection Building. Committee members discussed moving some of the agencies currently located in the Cooperative Extension Building to the Support Collection Building as the Historian should not need the entire building. Committee members mentioned wanting to use the basement of the building for storage, but agreed that it is very damp, and additional work would need to be completed first. Legislator Dwight Fanton suggested they might want to consider using a raised floor and installing a sump pump in conjunction with a dehumidifier. Committee members requested the Clerk of the Board to ask the County Historian to attend the next meeting so that further discussion can take place.

### **PARKING PLAN**

Deputy County Administrator Mitch Alger distributed copies of a Departmental Parking Survey that he completed after meeting with the various departments. After Committee Chairman David Pullen shared some concerns regarding the parking spaces needed, Mr. Alger clarified that he prepared the document based on maximum potential. The Departments highlighted in grey are housed offsite. The survey was prepared to give committee members an idea of what they should be shooting for in terms of parking capacity. Committee members requested Mr. Alger to work with the departments to determine how many customers are passing through in a day. Although the numbers can vary widely depending on what's going on, we need to have some idea of how many public users we need to provide for. **Refer to Deputy County Administrator**

Committee members briefly talked about the possibility of using some of the property on Court Street for parking. No scaling has been prepared, but they would like to determine how many cars can be accommodated on Court Street. Committee Chairman Pullen commented that the state keeps demanding that we need to do more and more, and ultimately we could use all of Court Street. We are currently paying \$500/month to use the church parking lot off of Court Street. Committee Chairman Pullen also talked about the possibility of installing a roadway behind the new building and creating additional spots there and by the Veterans' Memorial. Committee members would like to determine how many parking spaces we currently have, and how many we really need.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, July 6, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Graves and carried.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brenda Rigby Riehle, Clerk of the Board  
Allegany County Board of Legislators

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING – JUNE 29, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, G. Benson, D. Cady, K. Graves, C. Crandall

*Absent: P. Curran*

**Others Present:** M. Alger, S. Collins, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, K. LaForge, J. Margeson, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, S. Sheldon, F. Sinclair, R. Whitney; **Media:** J. Cole, Olean Times Herald

**Call to Order:** 9:00 a.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**BUILDINGS & GROUNDS MAINTENANCE BUILDING:**

A referral was received from the Ways & Means Committee to consider issues related to a proposal for construction of a Maintenance Building to replace the building demolished to make space for the Courthouse addition. This matter was also previously addressed by the Public Works Committee. The department has been without the building for nearly two years, and it has been identified as a pressing need.

Public Works Superintendent David Roeske summarized the Maintenance Building project activity to date. The Public Works Committee made the decision last year, after considering various options, that the building should be constructed in the back corner of the parking lot behind the County Office Building. Money was appropriated through Board action for the design (*Res. #115-10*). The building was designed as a steel building, and bids were requested. The bids came in a little high, but were within the ball park. When the matter was taken to the Ways & Means Committee, there was opposition to cost and construction materials, and it was referred to this committee. Since then, there was discussion on Public Works' staff doing some of the work themselves. After talking with the contractor and consultant, it was decided that Public Works would do all the inside work. They would not award the contracts for plumbing, electrical, and HVAC, and would eliminate a lot of the interior finish work. The foundation, shell, firewall, insulation, exterior doors and windows would be contracted, reducing the price down from \$720,000 to \$355,800 for the contracted portion. There is currently \$399,000 appropriated in the 2011 budget for this project, and some additional funds would have to be budgeted next year to finish the inside. The total project should cost between \$420,000 and \$450,000 with Public Works doing the interior, plumbing, electrical, HVAC, and finish work. The building permit will have to be modified a little to remove the HVAC unit from the plan, because they will be using something different, but they will follow the plan for electrical and heating, using a local source for the heating and doing the installation themselves. This way, materials for finishing the inside will be purchased locally. Addressing the possibility of using some of the former Sheriff Office space, Mr. Roeske noted that the Sheriff's staff will continue to use the security "bubble" area and the holding cell area. There is some space on the back wall side (former kitchen), but it's too small.

The proposed building is 4,800 square feet (40' by 120'), and it includes a storage area, workshop, and office/meeting room. Mr. Roeske stated that the size is the minimum for their needs; it is not over-sized. Plans call for completion by Spring 2012. The metal building is similar to a Morton Building, and has a steel frame. When asked why pole-type construction wasn't used, Mr. Roeske stated that they planned to finish the inside better. Public Works built one of these buildings for their shop in Birdsall, and it's been a very good building. They will try to match the color of the building to the bricks in the other buildings, and it will have a painted

roof, not galvanized. Mr. Roeske pointed out that the garage they're currently using for a shop and the former Jail space they are using for an office are only temporary, as they don't meet code. He also noted that if construction is to take place in the back lot, it has to begin soon, because paving of the lot will be done in the fall. Legislator Graves remarked that there's been discussion about the building that this new building will replace. The reason we can't use that same type of building that's now obsolete is because it didn't meet code, it was two different levels, and it was not fire safe.

The proposed site that the Public Works Committee is looking at is the back corner of the parking lot behind the County Office Building, straight back from the north drive. Mr. Roeske explained this location is convenient for deliveries. Other locations that have been considered were the area where the museum is now and the properties on lower Court Street acquired several years ago. Some have said it would make more sense out front for deliveries; others felt the front was not appropriate for that type of building. Committee Chairman Pullen preferred the Court Street properties, but Mr. Roeske felt the Maintenance Building should be closer to the County Office Complex for convenience for deliveries, accessibility to supplies and tools, and the controls for the County Office Building will be located there.

Legislator Benson voiced his objection to building in the back lot due to the reduction in parking spaces, not only by the building itself, but access needed in front of it. Mr. Roeske noted that additional spaces are being added at the side and back of the Courthouse addition. Shari Collins asked how many parking spots would remain after construction. Mr. Roeske responded that it's difficult to estimate until the paving and layout are done, but there will probably be about 40 spots left. At a future meeting, the Committee will be discussing parking issues such as areas for employees and the public, staff who come and go frequently during the day, and handicapped spots. Deputy County Administrator Mitchell Alger is currently working on these issues. Parking will improve after construction is over, and although there will still be a need for additional space, there have been some improvements over the past several years related to the Sheriff's Office/Jail moving and freeing up spaces.

Other concerns voiced about the location were snow removal and piling snow in that back corner (*it will have to be removed more often*) and possibly moving some of the storage space to another location (*not convenient because deliveries would have to be made at other spots and transported, taking time and labor; and since storage is only one-third of the building, we wouldn't gain that much in parking*). When asked if heated floors were considered, Mr. Roeske replied that they didn't look into that; the design includes forced air heating with A/C running through the same ducts. Changing would require re-design and a new permit, which would hold up paving, etc.

Sheriff Rick Whitney explained the need for his staff's continued presence in the County Office Building in a portion of the former Sheriff's Office space. There is a little vacant space, but nowhere near what Public Works needs. The E-911 Back-Up needs to stay where it is, and the deputies need space for processing problems that arise within the complex. They might need the Sally Port occasionally, and they still need the holding area for arrests made on site. The old visitation room is about all they can give up, and that might be adequate for janitor supply storage. Mr. Roeske commented that the Sally Port wouldn't be able to be used for Public Works for anything other than parking a vehicle, due to noise.

Legislator Benson asked about utilization of the ground level of the Courthouse addition. Mr. Roeske explained that the entire ground level is being used, but it wouldn't have been adequate for maintenance, due to noise, welding, etc. Committee Chairman Pullen noted that

originally there was some empty shell space on the ground floor of the addition, but the Treasurer's Office had to be re-located to allow space for the Courthouse security area, and Information Technology and the Real Property Tax Agency were moved as well. Other than that, there are only utility areas. The addition does aid in complying with regulations and code issues by providing handicapped access via the elevator connection to the Courthouse. Mr. Pullen also noted that most of the empty space on the second floor of the addition will now be used for the District Attorney, opening up space for the County Attorney. One of the final spaces freed up will be the County Office Building ground floor space currently used for the Courts and planned to be used for Social Services. The top floor of the County Office Building, the former Jail space, is still unresolved and will have to be addressed at some point.

Chairman Crandall commented that there were several plans with support from various legislators, with discussion centering on location and cost, but there was not support for the plan that came out of Public Works. They came back and approached it in a different way and cut \$300,000 from the original cost, but aside from the cost were these other questions related to size and construction materials. Mr. Roeske has adequately answered each, but Chairman Crandall still questions if it's enough of a compromise to get support. Regarding the former Jail space, the original bond proposal would have addressed what to do with that, but it wasn't supported, so now we're picking through other space issues. In his opinion, one of the most expensive parts of the Maintenance Building is the office and the need to be heated and finished off. There is still space here that could be utilized for that. Work is needed upstairs to bring it up to code, but he wondered if there is a way to utilize it for this project and put the infrastructure there to build out from. Alfred State would be willing to look at the inside work, and if we had a start, it may be an opportunity to move forward. Mr. Crandall questioned revamping the elevator system, and if the bond could be utilized for the upstairs renovation. We need a compromise with enough support to move this Maintenance Building plan forward. There's been discussion of other materials. He asked what happens with another plan: would it have to be re-bid, or would it be treated as a change order? Mr. Roeske replied that it would have to be re-designed and re-bid, and there's a cost associated with that. They've already pulled the contracts for electrical and HVAC, so that part wouldn't have to be re-bid.

Legislator Graves expressed the issue of cost to the taxpayers and the need to keep them in mind and compromise. Chairman Crandall stated that there is absolutely a need for a Maintenance Building, but we need something with a reasonable cost. Mr. Graves commented that the County is held to a higher standard by building codes and other laws i.e. prevailing wages. Municipalities end up paying nearly 100 percent more than a private entity could have the project done for.

Legislator Sinclair remarked that he supports the location and the need for the Maintenance Building, but he felt that reducing the size by utilizing space upstairs for storage or space somewhere in the main building for the office should be considered in order to fully utilize space for parking.

Legislator Sinclair presented the Insulated Concrete Masonry Wall (ICMW) construction as another option. The advantage of this construction material is that it provides a thermal mass inside the insulated barrier that holds its heated or cooled environment longer. The product is manufactured locally, and there are local construction examples. Mr. Sinclair noted that he suggested this alternative several months ago, as he felt the material could match the feel of the campus better. There is energy efficiency to be gained long term, as well as efficiency in building it. The walls are already finished. There are savings to be realized on

labor, because you'd have one mason as opposed to several workers for another type of construction. Mr. Sinclair gathered the following rough estimates:

Southern Tier Concrete –	
4,860 block (12"), 12' wall, 40' by 120', including firewall, plus miscellaneous materials/grout –	Est. \$ 25,000
Miller & Richards –	
Lay 4,860 block, including control joints, at prevailing wage –	Est. \$ 38,000
Fassett Lane –	
Joist system, 4/12, 42' by 120' –	Est. \$ 6,500
Install rafters –	Est. \$ 15,000
Swan Roofing –	
Metal roof, including underlay, \$50/sq by 330 sq –	Est. \$ 16,500
Foundation – 47 cu yds @ \$400/yd –	Est. \$ 20,000
Floor – 178 cu yds @ \$300/yd –	Est. \$ 54,000
Foam Floor Insulation –	Est. <u>\$ 6,000</u>
TOTAL for Unfinished Shell –	Est. \$181,000

Mr. Roeske commented that a lot of things were left out, such as the contractor's profit margin, and we wouldn't be guaranteed that materials would be purchased locally. The project wouldn't be bid out in portions. The contractor would choose where he purchased materials. Mr. Sinclair stated that we wouldn't have to go with just one big contractor. This option might be more work for the department, but we have an engineer and skilled people on staff, and the savings are there. He explained that this rough estimate is for construction to the same point where the other option came in at an estimate of \$355,800. He put these figures together to address the concern of the contractor that concrete construction would be a more expensive option. The ICMW option can save money, it fits in with the architecture of the campus, it's efficient, it's greener, and it utilizes local business. The insulation factor is listed at R20, but adding in the thermal mass holding it increases that efficiency. Mr. Sinclair submitted ICMW information and his rough estimates for consideration.

Mr. Roeske and County Attorney Thomas Miner both commented that if we changed construction material, the project would have to be re-bid. Chairman Crandall questioned to what degree the design would have to be re-done. Mr. Roeske stated that we would have to hire an engineer to design it, because County staff doesn't have the time. Committee Chairman Pullen voiced concern about the Wicks Law and working on the project with several contracts in different stages to get it done. Right now, the price for the shell is \$355,800, but the total project cost is about \$450,000. The option Mr. Sinclair suggested is a totally different system and would require a new design and plans by engineers or architects before bidding, which involves more cost. On the other hand, we already have the investment of the design costs for the steel construction proposal. County Attorney Miner agreed on the costs to re-engineer and re-bid. If we want to bid in smaller components, we'd have to have a general construction manager, and he didn't know how that cost would play out. Mr. Graves and Mr. Benson expressed support for pursuing the ICMW option. Mr. Roeske pointed out that we've already spent \$8,000 for infrastructure and \$62,000 for engineers or contractors. The average municipal building price is \$120 per foot; the steel building quote was \$150, which was a little high, but it was done by the Request for Proposals process, and Hunt was the low bid.

Chairman Crandall questioned what utilities would be needed and the value of thermal efficiency in the ICMW proposal if the function of the facility was scaled back to storage and some shop work reducing the size of the building's footprint. Mr. Roeske replied that they would

still have to run a gas line. They're planning on using the A/C units taken out of the former Information Technology Office area. Legislator Fanton pointed out that the building still has to have some heat. Mr. Roeske questioned where the maintenance staff would be located. He hasn't found an adequate space in the County Office Building. Chairman Crandall referred again to possible uses for the former Jail space. It would set future development of the area in the right direction if Public Works was located there. Mr. Graves asked about the capability of adding on to a block building, and if we could start smaller and enlarge later. Mr. Roeske reiterated that the size of the proposed building includes his minimum space needs.

Legislator Cady addressed a misconception in the public by clarifying that the Maintenance Building would service the entire County complex and out buildings, not just the Courthouse addition.

Mr. Pullen commented that to use the space upstairs, there would have to be elevator access. Right now, the only elevator that goes to the top floor is in the Sheriff's area, but that doesn't stop at the first and second floors. How to provide that access is probably beyond the scope of this meeting, but if there's a way to save money on the Maintenance Building by putting changes in to use the upstairs space for Public Works and help meet other space needs as well, it's worth considering. Chairman Crandall noted that we don't have any distinct plan or outline for addressing space needs while placing departments in the proper spots. We got within range of having a plan for looking at that and pulled up short to make decisions on these issues in committee. Now we're on the third committee to look at this issue.

Legislator Fanton commented on the various renovation projects Public Works has undertaken. They need office and work space. The proposal is within this year's budget with a little more needed next year for finish work, and now we're going through the third committee looking at other plans. The County is not financially strapped at this time. The steel building may not be as fancy as a brick building, but Public Works tried to go with the minimum to meet their needs. Mr. Fanton questioned the "design-by-committee" when the building has already been designed. Also, they looked at other sites, and they weren't practical. Maintenance staff will be working in these buildings all the time, so it's not practical to isolate them and spread them out.

Chairman Pullen agreed that Public Works has been, and will be, involved in the moving and renovation for numerous projects including District Attorney, County Attorney, Probation, Social Services, Motor Vehicles, and County Clerk's Office. When quotes came in high, those quotes were rejected, and Public Works agreed to provide the labor. They have saved the County as much as the cost for this Maintenance Building project, but we still have the responsibility to save as much as we can for the taxpayers. Legislator Graves commented that he appreciated the \$300,000 savings from the original proposal, but just because we're in good financial shape doesn't mean the taxpayer is able to shoulder it. It's our responsibility to be sure we have the best plan. Mr. Graves felt that the concrete building has merit and should be researched. Mr. Roeske stated that the only way to find out the true cost is to have the building designed and bid it out, and the re-design would cost another \$65,000. County Attorney Miner asked if the money paid to Hunt also anticipated their staying with the project to completion. Mr. Roeske replied that it does, and Hunt has been paid \$65,000 for design work. There was no construction inspection in that price.

***Location – The consensus of the Committee was to construct the Maintenance Building in the back north corner of the parking lot behind the County Office Building*** (opposed: Benson). Chairman Pullen noted that this is the location that the Public Works

Committee decided on, and there doesn't seem to be support for another location. There is no perfect solution. Legislator Graves stated that Public Works is the "first responder" for electrical, plumbing, and ice, so it makes sense to have the Maintenance Building as close to the worksite as possible.

**Material and Design** – Chairman Pullen pointed out the additional design expense involved with the ICMW approach proposed by Legislator Sinclair. Legislator Graves felt that the option should be researched, but doesn't want to spend another \$70,000 for design and bidding. Legislator Fanton stated that the estimated \$181,000 for the ICMW option doesn't include a lot of things. It would help if we had some real numbers from someone actually bidding instead of just estimating to compare with, but we have to be careful with these numbers we're looking at. Legislator Cady also noted that a better foundation would be needed with the block proposal. The steel construction is more flexible, and we have slate in the building site. Mr. Roeske suggested tabling this matter, and he will talk with the contractor/consultant for more information to bring back to the next regular committee meeting. **Decision on the material and design for the Maintenance Building was tabled following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Fanton and carried.**

#### **ELEVATOR ACCESS TO TOP FLOOR OF COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING:**

Committee Chairman Pullen distributed copies of an old floor plan for the ground floor of the County Office Building showing the entrances and elevators. He raised the issue of whether the main elevator could be made to go on up to the top floor. Mr. Roeske explained that we'd have to determine exactly what's above it and if there would be room for the mechanical equipment. Then we'd have to raise the shaft and install a new elevator system. Legislator LaForge suggested another option would be a free-standing system on the back of the building. Mr. Pullen referred to the former Jail elevator, and noted that the Sheriff needs to retain access. If we renovated the existing elevator or installed a free-standing one to access the top floor, we could address other needs, such as possibly using that floor, instead of the space on the ground floor soon to be vacated by the Courts, for expanding Social Services into, and using that ground floor space for Public Works. Mr. Roeske pointed out that elevators are very expensive.

Chairman Crandall remarked that we've discussed use of the top floor of the County Office Building for a number of years, and he's never seen any firm estimates on how to gain proper access. To resolve the issue, we need to have answers. We recently spent \$150,000 to replace the cooling tower, and sometime we may have to address issues with the existing elevator. **Mr. Roeske will obtain a quote from Otis to answer those questions related to the elevator.**

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, July 6, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m. following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Fanton and carried.



**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
JULY 6, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, G. Benson, D. Cady, K. Graves, C. Crandall

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Armstrong (Bovis), M. Balling (Bovis), C. Braack, D. Button, R. Christman, S. Collins, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, M. Kukupka (LaBella), J. Margeson, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, D. Scholes, S. Sheldon, F. Sinclair, R. Starks, R. Whitney;  
**Media:** B. Quinn, Wellsville Daily Reporter

**Call to Order:** 3:17 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of June 1, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Graves and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Balling and Mark Armstrong from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Mark Balling reported that the total invoiced to date hasn't changed from last month's report, because Javen Construction hasn't turned in a payment application for June. There were a couple of adjustments made: LaBella's Additional Services (covering the DMV and DA spaces) was increased from \$30,000 to \$40,000, and under Driveway/Parking Lot Costs, the previous revision of \$10,000 was increased to \$50,000 due to additional work.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #122 Fire Alarm Modifications in existing Courthouse, where the old system didn't provide current code coverage, added some fire and smoke devices – Est. \$10,000
- #123 Delete Projection Screens from Addition that OCA determined weren't needed – Est. Credit of (\$1,000)
- #124 Occupancy Sensor Revisions in Addition for spaces with problems with lights staying on due to not enough movement, made switching modifications – Est. \$800
- #125 Exhaust System Connection Revisions – using existing ductwork instead of installing new – Est. Credit of (\$1,000)
- #126 Partition Revisions in Rm #314, Corridor #208, and Baseboard Modifications throughout all Floors in existing Courthouse – working around a lot of different base materials, requiring removal and replacement of some – Est. \$5,000
- #127 Refinish Five Additional Pews (the five in the Hearing Room not originally included – Est. \$4,000
- #128 Delete Work Associated with Hardware for Door 209A (Door didn't exist) – Est. Credit of (\$2,000)
- #129 Provide Microphones in Courtrooms – omitted in bid documents – equipment is there, but not the actual devices – Est. \$4,200
- #130 Plaster Repair at Stairway and Soffit Modifications – from previous water damage near main stairs and some soffit modifications in secure area on second floor (off center,

so made adjustment on one side to balance out; some raised to provide more daylight) – Est. \$8,000

- #131 Repairs to Existing Fan Cool Units – sub-contractor having problems with the older units when doing the control valve change that was one of the alternates we accepted requiring repair or replacement of parts and adjacent materials – Est. \$5,000
- #132 Provide Hardware Set for Door 320B (breakthrough from Visiting Judge’s space to new District Attorney’s space) – hardware missing on original change order – Est. \$600
- #133 Delete all Exterior Parking and Directional Signage Noted on Drawings – County will be providing, so deleted it from Javen’s contract – Est. Credit of (\$1,200)
- #134 Change Light Fixture Type and Switch in Room 102 (small closet originally in IT Department) – didn’t meet code – Est. \$1,100
- #135 Insulate Existing Piping in Soffits – Courthouse ground floor – work nearly done; involved about 1,500 linear feet heating and cooling pipes where condensation was quite severe – Estimated at \$15,000, but since report was printed, approved at \$6,500

Legislator Fanton referred to Cancelled Change Event #108, Shell Space Fit-out for District Attorney, which was estimated at \$115,000, and questioned if it had been zeroed out because the County will be doing the work. Mr. Balling replied that it was, but not all of that amount will be savings, because some will be spent on HVAC, electric, and materials. Legislator Fanton pointed out that even at that, the County will be saving quite a bit on those changes, as well as the DMV changes.

### **Site Overview – Safety Report**

Mark Armstrong reported that there were no safety warnings issued during this reporting period, and there have been no lost time incidents to date for the project.

### **Work Performed in the Past Month (June):**

- Phase II punch list ongoing (mainly millwork corrections)
- Late Phase II change events ongoing
- Asbestos abatement underway at the ground floor vestibule
- Drywall finishing completed
- Painting underway
- Plastering of existing walls underway
- Demolition of breakthrough at ground floor completed
- Electrical rough-in on all floors completed
- HVAC control valves continuing
- Plumbing rough-in completed
- SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan) fencing and inspections

Mr. Armstrong noted that the contractor is following the schedule fairly well, but is slipping behind a little. He believes things will pick up.

### **Sixty-Day Look Ahead (July and August):**

- Phase II millwork corrections completed
- Phase II changes completed
- Asbestos abatement and air monitoring completed on all floors
- Plaster repairs completed on all floors
- Painting, ceramic tile, and ceiling grid completed

- Light fixtures completed
- Floor finishes completed
- Millwork completed
- Handicap lift installed on ground floor
- SWPPP fencing and inspections

The project is scheduled to be completed August 31. Javen shows the middle of September, but Mr. Armstrong thinks they can still meet the deadline. The additional abatement has to be taken into consideration, but there are things they could do to get back on schedule, i.e. have more painters on the job instead of just one or two. Furniture is scheduled to be delivered August 15, and the punchlist will begin in August and run into September.

### **COURT FACILITIES - OCA PROPOSAL:**

Committee Chairman David Pullen reported that the Office of Court Administration (OCA) has suggested the removal of a wall between the small courtroom and the former Judge's Chambers in the original Courthouse. This is the courtroom at the end of the hallway that was the former Chambers for the County Board of Supervisors. When it was made into a courtroom, the wall was erected to separate off a Judge's Chambers to the rear. Removing that wall will enlarge the courtroom, making it more versatile, although there is no jury box. The Chambers would be moved from where they have been to the clerical area. Committee Chairman Pullen has talked with Judge Parker about it. It's not a weight-bearing wall. If it's ever to be done, now would be the time.

Mr. Balling noted that the partition would be relatively simple to take down. The bench would have to be moved back toward the windows at the far end (current Judge's Chambers area). Committee Chairman Pullen spoke with an OCA representative, and although they don't like windows near the bench, in an existing facility, drapes or blinds could provide sight insulation. Mr. Balling estimated it would cost about \$5,000 for taking the wall down and moving the bench back. There won't be much cost associated with electric, and we should get a credit for not having to paint both sides of the wall being removed. The advantage will be a larger, more flexible courtroom. Legislator Graves asked if all the ancillary issues have been addressed, such as inmate movement and space for attorney/client consultation. Mark Kukuvka, from LaBella Associates, stated that courtroom was not intended for use as a criminal courtroom due to the lack of a jury box and problems with inmate movement. Depending on the Court calendar, inmates may occasionally have to be walked down the hallway, but that path wouldn't change with this proposal.

Committee Chairman Pullen pointed out that removing the wall would cost more if done later. It was not part of the original plan, but if it's going to be done, it needs to be authorized now while the crews are here. OCA did not require this change, but are now recommending it. There was no mention of OCA paying for it. Justification for the larger area is that OCA feels the need for a larger area within the railing to allow space for multiple co-defendants and co-plaintiffs and their counsel, instead of just the tables for the defendant and plaintiff. It would add flexibility, making it possible to have bench trials and maybe move family court cases to that facility if the other courtroom is being used.

Legislator Cady commented that we've spent millions to meet mandates, and he didn't feel we should spend even a penny more to meet suggestions. We've all seen how estimates grow and wanted to leave the room as it is. Everything we've passed was considered a wise investment, but there comes a point where you hate to see more things added. Legislator Graves agreed. Committee Chairman Pullen remarked on comments made by people who

were on the Board at the time the County Office Building was constructed that for a very modest amount, they could have made it possible to have unrestricted use on the floor above (former Jail), including putting a floor above that. If that had been done, we probably wouldn't have needed the new addition. Committee Chairman Pullen believes the proposed wall removal is a wise investment. Legislator Graves expressed concern about the possible need to partition that room off again in the future for some other use. Committee Chairman Pullen stated that the area is anticipated as a Visiting Judge's Court area. Where normally there would be space for a secretary and court attorney, the Visiting Judge doesn't bring his secretary with him when visiting another courtroom. There is space for the court attorney. The space that would have been for the secretary will become the Judge's area. What we're gaining by the change is elimination of the secretarial area that wouldn't have been used. Legislator Graves commented that he likes to see some flex space built in. When the County Office Building was built, all the flex areas that were supposed to take years to fill were filled within six months. He doesn't want to see us take that wall down and have to rebuild it later. The space may be more valuable in the future if left as is. Committee Chairman Pullen stated that the hardest space to come up with is courtroom space. This proposal accomplishes that. Mr. Balling will send Andrew Isenberg a request that OCA accepts this change in writing, stating that the space won't have to be modified to meet their needs.

***A motion was made by Legislator Pullen, seconded by Legislator Fanton and carried to authorize the removal of a wall to enlarge the small courtroom in the original Courthouse at a cost not to exceed \$7,000 (opposed: Cady). (This will be handled as a change order.)***

*(Mr. Balling later noted that there is asbestos tile under the bench in the room with the wall to be removed, which will increase the quote, but they will probably still be within the \$7,000 figure approved in the motion. He will talk with Javen about who does the asbestos removal.)*

### **COUNTY HISTORIAN SPACE:**

The Committee discussed a proposal for the County Historian and some other County agencies to use the current Support Collection Unit building located in the corner of the front parking lot, after Support Collection is relocated to the main building. County Historian Craig Braack's proposal is included below:

*"As per your request, this is my letter of proposed usage of the building currently housing our Child Support Collection Unit of Social Services (yellow brick building to the right of the Courthouse). I respectfully offer the following plan:*

*Historical Services Department would be in all the rooms on the right half of the building as you enter. At last week's meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee, I handed out drawings of the floor and possible specific room uses for my department.*

*The left half of the building would house the following County departments: Sealer of Weights and Measures, Workers' Compensation, and Youth Bureau/STOP-DWI. The rooms on the left half are different sizes, so allocation of these rooms could be determined by their departments' space needs.*

*A move of this magnitude would be advantageous to the County for the following reasons:*

- 1) *Centralization of County services in the Courthouse Complex*
- 2) *The current County Museum is no longer safely, economically usable*
- 3) *The building and office space where the other three departments are currently located are not handicapped accessible, and they are operating in very small quarters.”*

Mr. Braack noted that they are currently trying to dispose of records in the basement of the building. Committee Chairman Pullen asked if there was any information on asbestos abatement or potential work yet. Mr. Braack replied that wouldn't be known until things are opened up. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske commented that they looked into abatement several years ago, and he has about \$50,000 in his budget toward that. When asked if the abatement had to be done, Mr. Roeske replied that it does, because there are problems. Legislator Graves questioned if there was enough space, and Mr. Braack responded that there won't be a museum. His space would be called the County History Services Facility. Committee Chairman Pullen reported on Weights and Measures' expressed need for a two-bay garage for storage of equipment used on a day-to-day basis in the performance of his duties.

***Committee Chairman David Pullen will send a memo to Youth Bureau/STOP-DWI, Workers' Comp, and Weights and Measures asking for their opinions, needs, and issues regarding possible relocation to the Support Collection Building.***

#### **PROBATION DEPARTMENT SPACE:**

Probation Director Robert Starks reported on proposed renovations in the Probation Office space. He distributed floor plan drawings and information on high density record storage units (copies attached to original minutes). Records will be centralized in the middle of the office space, rather than the upper left corner of the floor plan as originally discussed, and two offices will be built in that left corner. Some temporary walls will be taken out. The high density storage units will be built with the wall as a part of it in such a way as to preserve the hallway. The high density record storage capacity that Probation will be purchasing costs \$20,000, which is more than enough room for their needs. The space shown on the floor plan could accommodate almost twice that much at a cost of \$35,000. They decided they didn't need that much additional space and may never need it if they continue to cull records as they do now. That may also allow them to move printers and copiers into that area, freeing up other spaces.

The only question remaining is the ultimate use for the area on the lower left side of the floor plan consisting of rooms designated as 1, 2, and 3, public male bathroom, small County Clerk's record storage room, and license plate storage room, respectively. Legislator Graves questioned Probation's need for those areas with the change in record management. Mr. Starks replied that they didn't need that space for storage, but they will be losing access to the museum and the jury room, where they hold groups and other meetings. Four or five groups per week are run by the Probation Department, and it would be nice to have a room large enough to hold those groups, as well as other meetings and trainings, right within their area. Most of the groups are held during office hours. They are already using the Public Safety Facility.

Chairman Crandall asked if it would be possible to utilize the hallway space for more. Committee Chairman Pullen noted that the area referred to is the main hallway down the center of the building. Right now, the only access off from that hallway is in the vicinity of what Mr. Starks marked as room 1, and opposite that is the entrance to what will be Support Collection (former IT area). Most of the rest of it doesn't need to be a hallway, because it doesn't go anywhere. The lower left corner of the sheet shows the current doorway to the outside where

the chairlift will be located for handicapped access to the Courthouse security screening area (former Treasurer's Office). The plans do call for a door in the chairlift area at the same level as the ground floor hallway, but it will be locked at all times (exit only).

There had been discussion on putting a partition in the hallway below room 1 toward the front of the building and use that space as a break area for Probation, Support Collection, and County Clerk staff. Maintenance staff will still need access to the area around the stairway, but that wouldn't preclude the use of that portion of the hallway as a break area. This led to discussion on the rooms to the right below room 3, which is actually one room with a partition, part of it being used as a County Clerk break room. The area has to be controlled by the County Clerk due to record security. If high density record storage was installed there as well, and the hallway area was made available as a break area, the portion now being used for a break area would be freed up. This hasn't been looked at professionally, but it might be a way to address some storage needs. The County Clerk is looking at digital document storage, so there may not always be such a high need for paper storage space, but he still needs to use room 3. Legislator Cady suggested leaving the restrooms intact, because we wouldn't gain much by eliminating them.

Mr. Starks noted that the centralized high density record storage will clean up all the serpentine file cabinets throughout the offices and the bookshelf storage in their hallway. The rest of the Probation renovation expense, outside of the storage, will be for replacing temporary walls (metal and glass) separating a few of the offices with more solid, sound-resistant walls. It won't cost a lot, and it's something that the Public Works crew can do in the winter when they're free. Chairman Crandall remarked that originally we were looking at reconfiguring some things, but by changing to this proposed floor plan, the high density record storage frees up space, using our staff saves money, and it still accomplishes what we started out to do. Committee Chairman Pullen pointed out that this falls under this committee as a space needs issue; it doesn't result from the Courthouse project. It pre-dated that.

Funding for the Probation project was discussed. There are still possible asbestos issues in the floor tile, which aren't budgeted for. Committee Chairman Pullen will check with bond counsel on using funds left from the Court project. Public Works has agreed to include funds in their budget for the partitions. Funds for the high density record storage will be included in Probation's budget for next year. ***Consensus of the committee was approval of Probation's proposal, but no formal action was required. Plans for the referenced rooms 1, 2, and 3 on Probation's drawing can be addressed at a later date.***

#### **PUBLIC WORKS MAINTENANCE BUILDING:**

Proposals for a new Public Works Maintenance Building to replace the one demolished to make room for the Courthouse addition were discussed following a referral from Ways & Means and previous discussion at a special meeting of this committee on June 29.

Public Works Superintendent David Roeske requested Hunt Engineers to do an objective review of the cost savings potential utilizing an ICMW with timber trusses alternate framing approach for the maintenance building, as quoted at \$181,000 for a building shell. He distributed a cover letter and cost data prepared by Christopher Bond, PE (copy attached to original minutes); excerpts included below:

*"It should be noted that our experience and industry standards including 'RS Means' construction cost data suggest that pre-manufactured metal buildings run about \$50/sf for a shell (without site work) and \$120/sf for a finished building, while masonry bearing*

*wall and framed roof buildings run \$70/sf for a shell (without site work) and \$160/sf for the finished building. ...we completed a comparison to see how it works out for this particular building.*

*In reviewing the suggested framing, three factors immediately come forward:*

*1 – The quotes provided do not include all the items required to complete a shell. Items such as earth work, reinforcement, doors and windows, etc. were not included.*

*2 – The quotes indicate a combustible roof system. Under the new code, this would require the space to be broken up into smaller spaces with firewalls and/or protected with sprinklers for fire protection.*

*3 – The quotes do not include the bonds, insurance, and general conditions required for municipal projects, and do not appear to be provided with prevailing wage rates as required for municipally let projects.*

*Upon inclusion of the omitted items and code anticipated requirements, this approach appears comparable with the pre-engineered approach. Further adjusting for prevailing rate and publicly bid pricing, **the masonry bearing wall framing cost is about 10 percent higher than the pre-fabricated metal building approach (\$393,700 as opposed to \$355,800).***

*Taking this one step further, you have already paid for the design of the pre-fabricated metal building, and could award a construction contract immediately. Changing building systems now would require roughly another 7 percent for re-design, and would delay the construction, requiring cold weather work or material price escalation if postponed to next year (estimate either at about 5 percent). Taking this into consideration, **the real cost increase to Allegany County to switch building materials at this point is 20 percent higher.***

Legislator Cady pointed out that the block building would require a better, deeper foundation, as well as the additional costs for re-design and possible delays. Legislator Sinclair stated that the efficiency in the insulated block building represents a savings. Mr. Roeske noted that the steel building is also insulated. Legislator Sinclair felt the estimates may come out close with the source of labor being local, to which Mr. Roeske answered that they haven't gotten too many local bidders, and some of the Buffalo area contractors are coming in lower. Mr. Roeske noted that they have several pallets of the blocks from the new building, and they may be able to incorporate them into the face or halfway up on the steel building to give it a more decorative look. When asked about the pricing, Mr. Roeske stated that these prices all came from RS Means, an industry standard. After adding in estimates for the missing items, code issues, and prevailing wage rate to the quotes for the masonry wall option, the cost for that option increased to \$393,700. Legislator Sinclair questioned if the prevailing wage rate applied when a private contractor hires someone else. Mr. Balling stated that it applies if they're working on-site. Mr. Roeske felt the information presented a fair comparison between the options. Legislator Fanton pointed out that we're looking at bid prices on one option and just estimates on the other, and typically they go up. Legislator Sinclair stated that he believes the concrete block building will fit better aesthetically and will be more thermally cost efficient over a period of years. He thinks the cost would come in less. In the end, he would like it to look better and fit in better with the complex. Mr. Roeske commented that he could look into changing the plan slightly to include an overhang on the roof and dress the building up a little. Legislator Cady remarked that steel will last if taken care off. He also noted that if someone

backs into a block building, there's a lot of damage; with a steel building, you just replace panels. He preferred the steel building. Legislator Sinclair referred to the soil borings taken in the back lot, noting there were some sediments requiring replacement of some materials. He questioned if the architects were confident of a secure foundation with a steel construction and also commented on the shaking from the railroad tracks. Mr. Kuvuvka replied that most of the areas were solid for their foundation, which is down to solid strata, and that building is a lot heavier than this one will be. Legislator Cady added that uniformity of the site is important. Mr. Roeske reiterated that if we put this off, it delays the paving. Legislator Fanton stated that this isn't the first time this has been discussed. The money is in the budget, and they tried to keep the cost down as much as possible. The matter was originally referred to this committee because the bid was more than expected, but he didn't want to continue beating this issue. They're not borrowing anything.

***A motion was made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Cady and carried unanimously to move forward with the steel building proposal for the Maintenance Building, including an overhang if reasonable and within budget, and having Public Works complete the inside work. Mr. Roeske will report to Legislators Fanton and Pullen about the additional cost for the overhang. Funds are already included in the budget. Because the design and budget were already approved by the full Board, no further action is required.***

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, August 3, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Crandall and carried.



**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
AUGUST 3, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, G. Benson, D. Cady, P. Curran, K. Graves; *Absent:* C. Crandall, D. Fanton

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Armstrong (Bovis), M. Balling (Bovis), D. Button, L. Edwards, A. Finnemore, G. Green, M. Healy, T. Hopkins, J. Margeson, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, F. Sinclair, R. Starks; **Media:** B. Quinn, Wellsville Daily Reporter; J. Cole, Olean Times Herald

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of July 6, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Curran and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Balling and Mark Armstrong from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Mark Balling reported on changes in the Anticipated Cost Report from last month. The driveway related parking lot costs are pretty much in. The approved revision of \$50,000 to the original budget of \$100,000 for that line item had to be adjusted to \$60,000, but it might end up coming down a little. Bovis added a line for the County fit-out of the District Attorney and DMV spaces at \$150,000. That work is underway by County personnel, but they wanted to account for it in the budget. That figure, which is probably generous, does not include County labor costs; it includes items such as HVAC, electric, fire alarms, millwork, ceilings, and carpeting, although some carpeting will be turned back over from the Court project (will be talked about later). Javen's construction costs of \$8,381,278.12 are through June, and another payment is in queue. At the present time, total project costs amount to \$12,603,634.66. The project budget was \$14,480,700. The project is currently under budget by \$1,877,065.34, but Mr. Balling pointed out that assumes we will spend the entire amount budgeted for contingency. There is still \$116,268.87 in construction contingency that's unallocated and \$75,959.75 in incidental budget contingency that is unallocated, and there are items that are trending under budget even further.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

**Approved Revisions:**

- #44 – Revised Detail for 3 Breakthrough Locations between Addition and Existing Courthouse – structural work – \$10,263.74
- #69 – Replacement of Existing Boiler Room Pumps that were Failing – \$4,333.73
- #75 – Elevator Operator for High Density Shelving Delivery – prior to being turned over to the County – \$634.32
- #76 – Changed Temporary Entrance Door to Include Window – modified existing door – \$304.48

- #88 – Added Fire Dampers in Room 156, Smoke Detector in Room 238A, Revised Millwork in Room 131 and 215/227, and Power to FM200 System – last minute changes, mainly around the IT room in the addition – \$10,693.30
- #89 – Provide Wood Mail Sorter and Smoke Detector in Room 238A – \$313.45
- #104 – Added HVAC Isolation Valves to Hot Water Piping in Courthouse Tunnel – there were none there, so that's a good addition for the County – \$9,348.63
- #123 – Deleted Projection Screens – OCA determined they weren't required – credit of (\$1,007.20)
- #127 – Refinish Five Additional Pews – ten included in the contract, but the County project team determined the five in the hearing room should also be done – \$5,524.73
- #135 – Insulate Existing Hot Water Piping in Soffits – work complete – \$6,523.60
- #136 – Furniture Replacement Due to Damage in Room 359 – back charge for damage caused by the contractor in the Judge's Chambers and one other office in the Addition – credit of (\$5,005.60)

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #121 – Ceiling Height Change in room 309, Power Change in Room 117, New Window for DA in Shell Space, and Crack Infills in the Existing Courthouse Floors – the largest cost included is for the new window in the DA space and the related masonry work, brick, lintels, scaffolding, and labor. When Bovis got the price, they asked about cancelling the window, but were told it was already fabricated. The price is being negotiated with Javen – proposed \$11,593.96
- #126 – Partition Revisions in Room 314, Corridor 208, and Baseboard Modification throughout all Floors – mainly for correcting mis-matched molding types present in several individual rooms. Some of the work involves pulling off and patching recessed ceramic base. The price is figured on time and material, but Bovis is asking for more information to ensure it's a County cost and not a contractor issue. This is a good idea, but getting to the fair value is the issue – proposed \$22,541.62
- #137 – Revised Wood Door Trim Details at Corridor 107, 211, Entrance from 209, and Corridor 302 – including main opening to the Addition – estimated \$2,500
- #138 – Repairs to Existing Wood Doors – no cost – the estimate of \$4,000 will be voided
- #139 – Miscellaneous Repairs to Finishes on Existing Courthouse 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – i.e. wires sticking out of walls, drywall inserts to be removed; estimated \$10,000 is probably high
- #140 – Hearing Room Modifications (removal of wall discussed previously) – the wall is down and the abatement is done, but when the carpeting was originally ordered, it was for two different types of carpet for either side of the wall. That's being turned over to the County for DMV, and new carpeting will have to be ordered. The cost for this change will still be close to the estimated \$7,000. Court personnel have indicated to Mr. Pullen that the decision to remove that wall was a very good move, because the change is very impressive in terms of lighting, size, usability, and adaptability. Mr. Balling noted that Andrew Isenberg, from OCA, responded to his e-mail regarding the space use issue by saying he couldn't guarantee there wouldn't be a need for space, but he didn't foresee the need. Mr. Isenberg also said it was a very positive upgrade for the space.
- #141 – Transom Heading at Door 202A and Duct, Wall, and Ceiling Modifications in Room 102 – estimated \$6,800
- #142 – Relocate Temperature Sensor and Add an Electrical Outlet in Room 309 – Judge's Chambers to coordinate with the furniture layout – estimated \$1,500
- #143 – Remove Radiant Heat Tubing and Infill Opening for Millwork – main floor security area – estimated \$1,500

Legislator Graves questioned if the schedule for completion was still on target. Mr. Balling noted that some correspondence has gone back and forth this week, and he felt that in one month, the project should be substantially complete. The contractor has committed to adding some manpower. The work remaining to be done consists of doors, painting, floors, and then the punch list. Although new change orders should be down to a trickle now, we may still have to do one for floor leveling if we go over the square footage in the contract.

### **Site Overview – Safety Report**

Mark Armstrong reported that there were no safety warnings for this period.

### **Work Performed in the Past Month (July):**

- Phase II exterior and civil punch list ongoing
- Late Phase II change events ongoing
- Asbestos abatement at the ground floor vestibule completed
- Drywall finishing completed
- Prime and first coat finish painting completed
- Plastering of existing walls completed
- Demolition of breakthrough at ground floor completed
- Electrical lighting and devices underway on all floors
- HVAC control valves completed
- Ceiling grid completed on all floors with ceiling tile underway
- HVAC ceiling registers installed
- Finish plumbing underway
- Millwork underway
- Hearing Room partition removed with asbestos abatement completed
- SWPPP inspections ongoing

### **Sixty-Day Look Ahead (August and September):**

- Finish painting completed
- Plumbing fixtures installed
- Electrical lighting and devices installed
- Millwork completed
- Doors and hardware installed
- Security system installed
- Flooring completed
- Chair lift completed
- OCA furniture delivered
- Punch list completed
- Phase III Certificate of Occupancy received
- Contract closeout in process
- County projects: DMV, DA, and Maintenance Garage underway

Mr. Balling noted that the paperwork close-out is in process. They would like to have all the training done and operation manuals turned over to County personnel so that the contract can be closed out as quickly as possible. A letter was sent from County Administrator John Margeson and Project Manager Bovis Lend Lease to the contractor indicating that we are anxious to have the project finished on schedule.

Floor plan drawings for the Courthouse renovations were included with the hand-outs to assist with the tour scheduled for after the meeting.

**PROBATION DEPARTMENT SPACE:**

Probation Director Robert Starks commented that there was nothing new to report. They are basically waiting until the rest of the construction is done and funds are identified for replacement of the temporary walls. There are currently provisions in the proposed budget for 2012 for the high-density storage units.

**SUPPORT COLLECTION BUILDING:**

There is a proposal for the utilization of the Support Collection Building by the County Historian, Weights & Measures, Workers' Compensation, and Youth/STOP-DWI following the Support Collection Unit's move into the ground floor of the Courthouse. Director of Weights & Measures Gilbert Green and Youth Director/STOP-DWI Coordinator Linda Edwards were present at the meeting. Currently the proposal for the main floor level is to locate the Historian's Office along with some display area on the right, and the other three agencies on the left. There are currently 12 people in the building. Mr. Braack had some drawings showing how the area is currently set up, but floor plans will have to be developed. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske will have one of his technicians look at the space and the current floor plans, and then they can sit down with each department to develop a floor plan. He wasn't sure they would have the actual plan done before the September meeting.

Legislator Sinclair pointed out that Mr. Braack had presented this proposal, but input hadn't been gathered from the other agencies. An opportunity was given to Mr. Green and Ms. Edwards for their initial reactions:

Youth Bureau Director/STOP-DWI Coordinator Linda Edwards commented that she would rather stay where she is, but will work wherever assigned. Their location at the Cooperative Extension building is quiet, and parking is not an issue. Her one concern was originally storage space for a generator and lighting unit she had considered purchasing for the STOP-DWI Program, but they decided that renting was a better option, so she won't need that type of storage space. She does need adequate office space for two people and dry, interior storage space for their give-away items and bicycle helmets. They need at least as much space as they presently have. Ms. Edwards is willing to look at the proposal, and she noted that the Cooperative Extension building needs a lot of work.

Workers' Compensation Self-Insurance Plan Office Manager Sharon Keib was not present, but Ms. Edwards reported that she needs office space for one person and enough space for the filing cabinets she has in the office and those presently located in an outdoor storage bay.

Director of Weights & Measures Gilbert Green noted that he would need access to a two-bay garage for storage of two trailers and other equipment. He felt it would be workable to have an office in the Support Collection Building and maintain the garage bays where they are.

**PARKING OPTIONS:**

Deputy County Administrator Mitchell Alger provided information on a Departmental Parking Survey (copy attached to original minutes). The spreadsheet is an update from one presented a couple of meetings ago and includes a calculation on public vehicles per day and notes from the departmental survey. Current parking capacity in the lot in front of the County Office Building, the Employment & Training lot, the public lot, and the Baptist Church lot totals 222. This does not include any spots in the back lot. Parking spots needed for employees total

299, and an estimated 630 public vehicles visit on a day-to-day basis. The potential number of spots needed, absolute worst-case scenario, is 929, but not all staff are here all of the time, and the public vehicles come and go and are not here all at the same time.

Legislator Graves pointed out that flexibility is also needed for things like snow removal, and without building a parking garage, there's no way to find another 707 parking spots. Adding even 100 additional spots would require tearing something down or building something. Committee Chairman David Pullen remarked that we don't need anywhere near 707 spots; parking is tight at times, but people are coming and going. Also, the calculations don't include the back parking lot. We'll re-gain some spots there, but we have to wait until after the Maintenance Building is completed to see what we'll have left and decide how to designate the area, whether it's employees, handicapped, or public. There has also been discussion to add parking adjacent to the Addition going around the back and to the front of the Courthouse, which could add 15 to 20 spots, or a total for the two areas of 40 to 50. That's a significant improvement over what we have now. When you add those areas to the lots included in Mr. Alger's calculations, it's better than when the Jail was still here and those department and employee vehicles were on-site 24-7. There was still a parking shortage at that time; this is not a new problem and not just due to this project.

Committee Chairman Pullen noted that once the changes occur and we use the Support Collection Building for the Historian, we have to do something with the present Historian space. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske has said that building is in very poor condition, so that area needs to be addressed and looked at. It doesn't give a lot of space, but because of the elevation shift, maybe we could look at a bi-level parking area there: one level accessed from the Court Street level, and the lower level accessed from the Employment and Training Center level. These are just some of the things we can look at. We did not have a parking plan when we approved the Courthouse project, and we have no plan now; we have options. Mr. Alger is working on that, and we'll see where we want to go with it. The County purchased two properties on Court Street for whatever use was appropriate. Nothing has been decided. At some point in the future, we may be required to expand the County campus, and those properties could be an option. The County also recently signed a contract for the lot directly below the back parking lot, so we will need to make a decision on the use for that lot, along with the two lots that have houses on them, although they're not much closer than the church lot.

Mr. Pullen questioned the possibility of a concrete and steel three-tiered structure off the back lot with all spaces rented and reserved for those who want to pay for a spot. The bottom level would be what is presently the grassy lot, the next would be at parking lot level, and then the upper level. The cost may be too prohibitive, and he questioned if there'd be enough interest and if it would generate enough revenue to possibly pay for itself. He wouldn't want to spend taxpayer dollars for parking unless it was generating income. Mr. Pullen spoke with Mark Balling who has worked on these structures at other locations and may be able to provide estimates.

***For the next meeting on September 7, Committee Chairman Pullen suggested that committee members and others wishing to provide input look through Mr. Alger's work and come up with a proposal for a parking plan including number of spots for personnel, spots for transient County personnel, handicapped spaces, spots reserved for public, County areas designated for County personnel, and areas designated as multi-user.***

Legislator Cady noted that this planning is good, but may be premature. He felt we might want to wait until the project is done and everything shakes out. He also felt that the public and visitors should have the closest spots, because it cuts down on traffic and is a matter

of courtesy. Committee Chairman Pullen pointed out there may be issues with terms of employment and special accommodation for handicapped and people with certain work duties. Legislator Graves questioned if maybe someone should approach the Village to see if they would be willing to lift parking bans on certain sides of the streets on the hill (Court Street, Wells Lane). Mr. Pullen noted that there would be an upside and a downside with any option we choose, but hopefully what we decide on will have more upside and be accommodating to the greatest number.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, September 7, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Curran and carried. A tour was conducted of the Courthouse renovations.

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 7, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, G. Benson, D. Cady, P. Curran, K. Graves, C. Crandall

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Armstrong (Bovis), M. Balling (Bovis), D. Button, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, T. Hopkins, J. Margeson, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, T. Ross, E. Ruckle, F. Sinclair, R. Starks; **Media:** J. Cole and D. Roorbach, Olean Times Herald

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of August 3, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Curran, seconded by Legislator Graves and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Balling and Mark Armstrong from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Mark Balling noted that the Anticipated Cost Report reflected work through August, and approximately 89 percent of the construction cost has been billed for. The balance in construction contingency is \$155,304.60. It's safe to say we will not come anywhere close to using that. There are a couple of recent changes under incidental costs. Furniture and Equipment was increased by \$3,000 from last month due to the Judge's credenza, but Javen will be paying for that through the damaged furniture credit change order. There is also a small adjustment under Telephone/Data Servers/Equipment for a couple of uninterrupted power supply units the County purchased for the IT area.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Month):**

Approved Revisions:

- #118 Sanitary Piping Revisions – around the existing building system – \$3,781.04
- #120 Firesafe Pre-Existing Floor Penetrations – less than estimated – \$4,434.62

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #125 Exhaust System Revisions – proposed price of \$2,648.61, but waiting for a reply from Javen as they actually owe on some things not installed
- #144 Delete Top Course of Paving on Back Parking Lot – the County will be doing this work to coordinate with the Maintenance Building – estimated credit (\$35,000)



- #145 Relocate the Fan Coil Unit in Room 204 (Security Office) – estimated \$2,500
- #146 In Existing Courthouse, Change all VCT-4 to VCT-1 – floor tile changed from black to tan – estimated \$3,000, but waiting for restocking price for swap out
- #147 Delete Law Library Window Infills and Install Opaque Film on Glass – estimated credit (\$1,500)
- #148 Remove Existing Door and Frame at the Main Floor Level at Bottom of Ornamental Staircase – at County’s request – estimated \$600 – Legislator Graves questioned if there was some building code reason that the door was there, and stated that he didn’t want to take it out then have to put it back. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske noted that the doorway was not wide enough. Mr. Balling explained that the door doesn’t meet code now, because it swings the wrong way, but he will check on it.

The project is currently \$1.869 million under budget, but Mr. Balling pointed out there is a lot of unused contingency, so that number could easily end up at \$2 million.

### **Site Overview – Safety Report**

Mark Armstrong reported that the project has a clean safety record for this reporting period.

### **Work Performed in the Past Month (August):**

- Phase II exterior and civil punch list nearly completed
- Late Phase II change events completed
- Ground floor vestibule underway
- Final coat of paint nearly completed
- Electrical lighting and finishes nearly completed on all floors; electrical inspection taking place in most areas today, to be finished when the handicap lift is done
- HVAC control valves completed
- Plumbing completed
- Millwork completed
- Carpeting and vinyl flooring nearly completed
- Doors and hardware underway

### **Sixty-Day Look Ahead (September and October):**

- Painting completed
- Electrical work completed
- Doors and hardware installed
- Security system installed
- Flooring completed
- Handicap lift installed
- Punch list underway
- Late changes completed
- Closeout requirements in process

- NYS Certificate of Compliance issued
- County projects: DMV, Fire Apparatus Access Drive, and Maintenance Building ongoing

Mr. Balling noted that the state inspection of the renovations is scheduled to take place in about two weeks. Punch lists will begin tomorrow on the completed rooms, the handicap lift will be completed on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, furniture will be delivered on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, and hopefully the formal blessing for moving back into the Courthouse will be given on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. There will still be some punch list items to complete, and he'd like to see the list before he says the project is done, but occupancy should be able to take place by the end of September. Chairman Crandall remarked that there were a lot of details and millwork that seemed to drag on with the Addition, and asked if there was less of that type of thing with the renovation phase so that this part would go quicker. Mr. Balling replied that because of how some of the issues went with the Addition Phase, the renovations went more smoothly, and there were also different circumstances. They are pushing them to finish.

Within 30 days, the project will be totally complete, unless there are some punch list items and late changes. Mr. Balling suggested that they continue to come to committee meetings, depending on changes, to provide updates on the financial status of the project.

#### **MAINTENANCE BUILDING – REVIEW OF COST ALLOCATION:**

Committee Chairman David Pullen noted that there have been questions on the cost of the Maintenance Building. The original budget figure included on Bovis Lend Lease's anticipated cost report for the Court Facilities Project (page 3) was \$14.48 million. Currently, the project is about \$1.869 million under budget, but considering contingency balances, it may end up \$2 million under budget. Comments have been made that we're not counting everything. One significant item is the Maintenance Building. Right now, the cost of that building is included in the Public Works budget, even though it was the Court Facilities Project that created the need to replace the previous Maintenance Building in a new location. The cost of the new Maintenance Building is \$364,000, not including the inside finish work. Public Works' 2011 budget includes \$380,000 for the building. Mr. Pullen questioned if that cost is in reality a Court Facilities Project cost, and if it should come out of what would otherwise appear to be our surplus for that project. Is it accurate and fair to the public and the various departments involved to not include that cost? Public Works Superintendent David Roeske felt the Maintenance Building should have been part of the planning process for the Court Facilities Project. Instead, his department has had to do the planning and try to budget for it. Public Works Committee Chairman Dwight Fanton agreed that the cost should have been included in the Court Facilities Project funding, especially since there was going to be a fund balance. He stated that in addition to having to replace a building that they lost, they now have a lot larger facility to maintain, so they'll need a little more room for storage and the maintenance operation.

Legislator Donald Cady noted that the \$380,000 presently in the Public Works budget would be freed up by transferring the expense of the Maintenance Building to the Court Facilities Project contingency funds, and he questioned what it would be used

for. Mr. Fanton responded that there has been discussion on possibly revamping the former Jail elevator to provide better access to the upper floor (next item on the agenda). An estimate of \$58,000 was received to put in a new elevator car and new controls, but that estimate does not include a new opening on the ground floor. Mr. Roeske pointed out that there are other things to consider that were not budgeted, such as the renovations asked for in Probation, the County Attorney's Office, Public Works, and some others. Mr. Cady asked if everything could be totaled to allow transferring a lump sum. Committee Chairman Pullen pointed out that although these other issues are tied together, they're not really part of the bonding done for the Court Facilities Project. The bonding would cover the old Courthouse, the Addition, the parking lot, and things related to it, but it's limited and does not include work in the County Office Building or the Support Collection Building. That would have to be covered by other County funding sources. For a project that was forced on us and during planning we had no idea how the cost would come out, \$12.6 million is a good outcome. Covering the cost for the Maintenance Building under the Court Facilities Project funding allows some flexibility in using the Public Works funds to include some things not in the original plan, such as changes in the County Attorney's Office, Department of Motor Vehicles, and Probation.

A motion was made by Legislator Fanton, seconded by Legislator Cady and carried to approve moving the expense of the Maintenance Building at \$380,000 to be paid out of the Court Facilities Project Capital Fund rather than the Public Works budget. This matter will be referred to Ways and Means, and they will also determine how to utilize the funds freed up in the Public Works budget, based on the recommendations of the Court Facilities and County Space Needs Committee. County Administrator John Margeson noted that this action, if approved, will allow utilizing currently funded monies to do projects other than the Maintenance Building, because the Maintenance Building will be covered by the Court Facilities Capital Fund. Mr. Margeson will check with bond counsel and the County Attorney to see if a resolution is necessary or if we can simply pay for construction of the Maintenance Building out of the capital fund already established for the Court Facilities Project. He already spoke with bond counsel about utilizing those surplus funds from the bond to pay for the Maintenance Building, and he's been assured that it's legitimate to do that. Mr. Margeson will attend the Ways and Means meeting to report on whether a resolution is necessary. **Referred to Ways and Means**

Legislator Graves noted that there are a lot of issues and areas that need to be addressed, and he'd like to see something done about the cramped conditions in Social Services. Mr. Graves suggested some planning sessions to establish a written action agenda, including goals and anticipated completion dates. Legislator Fanton pointed out that this action referred to Ways and Means will allow some of these other issues to be addressed because we'll have the funding for it.

#### **JAIL ELEVATOR – DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE ALTERNATE USAGE:**

Committee Chairman David Pullen reported that there has been discussion related to the former Jail elevator. Currently the only access is in the former Sheriff Control Center (the "Bubble") on the ground floor, in the former Jail on the third floor, and limited use in the "Tank" in the breezeway area on the second floor, formerly used

for taking prisoners from the Jail to the main court room. The public has never had access to that elevator. The Sheriff still needs to control that area for security purposes. If left the way it is, that elevator remains unavailable to anyone other than Sheriff's personnel for access to the top floor. That has stymied the ability to do any planning. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske contacted Otis Elevator for estimates on a new car that would open on the ground floor and possibly on the first floor. We already have an opening on the second and third floors. It would include the new car and all the controls that the public would need to use. We'd have to put in a new entrance in the breezeway. The shaft, all the power equipment, and the piston would remain. An estimate of \$58,000 was received for the new elevator car and controls, but that estimate does not include the new openings. When asked about the Sheriff security issue, Mr. Pullen explained that the Sheriff will not allow us to have the general public in the Bubble area, but if the public would only be able to access the elevator from this side, rather than the Bubble side, with a lockout function, the Sheriff would approve of that. The new elevator car would have double doors. The Sheriff doesn't use the top floor, which is presently just used for storage. The stairs go all the way up, but given the ADA and other requirements, we've been unable to consider using that 16,000 square feet of space for anything involving the general public or the general County employee population because of the lack of handicap access. Access points on each floor were discussed.

A motion was made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Curran and carried to authorize exploring the possibility of converting the former Jail elevator for use by the general public and County employees in a manner acceptable to the Sheriff to provide access to the top floor of the County Office Building, and obtaining an estimate from Public Works for the cost of cutting through and rebuilding new openings.

**Referred to Ways and Means**

Legislator Healy questioned alternate ways of providing access to the elevator on the ground floor while still avoiding the Bubble, and he pointed out that at some point, we might want to consider making that entrance a security station or leaving room for that option. It should also be visible to the Sheriff's security "Bubble," so space should be left to allow for that. At the same time, we also need to consider plans for where the second Assistant Public Defender will be located or if the Public Defender's Office should be relocated. Legislator Graves reiterated the need to plan ahead and noted that the top floor is very secure, even if it is remote. Committee Chairman Pullen noted that during election times, the Board of Elections needs priority use of the former Jail elevator for moving the voting machines from the third floor storage. There has been discussion of moving the voting machines to the new storage building being constructed near the Landfill, so that won't be a long-term obstacle. Until then, we would have to coordinate to prevent interference with the Board of Elections. Public Works Superintendent David Roeske noted that the new storage building should be completed within a couple of months.

Committee Chairman David Pullen commented that in the past, there has been discussion on offering the opportunity to one of the County's educational facilities to develop a plan for the third floor of the County Office Building. Skilled staff with training in design and building trades would provide the supervision and students would design

and construct some of what we need. This would serve several functions: it would relieve Public Works from having to do the build-out, provides the opportunity for cooperation and collaboration, and allows the students to develop building skills beyond what they would normally be working on. The concept hasn't been explored in detail, but if Ways and Means concurs, maybe we can proceed with looking into it. The Committee has had to deal with the hottest issues as we went along, but maybe now we can start planning ahead and planning to succeed.

**PARKING PLAN REVIEW:**

Committee Chairman Pullen reported that Public Works Superintendent David Roeske has indicated that until the Maintenance Building is further along, he won't know exactly how many parking spots will be available in the back parking lot and around the Courthouse Addition. Without that information, the planning process would be very challenging. The parking plan can be discussed further at the October meeting, when Mr. Roeske should be closer to having those numbers. Mr. Roeske stated that he hopes to pave and mark the back lot during the first two weeks in October.

Mr. Pullen spoke briefly about his idea for a three-level parking garage with dedicated parking spots for those willing to pay rentals (also mentioned at the August 3 meeting). Mr. Roeske said he could talk with some contractors to explore its feasibility and potential cost. We may then want to survey employees for potential interest, and there would be other factors to consider. Legislator Healy noted that there have been comments from the public about building a parking lot on the Court Street properties that the County purchased, and he questioned how many parking spots that would create. Mr. Pullen noted that there are probably several answers to that depending on whether one or both buildings were demolished and if all the space was used for parking. It was noted that the small lot below the back corner of the back parking lot has not been acquired yet and will need full Board approval. Mr. Pullen will be working with Deputy County Administrator Mitch Alger on a parking proposal for the October meeting.

**Next Meeting:**        Wednesday, October 5, 2011, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:**        The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Cady and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, D. Fanton, G. Benson, D. Cady, K. Graves; **Absent:** P. Curran, C. Crandall

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Armstrong (Bovis), D. Button, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, B. Kelley, M. Kukuvka (LaBella), J. Margeson, T. Miner, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, T. Ross, D. Scholes, F. Sinclair, R. Starks

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of September 7, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Cady, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried. (There was no meeting on October 5.)

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Armstrong from Bovis Lend Lease presented a progress report (copy of report attached to original minutes).

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

Mark Armstrong reported that Javen Construction was at 90.43 percent completion for pay purposes, but closer than that work wise. There are still some punch list items remaining and ordered material that's not in yet. The project is very close to being done. The State Inspector came November 1 and issued a temporary Certificate of Compliance. Once the chairlift near the main entrance is inspected and passes, he will forward the paperwork, and we'll have the final Certificate of Compliance. (There are some things in the chairlift elevator that have to be brought up to code.) The Anticipated Cost Report includes a change to include the estimate for the new Buildings and Grounds Maintenance Building, but the total project cost is still under budget by \$1,639,482.

When asked if Public Works and Security staff were involved in ongoing training, Mr. Armstrong noted that they are, and all training is being documented. Ninety-five percent of it is video recorded so staff can refer back.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Report):**

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #152 – New Aluminum Storefront Entrance System at Door #100A and a Price for Door 200A – (opening at chairlift area) – the door hasn't come in so is not scheduled to be installed until December 5 – should come in at under the estimate of \$7,500
- #153 – Seal Electrical Manhole Conduits and Provide Drip Pan – water infiltrating from manhole to subbasement – estimated \$1,000
- #154 – Install Chase in Room 110 and Delete Select Hardware at Doors 312A and 317A – the closet area containing cables in the former IT area needed to be enclosed in with drywall; deletions of door closers – estimated \$1,000

- #155 – Door 331A Modifications to Create a 0” Reveal for the Handicap Operator – the one that was installed didn’t work correctly – estimated \$1,200
- #156 – Phase III Certificate of Compliance Requirements – items found during first inspection to be brought up to code, i.e. exit signs, emergency lighting, etc. – estimated \$7,600
- #157 – Chairlift Modifications and Related Inspection and Test Report – items found during Inspector’s first visit: required ADA phone, signage, sheet metal protection – no estimate
- #158 – Air System Duct Testing in Existing Courthouse – a deficiency was found indicating leakage – testing to be done to locate leaks – once identified, will have to be fixed – County may elect to do the repairs – estimate for testing \$5,000

### **Site Overview – Safety Report**

No safety warnings were issued during this reporting period.

### **Work Performed in October:**

- Phase II exterior and civil punch list underway
- Late Phase II and III change events continue
- Ground floor vestibule nearly completed
- Final coat of paint completed
- Electrical lighting and finishes completed on all floors
- HVAC control valves completed
- HVAC air balancing report under review by Architect
- Plumbing completed
- Millwork completed
- Carpet and vinyl flooring completed
- Doors and hardware completed
- Temporary Certificate of Compliance issued

### **60-Day Look Ahead (November and December):**

- Punch list items completed
- Late Phase II and III change events completed
- Security system installed and tested
- Handicap lift installed and inspected
- Javen contract closed out
- New York State Certificate of Compliance issued
- County Projects: DMV, Fire Apparatus Access Drive, and Maintenance Office/Garage ongoing

Nearly everything will be completed in November, but the chairlift door will be installed in December. Bovis Lend Lease will present a final report at the December meeting, with a tour of the renovation area to follow the meeting.

Mark Kukuvka from LaBella Associates commented that it’s been a good project, and there’s been a proactive relationship between Bovis Lend Lease, Public Works, and this Committee. The County hit the marketplace at the right time and was able to leverage some other improvements to get the maximum benefit for the taxpayers. In his dealings with the Office of Court Administration, Mr. Kukuvka felt they were proactive and tolerant in working

together once the project was committed to. OCA should be pleased from an operational standpoint. We satisfied the Court's needs for the foreseeable future with some room for expansion. There will be a break-in period when their staff may have to come back; the test will be getting through the first heating season and the first cooling season.

### **MOVE INTO RENOVATED COURTHOUSE FACILITY:**

Public Works Superintendent David Roeske reported that Security will be moved from their temporary location to the Security Screening area at the front main entrance of the Courthouse on Friday. *(Subsequent to the meeting, this move was postponed to November 10.)* Everyone, including employees, will enter through Security Screening at the main entrance of the Courthouse. Other than that entrance, all doors in both buildings will be kept locked. People in the County Office Building will have to exit through the door at the underpass, because the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor breezeways will require swipe cards to go back to the Courthouse areas. *(Subsequent to the meeting, it was communicated that people will be able to go back and forth between buildings on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor without a swipe card.)* There is no card reader at the County Office Building entrance. People in the Courthouse offices will be able to exit through the Security Screening area. The door by the handicap lift is only for the handicapped and as an emergency exit. That single point of entrance was very important to OCA and also to Social Services. At some point, we may want Security Screening at the County Office Building entrance as well.

The Courts will move into the renovated areas within a couple of weeks. There's a little more work in the main Courtroom to take place next week. Everyone will be in by the first of the new year. OCA has talked about a grand opening or open house.

### **PARKING UPDATE:**

#### **Parking Lot Behind the County Office Building:**

Public Works Superintendent David Roeske reported that paving is done, and lines will be painted tomorrow (11/03). The total number of spaces in the combined area of that lot and to the back and side of the Courthouse Addition is 70. To get to the back side of the Courthouse Addition, direction of travel is from the back lot out and around to the Support Building.

#### **Court Street Properties:**

The Presutti lot is being graveled for parking and should allow for 20 spots. Legislator Graves commented on a statement made at the last Board meeting that the parking issue was created by the Courthouse Addition, and he felt that needed to be corrected. Legislator Graves has worked for the County since 1974, before the County Office Building was built. It was the construction of this building that created the parking issues, and the problem has gotten worse due to increases in departments, notably Social Services. This upset that the Addition is causing isn't just due to that; it's been a problem for a long time, and it's a dangerous situation. Legislator Cady pointed out that the buildings were not purchased for parking, but now we need parking. Legislator Fanton stated that we're not going to be that much shorter on parking than we were before the construction project. Committee Chairman Pullen noted that it's been a point of debate, but the fact remains, that the County had no parking plan when we purchased those properties. We lost space during the construction phase, but that's wrapping up. We're going to gain 70 spaces and maybe another 20, but we still need to establish a parking policy.



## **Parking Policies:**

The committee discussed restricting use of the back parking lot, with signs to indicate who can park there, and the related issue of enforcement. Regulations are enforceable if there is a formal policy and it's imposed in a non-discriminatory, consistent manner. The back lot is currently designated for staff; we can control the back lot and the lot directly in front of the County Office Building. Mr. Roeske suggested the issuance of hangtags for those authorized to park in the back lot. Suggestions made regarding who should be allowed to park in the back lot included: employees whose work responsibilities make it necessary for them to come and go multiple times each day, handicapped, County vehicles, Department Heads, emergency vehicles, and reserved spaces around the Addition for Judges and Chief Clerks. There is also a loading zone designated. Department Heads should be asked to report on how many spaces are needed for those transitional vehicles, and a permit will be issued by the County Administrator. Department Heads may also have to justify why a certain County vehicle should be in that lot. Only those with valid handicapped tags will be allowed to park in the handicapped spots. Communication should be made to all employees that the back lot will not be for general employee parking, but will require a permit. It was noted that this is a start, and the policy can always be reviewed later.

***A motion was made by Legislator Pullen, seconded by Legislator Graves and carried to establish a parking policy for the lot behind the County Office Building to restrict parking to County vehicles, Department Heads, emergency vehicles, handicapped, and transitional employees coming and going multiple times during the day for work-related activities with permits from the County Administrator/Department of Public Works, such policy to be communicated to employees (opposed by Legislator Fanton). Prepare Resolution***

County Treasurer Terri Ross commented on the poor lighting in some of the parking lots, particularly the Baptist Church lot. With the time change and staff having to work until 5:00, it is dark when they go to their cars.

Committee Chairman Pullen suggested that the committee consider other policies. One issue is that the main front lot should be only for the public. It was noted that the signs are still there for 30-minute and 60-minute parking, but the "public only" regulation is hard to enforce, because the people working here are also members of the public. Committee Chairman Pullen commented that it's a mark against us if members of the public come and can't find spots because employees are parking in that lot. Given the research that Deputy County Administrator Mitch Alger did, there's not enough parking to meet all of our projected needs. We need to address that. Do we want to have space reserved for a monthly fee? If so, is there enough space, or do we look at constructing an area? Legislator Graves referred to the parking in the back lot and felt it would be prudent to just let it settle out on its own. We should open up areas and craft a policy around how it's being used and manage it, keeping it as simple as possible, then readdress it in a few months. Legislator Cady felt that there will be enough room. County Attorney Thomas Miner expressed his appreciation for the committee's consideration of allowing Department Heads to park in the back lot, but noted that he would continue to walk from the lower lot for the health benefit and as a way to encourage those that can to walk, especially those in the front lot, to leave spaces for the public.

## **PUBLIC DEFENDER OFFICE SPACE:**

A referral was received from the Public Safety Committee. The Public Defender's Office is requesting the creation of a Second Assistant Public Defender position, and the Public Safety

Committee referred the matter of office location for this new position to this committee for discussion.

Public Defender Barbara Kelley is proposing using the office which has most recently been used by the Court Facilities Project Construction Manager. It's outside of their secure door, so it's not ideal, but adequate. Ms. Kelley is not asking for the "bubble area" that is being retained by Security, just the two small offices, which she would like to have converted to one. She plans to have the position filled by January 1.

***A motion was made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Fanton and carried to authorize County Administrator John Margeson to communicate with the Sheriff that the space currently occupied by the Project Manager and the space next to it outside the "bubble" is to be made available, with the ultimate decision to be made by Mr. Margeson. Any questions are to be referred back to this committee.***

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, December 7, 2011, at 3 p.m. followed by a tour of the renovated Courthouse spaces.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES AND COUNTY SPACE NEEDS COMMITTEE  
DECEMBER 7, 2011**

**\*\* NOT APPROVED \*\***

---

**Members Present:** D. Pullen, G. Benson, K. Graves, C. Crandall; **Absent:** D. Cady, P. Curran, D. Fanton

**Others Present:** M. Alger, M. Balling (Bovis), D. Button, A. Finnemore, M. Healy, T. Hopkins, J. Margeson, T. Miner, K. Monroe, B. Riehle, D. Roeske, D. Scholes, F. Sinclair, R. Starks, R. Whitney; **Media:** B. Quinn, Wellsville Daily Reporter

**Call to Order:** 3:00 p.m. by Committee Chairman David Pullen

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the meeting of November 2, 2011, were approved following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried.

**COURT FACILITIES PROJECT, CONSTRUCTION MANAGER UPDATE:**

Mark Balling from Bovis Lend Lease presented a final report for the project (copy attached to original minutes). Work is significantly completed. There are a few missing parts that were on the punchlist and a couple of late changes. The exterior door at the ground floor chair lift entrance should be installed this week. They're tracking the items that have been ordered, and Javen is on top of getting that taken care of. There are a few items the County has agreed to do, and would prefer to do, so a value will be assigned for that work. That's one of the change events to be reported later. The closeout of Javen's contract is proceeding. After Mr. Balling's report was printed out on Monday, some of the changes have been resolved, but about 30 remain. Javen is committed to getting those worked out. The paperwork Javen owes the County for the operation and maintenance of equipment is currently at LaBella Associates. That will be returned to Javen and handed over to the County Department of Public Works. We'll eventually get into the warranty date of January 1 when the County officially takes over.

**Budget Review – Anticipated Cost Report:**

The "work in place" for Javen Construction hasn't changed since the last meeting (90.43 percent work that's been invoiced). On their last payment application, they wanted to bill to 95 percent with a 5 percent retainage, but they agreed to 94 percent because there are a lot of changes not processed. Construction Contingency has been reduced by \$85,000, because that money isn't needed for changes at this point. Under Incidental Costs, the driveway cost budget was increased to cover the paving. Javen's portion of the paving that they were to do by contract is reflected in their anticipated changes as a credit, so that's a wash.

Mr. Balling asked if there had been a transfer of funds yet relative to the Alternate Nos. 2 through 4 reimbursement by Office of Court Administration, and County Administrator John Margeson responded that there hadn't been. Mr. Balling noted that the alternates are done, and he'll let OCA know so the transfer can take place.

**Change Event Log (Changes from Last Report):**

Approved Revisions:

- #131 – Repairs to Existing Fan Cool Units – sub-contractor having problems with the older units when doing the control valve change, requiring repair or replacement of parts and adjacent materials – originally estimated at \$5,000, agreed on a value of \$2,961.78

Approximated Revisions (Pending):

- #159 – Revise Building Directory in Security Area – changes had to be made to reflect the changes in spaces from what Javen was told – estimated at \$1,000
- #160 – Credit for Punchlist Items to be Completed by County – estimated at a credit of (\$6,300) – it won't be that much, because Javen ended up doing some of the work they were told they didn't have to do, but there will be a value assigned for the things the County will be doing. The biggest item is the chair lift shaft drywall repairs and painting.

Mr. Balling has a 3/4-page list of “work to complete” items, including the punchlist and the change issues. He spoke with Mr. Bigelow about the security system issues. Everything else involves materials on order, and most of them are relatively small items. There is one item that won't be done until spring that involves some brick that was opened up on the Addition, and when it was replaced, a keystone broke. That will take time to get, and the weather prohibits the work now, so they will come back in the spring.

The bottom line on the total project budget was formerly at \$2 million under budget. After putting in the cost of about \$425,000 for the Buildings & Grounds Maintenance Building, Bovis is projecting close to \$1.6 million under budget.

Anticipated date of completion for most of the remaining items Javen has to address is the end of December. Only a couple of items will take longer due to receipt of materials.

**COURT FACILITIES OPEN HOUSE/RIBBON CUTTING:**

The Open House and Ribbon Cutting for the new and renovated Court Facilities was discussed. The date that appears to work is January 6, 2012, at 12:30 p.m. The event will hopefully include a ribbon cutting and touring of both the Addition and the renovated Courthouse, including not just the Court spaces, but also the other agencies located there (County Treasurer, Real Property Tax Services, Information Technology, Security Center, and Support Collection Unit). It was noted that the County is also doing renovations for Department of Motor Vehicles and Probation. There have been more activities than just work in the Court areas. The total project will end up costing about \$12.9 million, but we've addressed a lot of problems in addition to meeting OCA's requirements. The Open House will be a celebration of a successful completion of a very involved project. A motion was made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried to authorize holding the Open House for the new and renovated Court Facilities on January 6, 2012, at 12:30 p.m.

**PARKING SPACE STATUS UPDATE; DISCUSSION OF REVISED PARKING POLICY:**

Public Works Superintendent David Roeske reported that the Public Works Committee passed the same motion that was made by the Court Facilities and County Space Needs Committee last month regarding the parking policy.

Committee Chairman David Pullen noted that the building on Court Street is gone and the lot has been graveled, but no one is using it, even when there's a shortage of parking. Mr. Roeske felt that was probably just hesitation. When someone starts parking there, more will follow.

Mr. Pullen also asked about conditions in the Baptist Church lot. Last winter there were complaints about puddles and ice. Mr. Roeske stated that it's a gravel lot, and there's going to

be ice and pot holes. The only thing they can do is to fill in with gravel as needed when it thaws enough, but they can't when it's frozen. They do sand and salt it. He'll have the lot checked to see if grading will help.

**FACILITY UPGRADES FOR VARIOUS COUNTY OFFICES – STATUS REPORT:**

Work is being done on various County Offices by Department of Public Works. An update was given for each item listed below by Superintendent David Roeske. He noted that he will be utilizing some of the highway crew during the winter for Buildings and Grounds work.

**Department of Motor Vehicles' New Area in Courthouse Building (former Surrogate Court Clerk and Treasurer Accounting areas):** The painting is done, the floor is scheduled to be done next week, and Public Works should be finished with their work by the end of the month. After they get the furniture and workstations installed, Department of Motor Vehicles will be ready to move in (County Clerk is scheduling the workstation installation).

**New District Attorney's Office Area in Courthouse Addition:** This space will be started after Public Works is finished with the DMV space.

**Work on Probation Department Area:** This project will be shoved back until later next year. Probation Director Robert Starks noted that he submitted the Purchase Order for the high-density storage unit. He was told it would take four to six weeks after they received that PO to install it, so that will probably be January. They have the space for that, and they'll be able to get rid of all the old cabinets, which will help a lot until Public Works is able to do the rest of the work. The money for the storage units is coming out of this year's budget.

**Renovation of Former Support Collection Unit Building in Front Parking Lot Area:** Support Collection staff was just recently moved out of this building. Public Works won't do much with it until after the first of the year. They'll do an evaluation of the building and put together a bid and spec to have the asbestos taken care of. Committee Chairman David Pullen asked if there is any proposal for use of the downstairs space in that building. Mr. Roeske noted that it's still being used for storage, and he wasn't sure what Social Services' plans are for what they have stored there. Record storage is Craig Braack's responsibility, so we'll have to see how things play out. Mr. Roeske noted that he won't know if there is any asbestos in the basement until after the inspection. Legislator Graves commented on handicapped accessibility.

**Utilization of Former Sheriff Area for Second Assistant Public Defender Office:** The Public Defender needs that area the first part of January, so Public Works will try to get the two rooms involved put together as one before the end of the year.

**Changes in Former Support Magistrate Area on Ground Floor of County Office Building (formerly Room 8) for Use by Social Services Foster Care Program:** Mr. Roeske hasn't seen any plan yet for renovation of this space.

**Renovations to Former District Attorney's Office Space on Second Floor of County Office Building for Use by County Attorney's Office and DPW:** Public Works can't do anything on this space until the new area for the District Attorney in the Courthouse Addition is finished.

**Proposed Changes to Elevator Shaft and Facilities Serving Former Jail Area to Provide Access to All Four Floors of County Office Building:** Public Works will start working on the elevator next year.

**Maintenance Building:** The shell is almost completed. Public Works will be working on the inside of that building as time allows.

**Records Storage Building:** Public Works is working on the inside. As soon as the lights and the heating and cooling system are finished, they'll get the walls done, and that building will be usable, hopefully by March. The siding won't be done until spring.

**BUILDING ACCESS:**

The Public Safety Committee has been addressing matters regarding access into the buildings, but the issue hasn't been referred to this Committee.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, January 4, 2012, at 3 p.m.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m. following a motion made by Legislator Graves, seconded by Legislator Benson and carried.

Respectfully submitted,  
Adele Finnemore, Deputy Clerk of the Board