I. CALL TO ORDER

Mrs. Ferratella called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 12, 2017, MEETING MADE BY MR. MALTER. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETTEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0. (MR. HAURYSKI VOTING MEMBER)

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. County Manager

1. Contract for Fiber Install – We would like to contract with Empire for the fiber runs from this building to the new building and to Records Storage Building. They have quoted a price of $5,740 to run the fiber from this building to the new building. We are waiting to hear a price to run it to the Records Storage Building. The maximum cost for the Records Storage Building is $9,500. In talking with Mr. Peaslee and Mr. Rose, they are working on a solution with Empire that might be less costly.

Mr. Wheeler requested authorization to spend up to $9,500 to run fiber from this building to the Records Storage Facility and up to $6,000 to run the fiber to the New Office Building. We do have money available in the building capital project.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO CONTRACT WITH EMPIRE TO RUN FIBER FROM THE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING TO THE NEW OFFICE BUILDING FOR A COST NOT TO EXCEED $6,000 AND TO RUN FIBER FROM THE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING TO THE RECORDS STORAGE CENTER FOR A COST NOT TO EXCEED $9,500 AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT FOR THESE SERVICES OUT OF THE NEW OFFICE BUILDING CAPITAL PROJECT MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MR. HAURYSKI. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0. (MR. HAURYSKI VOTING MEMBER)
2. **Court Space Study** – Mr. Wheeler informed the committee that they received a dozen applications to look at the space we have, as well as utilizing the third floor of the new office building. We are looking for conceptual drawings and diagrams of potential options. This is something that we do not have a choice; we are required by the State Office of Court Administration to provide adequate space for the courts and this is something that we need to do. After going through the applications, we interviewed SWBR and Labella. Mr. Wheeler commented State OCA is recommending Labella to provide conceptual drawings and diagrams at a cost not to exceed $34,000. The proposal from SWBR came in at approximately $24,000. Based on the proposals submitted, the County’s and the court’s history with Labella, and the emphatic recommendation of the State, he would recommend contracting with Labella for a cost not to exceed $34,000.

Mr. Malter asked will the State pick up the cost of this? Mr. Wheeler replied no. There is some rearranging of offices that needs to be done and the courts are really looking for another big courtroom. Another reason to engage Labella is they have a deep history with the Rochester Office of Court Administration with state court buildings. They may have creative ways to find some funding. If we construct something, OCA would pay us rent, however, they will not pay the capital cost.

**MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO CONTRACT WITH LABELLA FOR CONCEPTUAL DRAWINGS AND DIAGRAMS FOR COURT OFFICE SPACE IN THE CURRENT COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING AS WELL AS THIRD FLOOR OF THE NEW COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING FOR A TOTAL COST NOT TO EXCEED $34,000 MADE BY MR. HAURYSKI. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0. (MR. HAURYSKI VOTING MEMBER)**

Mr. Haurski stated that he would like to get a consensus of the Legislators present on a proposal for the court system to use our Legislative Chambers and to move the Legislature Chambers and offices across the street to the third floor of the new building. Mr. Wheeler stated this is one of the things OCA had mentioned and it would be the easiest option.

Mr. Malter asked would all of the administrative offices move? Mr. Wheeler replied yes, it would include the County Manager, and potentially the Planning Department and the Law Office. The Office of Court Administration will insist on a courtroom in this building and some offices will be moved. Mr. Haurski commented this option made more sense.

3. **Hornell Courthouse** – Mr. Malter asked what is the status of the Hornell Courthouse? Mr. Wheeler replied the City of Hornell did not record the deed. City Council did authorize acceptance of the building and they have had some interested parties, however, Mr. Wheeler told the City he would give them a little more time, but it will not be too long before we go to auction. Mr. Van Etten stated he would tell the City that they have until April 1st.

4. **Records** – Mr. Malter asked for the status on the Records Storage Center. Mr. Wheeler stated Mr. Rose, Mr. Alger and Mr. Webb have been working with Mrs. Gamet and they should be doing the move in the next week or two.

**MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. VAN ETEN. SECONDED BY MR. HAURYSKI. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0.**

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman  
Deputy Clerk  
Steuben County Legislature
I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2018, MEETING MADE BY MR. SCHU, SECONDED BY MR. MALTER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. County Manager

1. Project Update – Mr. Webb informed the committee that the Records Storage Facility is substantially complete and records are currently being stored there. There is exterior finishing work that needs to be done, and will be completed as weather permits.

Mr. Webb stated construction on the new office building is going well. The mechanical, plumbing and electrical systems are in and the permanent power is on. The exterior brickwork will begin Thursday and they will start on the South side of the building and work around the East and West sides and finally the North to give Verizon time to complete their work. They are using radiant heat to heat the building and have begun tiling the bathrooms, installing flooring and working on the front staircase. The first and second floor corridors are scheduled for flooring next week. Everything is coming together and they are looking at a completion date of August 1, 2018. Substantial completion should be the middle of July and we can start moving in July 15, 2018. Mr. Webb stated the elevator work will start next week and take about three to four weeks. The overall project is still within budget.

Mr. Wheeler commented Mr. Webb and his team has been fantastic. Mr. Rose and his crew have also done a great job.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked are we talking about possibly using the third floor? Mr. Wheeler replied we are scheduling meetings with departments and have already had the kickoff meeting with the courts and Labella. We need to do a detailed space analysis. This will end up being a separate project.
Mr. Van Etten stated financially the project budget was $8.7 million and we are under budget; does that include contingencies? Mr. Wheeler replied we have used quite a bit of the contingency. The total project budget is $8.9 million if you include the Records shelving. We are down to $10,000 - $15,000 with the contingencies out. There were some unexpected costs such as the unsuitable soil and the addition of the third floor.

Mr. Swackhamer asked what was the contingency? Mr. Wheeler replied $60,000. Mr. Webb commented we expect some minor additions that would be in the area of $1,500 - $2,000. He cannot see anything else big coming in at this point. Mr. Swackhamer commented they have done a good job.

2. **Hornell Courthouse** – Mr. Wheeler stated that he and the Ms. Prossick have had conversations with the City of Hornell on where they stand with taking the courthouse. We were finally able to find the resolution that the City of Hornell adopted in December. According to the resolution, the City of Hornell is in possession and the position in a legal sense is that they already accepted the property. We were notified by the City of Hornell that there were some individuals interested in the courthouse and there are a couple of options. We originally gave the City until April 1, 2018 to make a decision. Mr. Wheeler commented the committee can stay with that recommendation and we can have the Law Department send a letter stating that they have a certain number of days to record the deed and accept the property or we will proceed with a public auction. The other option is to give them more time.

Ms. Lattimer stated she would not give them more time. Mr. Van Etten stated he wouldn’t either. Mr. Wheeler stated we had a deal with the City of Hornell and for a number of reasons, they chose not to complete the final step. We will send a letter directing them that they have 10 business days or two weeks to record the deed. This gives them the impetus to get it done. It also gives them time, as we will not be having an auction next week, so they can come back to you. Ms. Lattimer suggested it be 10 business days.

**MOTION:** **DIRECTING THE COUNTY MANAGER AND THE LAW DEPARTMENT TO DRAFT A LETTER TO THE CITY OF HORNELL INDICATING THAT THEY HAVE TEN BUSINESS DAYS TO RECORD THE DEED FOR OWNERSHIP OF THE HORNELL COURTHOUSE BEFORE IT WILL BE PUT UP FOR AUCTION MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MR. SCHU FOR DISCUSSION.**

Mr. Hauryski stated this was brought up back in October. Mr. Wheeler stated you actually made a motion in October or November. Mr. Hauryski stated Mr. Hogan was in charge at that time and he has been after Mr. Wheeler about this almost weekly since then. The City has put this off and he is tired of dancing around.

Mr. Malter commented Mr. Griffin has indicated to him that he is not interested in the building.

Mr. Donnelly stated we will put a placeholder in the tax auction and it will sell in the sequence that it normally would. We can also take it out of the auction if you choose. Mr. Van Etten asked given the nature of the building, would it be better to keep it separate? Mr. Donnelly replied we could probably get someone to sell it right on site.

Ms. Prossick stated that she spoke with the City Attorney, Joe Pelych, and they have had the deed signed since December 19, 2017. He said he would get me an answer today.

**VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION:** **ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**

3. **Moving Costs** – Mr. Van Etten asked do you have any idea of the cost to the County to move into the new building? Mr. Wheeler replied we have been using the Mobile Work Crews. The furniture will be difficult. We did budget new furniture for the conference areas into the budget. The voting machines, there is a cost every time you move them, however, now we will have a loading dock system so it should be easier.
MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MR. SCHU. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature
**MINUTES**

COMMITTEE: Robin K. Lattimer, Chair Carol A. Ferratella, Vice Chair John V. Malter
Brian C. Schu Gary D. Swackhamer Scott J. Van Etten

STAFF: Jack K. Wheeler Mitchell Alger Pat Donnelly
Tammy Hurd-Harvey Jennifer Prossick

LEGISLATORS: Kelly H. Fitzpatrick Frederick G. Potter Gary B. Roush

OTHERS: Mary Perham

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 10, 2018, MEETING MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MRS. FERRATELLA. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. County Manager

1. Project Update – Mr. Wheeler informed the committee that they will be going through the punch list next week. The inside looks great and the brickwork is almost done. The curbing will next start week.

2. Furniture – Mr. Wheeler requested authorization to spend up to $25,000 out of the Office Space Capital Project to purchase tables and chairs for the conference rooms in the New Office Building. These will be purchased off State contract.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO SPEND UP TO $25,000.00 FROM THE OFFICE SPACE CAPITAL PROJECT TO PURCHASE TABLETS AND CHAIRS FOR THE CONFERENCE ROOMS IN THE NEW OFFICE BUILDING MADE BY MR. MALTER. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETten. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

3. Other

MOTION: TO ADJOURN REGULAR SESSION AND RECONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC OFFICERS’ LAW, ARTICLE 7§ 105.1.H. THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION, SALE OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY OR THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF SECURITIES, OR SALE OR EXCHANGE OF SECURITIES HELD BY SUCH PUBLIC BODY, BUT ONLY WHEN PUBLICITY WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECT THE VALUE THEREOF MADE BY MRS. FERRATELLA. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETten. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.
MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER ADJACENT TO THE NEW OFFICE BUILDING TO PURCHASE A LITTLE LESS THAN 1 ACRE PARCEL MADE BY MR. SCHU. SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE TO REMOVE THE HORNELL COURTHOUSE, PARCEL #151.71-04-013.000 FROM THE 2018 PROPERTY TAX SALE MADE BY MR. SCHU. SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN EXECUTIVE SESSION AND RECONVENE IN REGULAR SESSION MADE BY MR. SCHU. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETTEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MR. MALTER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature
I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 10:25 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 12, 2018, MEETING MADE BY MR. MALTER. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETTEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Project Update – Mr. Wheeler stated the project is going great. The paving and striping of the parking lot is done and they will be finishing up concrete work tomorrow. We are down to the punch list items. The project is under budget and everything is on track. We will start moving in relatively short order. The Records Storage Facility is looking good. We are in the process of finalizing quotes for signage. We are looking to purchase ADA compliant signs, office signs and outdoor signage. Additionally, we are working on the sound system and meeting with vendors. He stated they could put together an A/V system on our own, but we wanted vendors to provide quotes.

Mr. Wheeler stated the court space study is in process. We recently had a phone conference with the courts and LaBella. During that conference we were updated on the status and we were able to review and discuss potential options. Within the next two weeks there will be another review and sometime in August we will get the draft report and start presenting options to the Legislature. It will be a challenge; however, the courts have been very good.

Mr. Swackhamer asked do we charge the courts for space? Mr. Wheeler replied we do charge rent and they pay a portion of any upgrades. Mr. Swackhamer asked how will you recoup charges for this project? Mr. Wheeler replied you won’t. You would just adjust the rent based upon the square footage. We get $1 million right now. We may get a little more, but you will be paying for any changes. They will essentially be adding another courtroom and a hearing room, which will mean a little more space.
Ms. Lattimer asked when will you start moving departments into the new building? Mr. Wheeler replied we are looking at the last week of this month. Cornell Cooperative Extension may be a bigger move. Mr. Rose is coordinating his staff and the mobile work crew. We will need our certificate of occupancy before we start any significant moving.

Mr. Swackhamer asked what about the records at the Records Center? Mr. Wheeler replied we have most of the records moved. We still do not have Mrs. Gamet’s office moved yet, but the office desk and related supplies have been ordered. We did give our 90-day notice to Centers, but we have not heard from them. We will be moved into the new Records Storage Facility by September at the latest.

B. Hornell Courthouse – Mr. Wheeler stated there has been a lot of discussion over the past year. We had an arrangement with then Mayor Hogan, before we moved the DMV to the North Hornell/Hornellsville location, and the City of Hornell was willing to take ownership of the Courthouse because they had a developer who was interested in the property. In October, we went through the process of transferring the property and the City never recorded the deed. We have been trying to work with the City and it does not look like that will happen anytime soon. We have communicated with the City, but the County cannot wait forever to see what the disposition of the property will be.

Mr. Wheeler stated his recommendation is to rescind the deed transfer to the City of Hornell and move toward putting the Courthouse up for public sale.

MOTION: RESCINDING THE DEED TRANSFER TO THE CITY OF HORNELL RELATIVE TO THE HORNELL COURTHOUSE, AND DIRECTING THE COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE TO PUT SAID PROPERTY UP FOR PUBLIC SALE MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MR. MALTER FOR DISCUSSION.

Ms. Lattimer commented this committee had previously discussed taking this action if there was no movement. Mr. Wheeler replied you have. In our view, they own the Courthouse and have not recorded the deed. The city’s view is that we own it. Mr. Potter commented it sounds like they don’t want to take ownership unless they have someone going in.

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0. Resolution Required.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN REGULAR SESSION AND RECONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC OFFICERS’ LAW, ARTICLE 7§105.1.H. THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION, SALE OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY OR THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF SECURITIES, OR SALE OR EXCHANGE OF SECURITIES HELD BY SUCH PUBLIC BODY, BUT ONLY WHEN PUBLICITY WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECT THE VALUE THEREOF MADE BY MR. MALTER. SECONDED BY MRS. FERRATELLA. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN EXECUTIVE SESSION AND RECONVENE IN REGULAR SESSION MADE BY MR. MALTER. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETTEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF A 76’x80’ PARCEL OF PROPERTY LOCATED ON 12 EAST MORRIS STREET FOR $23,000.00, PLUS THE COUNTY REMOVING TREES, ADDING A FENCE AND POURING A CONCRETE SLAB, CONTINGENT UPON SUBDIVISION APPROVAL BY THE VILLAGE OF BATH MADE BY MRS. FERRATELLA. SECONDED BY MR. MALTER. MOTION CARRIES 4-1. (MR. SWACKHAMER OPPOSED).

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. SWACKHAMER. SECONDED BY MR. MALTER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Respectfully Submitted by Amanda L. Chapman, Deputy Clerk, Steuben County Legislature
STEUBEN COUNTY ADHOC OFFICE SPACE COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, October 9, 2018  
11:30 a.m.  
Legislative Committee Room  
Steuben County Office Building  
Bath, New York  

**MINUTES**

**COMMITTEE:** Robin K. Lattimer, Chair  
Carol A. Ferratella, Vice Chair  
John V. Malter  
Gary D. Swackhamer  
Scott J. Van Etten  

**STAFF:** Jack K. Wheeler  
Mitchell Alger  
Tammy Hurd-Harvey  
Jennifer Prossick

**LEGISLATORS:** K. Michael Hanna  
Hilda T. Lando  
Frederick G. Potter  
Thomas J. Ryan

**ABSENT:** Brian C. Schu

**OTHERS:** Mary Perham

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 12, 2018 MEETING MADE BY MR. MALTER, SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER, ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. County Manager

1. **SEQR** – Mr. Wheeler stated this committee authorized the purchase of the 18 East Morris Street property and as part of that, we need to do a SEQR Type 1 Unlisted action and designate Planning as the lead agency.

MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COMMENCEMENT OF A SEQR, TYPE 1 ACTION ON THE MORRIS STREET PROPERTY AND DESIGNATING THE STEUBEN COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT AS LEAD AGENCY MADE BY MR. MALTER, SECONDED BY MRS. FERRATELLA, ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

2. **New Office Building Annex Opening** – Mr. Wheeler announced they will be holding the new building opening on Thursday, October 11th from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. MALTER, SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman  
Deputy Clerk  
Steuben County Legislature
**MINUTES**

COMMITTEE: Robin K. Lattimer, Chair  Carol A. Ferratella, Vice Chair  John V. Malter  
Brian C. Schu  Gary D. Swackhamer

STAFF: Jack K. Wheeler  Mitchell Alger  Alan Reed  
Tammy Hurd-Harvey  Matt Sousa  Brenda Mori  
Pat Donnelly  Jennifer Prossick

LEGISLATORS: Joseph J. Hauryski  Frederick G. Potter

ABSENT: Scott J. Van Etten

OTHERS: Mark Kukuvka, LaBella  Carla Grace, LaBella

I.  CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

II.  APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION:  APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 9, 2018, MEETING MADE BY MRS. FERRATELLA. SECONDED BY MR. MALTER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III.  NEW BUSINESS

A. County Manager

1. Parking Lot Lease – Mr. Wheeler stated 20 months ago we entered into a lease with Jay Dickson for additional parking. That lease expired at the end of October. He recommended extending the lease under the same terms and conditions for an annual price of $4,000.

Mr. Malter asked has this been built into the budget? Mr. Wheeler replied we will pay for it out of the capital project.

MOTION:  AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO EXTEND THE LEASE FOR PARKING WITH JAY DICKSON FOR ONE YEAR FOR A COST OF $4,000 MADE BY MR. SCHU. SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Swackhamer asked do we have a time schedule for the other property? Mr. Wheeler replied they have not heard back yet. Ms. Lattimer asked for the status on the parking lot extension. Mr. Wheeler stated the abstract is back and now they will do the survey and go through the application for subdivision. We will not be able to do anything until the beginning of spring.

Mr. Swackhamer asked are you keeping a budget on the extra costs? Mr. Wheeler replied yes. Mr. Swackhamer stated he would like to see everything, including labor and materials. He stated that for him he believes it would
be safer to hire someone to have the trees taken down. Mr. Wheeler stated we can look at it. We do have trimming to do around the complex and we could see if they would take down those trees as well.

2. Court Space Study – Mr. Kukuvka provided a handout and PowerPoint presentation of the Court Space Study. Last month, the group had wanted to know the existing space as well as the proposed new space and we have provided a graphic representation of the phasing. Each phase has to be completely done and occupied before the next phase begins. This is only a study, but we are guessing the timeframe could be as soon as 47 – 48 months on an aggressive schedule, or up to 60 months or higher. Mr. Kukuvka stated if you bid all of the phases at once, he would think there would be some savings. You would bid as one contract with the understanding that there are phases.

Mr. Malter stated on the program summary you reference net square footage and gross square footage. What is the difference? Mr. Kukuvka replied net square footage is what we call the carpet area, inside the walls. The gross square footage includes hallways, walls, etc.

Mr. Wheeler stated if you separate out what is for the courts, the additional reimbursable space would be 4,500 square feet. We get reimbursed $176,000 right now, which does not include any renovations. The square foot reimbursed is different in every space. You had asked what it would be now and if we use the current rate, we may get an extra $25,000 per year.

Mr. Malter asked would the reimbursement be on the net or gross square footage? Mr. Wheeler replied that is for the court space. When we take out all the others and just look at the court space, they are getting an additional 4,500 square feet or so.

Mr. Kukuvka reviewed the proposed floor plans and the phasing schedule. Mr. Malter asked has the square footage for the Public Defender, County Attorney and District Attorney been increased? Mr. Wheeler replied yes. Mr. Kukuvka stated we tried to right-size and did a head count in each of the departments. Mr. Wheeler asked does this include the additional staff with Raise the Age? Mr. Kukuvka replied yes.

Mr. Swackhamer asked when will we see the proposed layout for the Legislature? Mr. Kukuvka replied we have not been hired beyond this study. We would do the designs at all once. There will be three phases, if the Legislature approves the plan. You will have multiple meetings with the user groups for concepts. There will be steps along the way and more detailed budgets as you move forward. Because of the complexity, it will take one year to design it. He would suggest that you bid the entire project all at once. Swing space will be an important issue.

Mr. Malter asked construction would begin 2020? Mr. Kukuvka replied yes. Mr. Wheeler commented if we got aggressive, we may be able to start construction at the end of 2019. Mr. Kukuvka stated it will take at least five weeks for the bidding process. There will be two months between the date you bid and the date you award. Then we will need to get the contracts in order. So, that could be three months for the bidding and award process. You would only be moving one department twice, and that is a court function. Mr. Kukuvka reviewed the probable costs summary by construction level.

Mr. Malter commented it looks like the project will be over a four-year period so we wouldn’t have to budget it all at once. Mr. Kukuvka replied we may be able to get something from the Office of Court Administration for this, and that is something they will look into. When you award the project together, you will have to have the money encumbered in order to award it.

Mr. Malter asked we do not really have a choice, do we? Mr. Wheeler replied no. Ms. Lattimer commented looking at the schematics and her conclusion, all we can really do is try to control the cost. We are not going to nitpick and move departments around and she is relying on the architects to do that. Mr. Malter stated his only concern is that he feels the Law Department should be located by the Legislature, but apparently there is no room.
Ms. Lattimer asked the committee for their thoughts. Mr. Schu stated that he agrees with Ms. Lattimer; this is a mandatory project and the key is to hold down the costs.

Mr. Hauryksi asked what are the next steps? Mr. Wheeler replied in the past you have done a resolution authorizing the project. At the last meeting you selected a plan and he doesn’t think you really need to formalize that, other than the next step which would be securing the contract for architectural and engineering services. This contract will be for the high-level schematics; we will have to get the costs for that and then discuss procurement.

Mr. Hauryksi asked what is the timeframe? Mr. Wheeler replied we could have a meeting next month. If we need to do an RFP, we can hold a special meeting prior to the November Legislative Meeting.

Mr. Swackhamer commented that he thinks we should keep this in the same committee. This committee was formed for this reason. Ms. Mori commented you will need action for the project from the Legislature; you will need actual authorization. Mr. Wheeler commented in his view what you do in moving forward with this project is get authorization when you get to the point of financing. You have enough in the Fund Balance, that you could transfer unrestricted fund balance into the capital project. Mr. Reed stated you may want to confirm that the committee has the authorization. Ms. Mori stated the initial contract was for the Annex and Records Storage Building. Now this is a separate project. Mr. Wheeler stated it is a separate project, but the decision point is to contract for engineering services. Ms. Mori stated I do not want you to run into issues with the other Legislators not having input.

Mr. Swackhamer stated we need to do something. We have been in contact and the Legislators have known this was coming. Mr. Hauryksi stated at the last Chairmen’s meeting they all saw this presentation. Mr. Malter commented they just need the new update. Ms. Lattimer asked Mr. Wheeler to send out the new presentation materials to all Legislators via email. Mr. Malter asked why are we waiting at this point for the design work? Mr. Wheeler replied we need to confirm the process. If it is an easy answer, we could bring it back for a special meeting prior to the November Legislative Meeting.

**MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. MALTER. SECONDED BY MR. SCHU. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature
I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and asked Mr. Ryan to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. County Manager

1. Extending Contract with LaBella for Architectural and Engineering Services – Mr. Wheeler stated an email was sent out about two weeks ago outlining the proposal for the court space renovations. He stated he received LaBella’s proposal for design phase services, bidding and construction administration for the court space renovations and distributed it to the committee. These costs outlined in the handout are in line with what he was expecting.

Mr. Wheeler stated that after discussing this with the Law Department, Purchasing and others, our recommendation is that extending the contract with LaBella is most efficient and cost effective. You could put out an RFP for this, however, their costs are 9.25 percent of the proposed construction cost, which is in line with the industry standard. This proposal is for $620,000 for a five-year commitment. With your current contract, including outstanding billing, you have $700,000 which is for a two-year commitment.

Mr. Wheeler explained LaBella has included additional services in this proposal, some you may use and some you may not. An example is engineered drawings or existing conditions, which you may not need. Most of the rest of the services, you would need to talk about as you could have a construction manager do that. He would recommend engaging the services of a construction manager in the near future for this project. He recommended the committee authorize extending the contract with LaBella for a maximum of an additional $620,000 with the optional items being required to come back before the committee for approval.
MOTION:  WAIVING THE PROCUREMENT POLICY AND AUTHORIZING THE EXTENSION OF THE CONTRACT WITH LABELLA FOR ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATIVE TO THE COURT SPACE RENOVATION PROJECT FOR A MAXIMUM OF AN ADDITIONAL COST OF $620,000 WITH ADDITIONAL OPTIONAL ITEMS BEING REQUIRED TO COME BEFORE THE ADHOC OFFICE SPACE COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN.  SECONDED BY MR. MALTER FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Van Etten asked where will this $620,000 come from?  Mr. Wheeler replied you have $700,000 - $750,000 in the ad hoc building project, and $250,000 budgeted in the 2019 budget.  There is enough to cover costs for a couple of years.

Mr. Van Etten commented there is $133,000 for construction administration, but it seems like that would be paid to the construction manager that we would hire.  Mr. Wheeler replied it is, but Labella was here frequently during the construction project of the Annex Building/Records Storage Facility.

Ms. Lattimer asked have you projected the cost of a construction manager?  Mr. Wheeler replied no.  The prices are all over the board, but with a potential five-year project, you would be looking at $300,000 - $400,000.  Mr. Van Etten commented the one we had for this project did a great job.  Mr. Wheeler stated he will come back to the committee with options for that.  We will need to do an interview process and at that time will let them know that it will be a long project, but it would not be necessary for them to be here every day for five years.

Mrs. Ferratella stated LaBella has worked with us a number of times and did the study for the reuse of the old Health Care Facility.  Ms. Prossick stated that is part of the resolution that you will consider at this morning’s Legislative meeting. We are recommending waiving the procurement process as LaBella has the experience and background of working with the County on previous projects.  Ms. Lattimer commented that would be her concern with putting this out for an RFP; the costs would really increase with a different firm.  Mr. Wheeler stated there would be months of additional work if a different engineer were to come in.  Mr. Van Etten commented that he does not think you want to start over.  We were also told that LaBella has a good working relationship with the Office of Court Administration (OCA).  Mr. Wheeler replied LaBella has done four or five of the most recent court renovation projects in the State.  That relationship with OCA is important to us and to the courts.  The courts are very comfortable with LaBella.

Mr. Malter stated the only problem he has is once we do this, we will have filled up every space and there will be no room for future expansion.  Mr. Wheeler replied it will be close, but you will still have the South Conference Room that could be used for flex space.  Mr. Malter asked if we need 45,000 square feet for the courts, is there an option to build a new building just for that space requirement and could we do it for $6 million?  Mr. Wheeler replied he would guess no.  An initial look is that it would cost much more than that.  The Annex was an $8 million project and was 10,000 less square feet.  The second part is we currently do not have any land.  Then you are talking about going out to the County farm and then needing to relocate departments out there.  Mr. Malter commented you have options across the street.  Mr. Wheeler replied you do.

Mrs. Ferratella stated you will be moving people whether you build a new building or not.  Mr. Malter stated the biggest issue for moving departments was that the District Attorney was adjacent to the courts.  Mr. Wheeler stated if you build a new building, the State will want all of the court operations under one roof.

Mr. Van Etten stated if we spend the money we will not have any open space.  Do you want open space?  Mr. Malter stated we built the third floor on the annex for future use and now we are looking at using that.  Mr. Van Etten stated we decided to add the third floor because we knew there would be issues with space in the future.  Mr. Malter stated if we had known before we could have used the annex building because it would have been big enough for the courts.  Maybe we should have been apprised of that need earlier.  Mr. Wheeler replied the courts never put us on notice until after we started the project.  In 2014, they were talking about adding a hearing room or two.  Then it blossomed.

Mr. Mullen distributed a handout with his written comments regarding this, a copy of which is on file in the Clerk of the Legislature’s Office.  He stated he was not able to come to the last meeting in November, but the minutes stated this project was already approved.  None of us were aware of the scope of this until November.  All I have seen is one option.
I would like to see additional options that show potential cost savings. Mr. Malter talked about a potential building somewhere else. Someone had suggested building out by the Jail so we wouldn’t have the transportation costs. Maybe we should consider combining this with the detention facility. Mr. Mullen stated he was floored that all of a sudden we are looking at a $5 million project. His request is that we be given other options. At the Chair’s meeting last month, he had asked for an explanation of why the moves that were proposed needed to be done. That was something that was said LaBella would do.

Ms. Lattimer stated she is not sure how to respond. We were given one proposal that LaBella provided that was the best option. She doesn’t know if any other options were on the table due to the requirements of OCA. Mr. Wheeler explained you have a fixed footprint to work with. Building a new facility will be far more expensive. We are working with a limited footprint where we are trying to plug things in and each has a resulting option. Maybe we could have kept the committee more apprised, but he believes they did. As staff, part of our role is to have these discussions on your behalf and present them to you.

Ms. Lattimer commented it became clear to her that this is not her area of expertise. LaBella presented what they felt was the most cost effective plan that compromised with OCA. Mr. Mullen asked does the committee know what OCA is requiring? Mr. Wheeler replied this is a bare bones representation of what OCA is requiring. This is the compromise. They wanted everything under one roof and that is not feasible. This plan is what we came up with as a compromise. Ms. Lattimer stated she is not questioning the dynamics of how they are moving departments. Our only job at this point is to watch the cost. That is really the only thing we have control over.

Mr. Malter asked with this proposal, are we putting all of the court system under one roof? Mr. Wheeler replied there will still be a courtroom on the third floor of the Courthouse. They wanted to move Probation out, but we are not going to do that. If you want to build another building, then we can complete a redesign scope. Ms. Lattimer commented if we build a new building the costs will skyrocket.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked was the committee involved with the negotiations with OCA? Mr. Van Etten replied no, we hired a professional architect to do that for us. They sat with Mr. Wheeler and staff. You do not want all of us sitting in a meeting with OCA. I do not want to do that as that is not my area of expertise. Mr. Wheeler explained we did that on your behalf. You also had every department head potentially impacted by the project meet with LaBella to give input on their space needs. Ms. Lattimer commented if we build a new building the costs will skyrocket.

Mr. Van Etten stated that he understands Mr. Mullen’s concerns, but this not a want, it is a must. We are being given an edict by the State and if we do not do this, they can require us to build a new building. Mr. Mullen stated I have no idea what OCA would require within this building. I asked if we can get an explanation. It would be nice to know why we are doing all of the things listed. He stated he does not know exactly what OCA is asking. Mr. Van Etten asked what level of detail do you want from OCA? Mr. Mullen stated he wants to know what they are requiring. Mr. Wheeler explained OCA wants to consolidate as much as possible under one roof. They want a drug testing room, a better grand jury room, additional waiting area, a family-children center. They also wanted the District Attorney to be in a different building. The fourth courtroom was included as there may be a fourth judge. Ms. Lattimer stated pretty much what Mr. Wheeler outlined is what OCA is looking for.

Mr. Malter asked are there minutes of those meetings? Mr. Wheeler replied no, we did not keep formal minutes. We can in the future. Mr. Malter stated he was just looking for something that Mr. Mullen could review. Mr. Van Etten asked did the State give you a wish list? Mr. Wheeler replied verbally, the ones that I listed. Their main concern was the consolidation of staff and security. They are currently paying for security at four different locations.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked what would they do if we did not have the funds? Mr. Wheeler replied you would find the funds. Other counties have bonded for it. He stated that Mr. Alger went through this in Allegany County. Mr. Alger stated they were the last county in the State to comply with the law and they ended up with a $12 million project to add a new courthouse and renovate the existing courthouse.
Mrs. Lando commented the City of Corning had to redo their courthouse and it cost the city $500,000 and we didn’t have the money, but we had to do it. Mr. Wheeler stated we could push back, but the relationship thus far has been cordial. The State can force you to do just about anything.

Mr. Hanna asked how long will this last before they will want something else? Mr. Wheeler replied they have been working well with OCA. This building was built in a way that the previous judges wanted. That has worked for 30 years and OCA wants to find a solution that works for the next 30 years.

Mr. Malter stated this proposal doesn’t include a family center. What if the State comes in and says we need to have one? Mr. Wheeler replied something had to be cut, so it was the family center since they needed the drug testing room.

Mr. Swackhamer asked does the committee have the authority to approve this until the Full Board meets? Mr. Wheeler replied yes, the committee has the authority. There is a resolution being presented at this month’s Legislative Meeting that more clearly clarifies the role of the ad hoc committee and ratifies any actions you have taken.

**VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**

**MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. VAN ETSEN. SECONDED BY MR. SWACKHAMER. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.**

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature