I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

II. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Project Update - Mr. Wheeler informed the committee that we have the State (OCA) closer to the approach that we were suggesting for moving forward. The update that Mr. Simbari is going to review with you leaves a little flexibility.

Mr. Simbari reviewed the schematic design incorporating the revisions. Originally we started out with 44,644 of square feet and we have now increased that to 49,258. With this revision, Veterans will remain off site.

County Office Building – 1st Floor
Mr. Simbari stated this floor plan has remained the same as before. The one thing that is not shown on here is the new proposed drop-off area outside of the sally port.

County Office Building – 2nd Floor
Mr. Simbari stated this floor plan has changed slightly as we have shifted some of the court space; Grand Jury in the South Conference Room. We have also left the Law Library in its current location.

Mr. Wheeler stated we were brainstorming to think of what we could go back to that is acceptable to OCA. We are proposing to keep the DA’s Annex for the investigators. This is not ideal as they are not located with the District Attorney, but OCA has indicated they can live with this. We have opted not to move the Law Library in an effort to save money. Mr. Simbari stated with the Grand Jury Room, we looked at what we could do to try to cut costs and the Law Library was one piece of that. The other piece was to try to share the 3rd floor of the Courthouse with OCA and they were against that. They however liked the idea of moving the Grand Jury to the South Conference Room area. He stated that OCA indicated to us that they were offered a permanent 4th judge but they turned that down as there was not enough space, but they foresee that happening in the future. They would prefer to have everything in the County Office Building, but are willing to make concessions.
Mr. Wheeler stated this is a base design with a list of expensive options. The District Attorney does not think this plan is efficient as he will be in the Courthouse and Grand Jury would be in the main building. It does meet OCA requirements, so we are calling this floor plan the base bid and will talk about the “ideals” as alternates.

Mr. Simbari stated with this floor plan we were able to provide them with another area where the breakroom is for a private witness area and file storage. We also redid the space for the County employee break room which will now be located off the main corridor.

**County Office Building – 1st Floor – Public Works**
Mr. Simbari stated there have been no changes to the floor plan for Public Works.

**County Office Building – 1st Floor – Court Security**
Mr. Wheeler stated the only change was the addition of separate women’s and men’s locker room; we currently do not have that now although we have plenty of restrooms. This seems unnecessary, but OCA was adamant that this was needed. These are just changing areas.

**County Office Building – 1st Floor – Surrogate Court Clerk and New Hearing Room**
Mr. Simbari commented this floor plan remains the same.

**County Office Building – 2nd Floor – Supreme/County Court Clerk, Family Court Clerk, Support Magistrate Hearing Rm.**
Most of the floor plan presented at the last meeting remains the same, however, there have been some significant changes to the northwest quadrant, which is where Public Works is currently located. We have included the expansion of the court waiting space into the lobby area and will be moving a door. The court area remains unchanged. The visiting judge and the Drug Coordinator will be located in the back corner along with a small hearing room. We have made a couple of minor revisions with changing doors, the LULA elevator with a pedestrian path to Courtroom 4. With the DA having even greater needs with regard to file storage, we reorganized the handicap lift and introduced two offices for DA use in the connecting link.

**County Office Building – 2nd Floor – DA Annex Space**
Mr. Simbari stated they made minor modifications to this space to incorporate more open work space for the three DA investigators.

**County Office Building – 2nd Floor – Grand Jury & Court Reporters**
Mr. Simbari stated we have put the Grand Jury Room in the former South Conference Room and added toilet rooms.

**Courthouse – District Attorney**
Mr. Simbari commented the 3rd floor remains as is, an OCA courtroom that they are currently using. One of the needs of the DA is to get an inner connecting stair between the 1st and 2nd floor. We will also need to lock out the elevator for 2nd floor access. We will need to reduce the judge’s chambers slightly to incorporate the stairs, although we could switch the judge and court clerk’s office. He stated they reconfigured the link on the second floor to incorporate two additional offices. Also we did modify some things with the DA’s space as they have double the need for storage as they currently store active felony files and will now need to store active misdemeanor files.

Mr. Simbari stated with regard to full-time and part-time offices, the DA thought there might be space in Hornell that he could utilize. One of challenges with the DA’s space is that it is not consolidated into one building. We talked about possibly switching them to the Balcom House, however, that is remote and not connected to the buildings, so that is not a good option.

**Surrogate’s Building/Balcom House – Conflict Defender/County Attorney/Public Defender**
Mr. Simbari stated there have been no changes in the floor plans from the last meeting.
Mr. Simbari stated we have included movable partitions to separate the Chambers area. Everything else remains the same.

**Bid Alternatives**
Mr. Simbari stated we also looked at alternative options for the District Attorney and for the relocation of Courtroom #3. With the alternative bid for the 3rd floor of the Courthouse, the Grand Jury Room stays and that room is only in use one time per month. We modified the perimeter spaces and redesigned it for file space and relocated the conference room. By doing this, OCA would not be located here and this would all become DA space. We included a toilet room and shared areas for the investigators. With the entire building being occupied by the DA, we would not need to build the connecting stairs because they would have the elevator and the link area would remain unchanged. The benefit to this option is that we will not have to do alterations to the other areas of the building and we would be able to accommodate the full program. Additionally, we would include two new handicap accessible toilets. Tied into this is the relocation of Courtoom #3. We have proposed relocating this to what is currently the South Conference Room. Doing this, we would need to relocate the existing equipment storage room. There would also be bench seating down the corridor.

**Design Options**
Mr. Simbari stated with budget issues to deal with, we looked at various design options that could potentially accelerate the schedule. We looked at eight options and have determined that they will not be any better from a cost perspective.

- **Infill COB Courtyard** – At the last meeting the question was asked about building in the courtyard area. The approximate space available is 14,500 square feet and would cost $6.1 million. This is not a feasible option. Mr. Simbari stated they worked with an independent cost estimator to do schematic estimates. The area of the three historic buildings (Courthouse, Balcom House and Surrogate’s) is 15,752 square feet and the cost estimator broke down the cost for each of the buildings. The estimated renovation cost of those three buildings is $2 million and the remainder would be the County Office Building.

  Mr. Schu asked if we expand the assessing function, do we have enough space? Mr. Wheeler replied if we piecemeal the assessing, we do have space for additional cubicles. If you went to countywide assessing, it would be tough. We would be looking at remote sites as the assessors will mostly be out in the field. In the short-term, yes we have space, but for long-term, we would need to look at it.

- **Renovate Existing Bowling Alley** – The approximate square footage of the Bowling Alley is 26,800 and the estimated cost is $7.2 million. This cost does not include the purchase price and a building evaluation would need to be completed.

- **Relocate Public Works into New Pre-Engineered Building** – Mr. Simbari stated we looked at the option of moving Public Works into a pre-engineered, 4,000 square foot building. The estimated cost would be $1 million and would add 1 ½ years to the length of the project. This is a basic building and does not include site costs.

  Mr. Van Etten commented if we were going to go with this option, we should have done this three years ago.

- **Provide Temporary Building for DA’s Office to Accelerate Schedule** – We would need to purchase three modular buildings which would provide 1,800 square feet and cost $226,800.

- **Lease & Renovate Partial Bowling Alley for Temporary Space** – This would give you 5,000 square feet at an approximate cost of $900,000. This may help to simplify and accelerate construction, but is a most costly solution.

- **Reduce Finance Department Size** – Mr. Simbari stated we had discussed potentially reducing the size of the Finance Office, but would need to conduct a program study. This department does need to remain in close proximity to Real Property.
Mr. Wheeler commented we may be able to use some extra space in the back of the department for the assessors.

- **New Court Facility** – A new building with 70,000 square feet to accommodate all court functions. The approximate cost is $31.5 million.

Mr. Simbari stated ultimately after looking at these options, we came back and said that we are on the right path with what is being proposed. He noted there are some scope creep items that total $1.5 million from the original concept estimate. Your construction budget is $5.8 million and these are the items that came out through the reprogram phase and also include any additional items that come up. These items are the LULA elevator, vertical access lift, new rooftop units, new stairs in the Courthouse, Balcom House expanded 2nd floor occupancy, Balcom House 1st floor beams, operable partitions in the Annex Building, inmate drop-off lane, courtroom lobby and waiting room renovations and fire alarm system panel replacement. With the addition of these items, the construction budget is at $7,368,828. Mr. Simbari noted on the handout there is a second column which includes the estimates from the independent cost estimator, Trophy Point.

Mr. Van Etten asked why the difference of your estimate of $7.3 million and the independent estimate of $9.6 million? Why is the HVAC estimate by Trophy Point three times your estimate? Mr. Simbari replied the mechanical estimate was low. We had discussions with the estimators and during the concept design it was very generic and a facility condition assessment was not done. The engineers did a quick walk through and did not look at the systems in any great detail.

Mr. Wheeler explained some of these things are things that Mr. Rose will likely put onto his future five-year capital project list. We are piecemealing the HVAC work. From a budget standpoint, this is not three times LaBella’s estimate, but about $500,000 of the HVAC work was being done anyhow.

Mr. Simbari stated the general construction costs and the costs associated with phasing the project were also estimated low. Last year was a very volatile year for construction and the number estimated for concept design probably was about 20 percent low. There were many projects at the end of last year that were held due to the material price fluctuations. Mr. Wheeler commented you want to be conservative and history has shown us to be conservative.

Mr. Simbari stated the items not included in the project cost are furniture/fixtures/equipment allowance, interior landscape/modular furniture allowance and hazardous materials abatement allowance. Those added items bring our total project cost estimate at $8.4 million and Trophy Point’s estimate at $10.7 million. Mr. Wheeler stated those costs will be reimbursed to a large degree. We have to provide furniture and fixtures to OCA, but they actually pay for it. They have committed to us that they will pay for it. Mr. Simbari stated they are exploring if there are other funds that OCA could provide to the project.

Mr. Van Etten commented if we are moving the courtroom to the County Office Building, we are not receiving a lot of money for the rental? Mr. Wheeler replied you can expect maybe an additional $30,000. Mr. Malter asked if we built a new 70,000 square foot facility, what would be the reimbursement? Mr. Wheeler replied the reimbursement is based on square footage and the reimbursement you receive will not bridge the cost of what you spent. We could ask Yates what they are getting for reimbursement. Mr. Malter stated his feeling is we may be in a position where the court system will come back in four years and tell us what to do. Maybe we should look at building new. Mr. Wheeler stated he has heard the reimbursement is not substantially different, but we will confirm that.

Mr. Mullen commented there may be flexibility with them between what we have now and a new 70,000 square foot building. With a new building we will have a lot of flexibility. Mr. Wheeler replied you could. Yates and Allegany went through this and if you open the door, they are building it their way and they are over building. We have had conversations with OCA and we want to plan for the future and we do not want them coming back in five years. They have told us this is the plan for the future.

Mr. Van Etten commented the 70,000 square feet is a little misleading. If you add up all the square feet in the current design, it is 37,000. Mr. Simbari explained the 70,000 square feet includes circulation space, toilet space, lobbies, etc. Mr. Wheeler stated in Yates, all of the courtrooms are in the interior of the building, but the waiting area is huge. Ms.
Prossick commented in New York State regulations, Article 20, for new builds, the space requirements are very specific. Mr. Wheeler stated the courthouse in Yates has a huge amount of dead space.

Mr. Mullen asked what about a new building on the bowling alley site for non-court functions; would that save on construction costs? Mr. Malter commented you would still have this cost and the cost for a new building. Mr. Van Etten stated he believes that area needs to be a parking lot. Mr. Wheeler stated we will get an estimate for that, along with projected reimbursement, but he has heard the reimbursement for a new building is not substantial; only about $30,000 more per year.

Mr. Van Etten asked with the option of relocating Public Works to a 4,000 square foot building, what was the thought as they currently have 3,000 square feet? Mr. Simbari replied the thought was to build for growth. He commented with regard to the comment of using the bowling alley for non-court functions, we would have to do a study for that. Mr. Wheeler also asked they provide the ROM cost for that. Mr. Mullen commented there would be the value of ample space moving forward. Mr. Wheeler stated you could move DMV, Personnel, OFA, Finance and Real Property. Mr. Simbari stated we will look at that and add to the schematic design.

Mrs. Hurd-Harvey asked have we thought about Mental Health as well? Mr. Wheeler replied we looked at that when we were starting the Annex project and it would have been an additional $15 million to build space for them. The question he has personally had is with the way the system is changing and we are putting more staff in primary care offices, do you build not knowing what the State is doing. Leasing at this point is better.

Mr. Malter stated this design has four courtrooms. Is the fourth courtroom smaller? Mr. Wheeler replied no, it still exceeds the minimum standards. We have had a couple of judges ask for larger chambers. OCA has looked at the design and it accommodates the judges’ needs.

Mr. Swackhamer asked what is the next step? Mr. Wheeler replied we will do the detailed design work for the bid documents. We do not need a final decision, but the committee could make a motion that you are comfortable with the base options for alternatives and then doing a detailed design based on that. Ms. Lattimer commented we still have choices. Mr. Wheeler stated when you are ready to bid, you will have the final numbers. Mr. Simbari stated we will provide you with the final numbers which will include a $1.1 million contingency, and 15 percent for design and construction contingency. The design contingency will decrease as we get further into the project.

Mr. Simbari reviewed the list of optional bid alternates. The first two, relocation of Courtroom #3 and DA expansion to 3rd floor of Courthouse are tied together; if you do one, you have to do the other. The total for those two alternates is estimated at $657,646 and includes soft costs. The third alternate is new finishes in Courtrooms A & B which would total $77,747. Alternate four is replacing the condensing boiler in the County Office Building at a cost of $47,915. Alternates 5 – 8 are the replacement of fan coil units in the County Office Building, Courthouse, Surrogate Building and Balcom House and these costs were included in the original estimates. All of the fan coil units are past their useful lives and are 25 – 30 years old. It seems like the County needs to have as a budget item to replace. Mr. Rose explained the fan coil units are different from the chiller units which we just replaced.

Mr. Malter asked when we bid, are we bidding the base bid and then all of the alternates also? Mr. Wheeler replied that is what we are suggesting. Mr. Simbari commented we kept in the base bid the replacement of the fire alarm system panel in the County Office Building. Mr. Rose stated we have a capital project for the replacement of that panel. Mr. Wheeler explained the panel we have is functional, but is not great. Mr. Simbari stated all of these alternates total $1.7 million.

Project Schedule
Mr. Simbari reviewed the project schedule. He believes they will be able to bid in March 2020, but they will see if they can accelerate that a little. We were able to compress the construction schedule down to 3 1/3 – 3 ½ years from 5 years.

Mr. Malter asked are we assured once this is presented to OCA that they will accept it? Mr. Wheeler replied they have accepted going forward in the next phase with the schematic design with the base bid and alternatives as presented to you today.
MOTION: AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER AND LABELLA TO PROCEED WITH THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN OF THE BASE BID AND ALTERNATES AS PRESENTED MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MR. SCHU FOR DISCUSSION.

Mrs. Ferratella asked with the scope of the project, how much work will Buildings & Grounds be doing? Mr. Wheeler replied they will not be doing a lot of the physical construction. When we get into looking at what we are doing with Veterans long-term, they will be more involved with that. Buildings & Grounds will be involved with some of the internal things such as modifying the F-1 Conference Room for the Risk Manager. They will also be working on moving departments and cleaning.

Ms. Fitzpatrick asked for clarification, is the base bid $10 million plus the addition of the alternates? Mr. Wheeler replied the alternatives would be additional. The estimates for those will get more detailed as we get further along. Ms. Fitzpatrick commented in discussing this with her constituents, there are concerns that we are overspending money. Where is the State’s authority to tell the County to do this? Mr. Wheeler replied it is in State law and regulations. We can provide that reference to all of you.

Mr. Malter asked is the Clerk of the Works included in this cost? Mr. Wheeler replied no that will be an additional cost.

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

Mr. Wheeler stated we will send you the schematic design. Mr. Malter asked that it include the cost for the Clerk of the Works. Mr. Simbari commented we have included $291,000 in soft costs for that.

Mr. Swackhamer asked with all of the school projects taking place, will that increase the cost of the project? Mr. Simbari replied that is a challenge we have. Mr. Wheeler stated if we can get the bids out in February, we could get in ahead of the school projects. Mr. Simbari stated we will try to see if we can accelerate the bid schedule.

Mr. Malter asked how many years are left on the Jail bond? Mr. Wheeler replied two years. There is $350,000 - $375,000 left and will be up in 2021.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MRS. FERRATELLA. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 6-0.
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