

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: MARCH 28, 2006

Committee Members Present: Others Present:

Supervisors Haskell	Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings
O'Connor	William Remington, Superintendent, Dept. of Public Works
F. Thomas	William Lamy, Deputy Superintendent, Dept. of Public Works
Champagne	William Thomas, Chairman
VanNess	Joan Parsons, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services
Geraghty	Joan Sady, Clerk
Girard	Paul Dusek, County Attorney
	Hal G. Payne, Administrator of Westmount Health Facility & Countryside Adult Home
	Carlene A. Ramsey, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist

Mr. Haskell called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty, seconded by Mr. VanNess and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the last meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk.

Mr. Morehouse distributed an Agenda packet to each of the Committee members and a copy is on file with the minutes.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Mr. Remington, who began his report with Agenda Item 2, Referrals. He explained the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors' Office tracked the pending items (or old business) and provided his office with a list each month, as illustrated on page 2 of the Agenda packet. The first 5 items on the list, he stated, were all associated with the Municipal Center renovations and the new addition. Since any further action on each of the items would be tied to the renovations/addition project, he suggested that Items 1 through 5 could be eliminated from the list.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. VanNess and carried unanimously to remove items 1-5 from the Clerk's Pending Items listing.

As for Pending Item 6, Countryside Adult Home Septic System, Mr. Remington invited William Lamy, Deputy Superintendent of DPW to report the status. Mr. Lamy explained a design had been completed by Carl Schroeder, which includes an estimate to connect to the Town of Warrensburg as well as on site disposal. He noted the Town of Warrensburg option was approximately \$800,000, while the onsite disposal option was close to \$300,000.

Mr. Lamy pointed out that from the test holes driven a couple of weeks ago, Mr.

Schroeder was able to determine the ground could support a new septic system. In addition, he noted that Hal Payne, as Administrator of the Countryside Adult Home, would present a request for funds to construct the system to the Westmount Health Facility and Countryside Adult Home Committee meeting later this week.

In the meantime, Mr. Lamy reminded the Committee of its decision to authorize Mr. Remington to seek grant funds to partially fund the project. He pointed out the Planning and Community Development Department had been consulted and a possible funding source may have been located. He said it was his understanding a grant application was being worked on for as much as \$150,000 to be applied against the \$300,000 construction costs.

Mr. Lamy further reported the design was being presented to NYS DEC (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation) later this week and the bid documents should be ready to issue by Monday, April 10, 2006. Following a 3 week advertising period, he stated the bids could be opened on May 4th.

In an effort to expedite the construction process even further, Mr. Lamy presented a resolution request to authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder on the Countryside Adult Home Septic System Project. He noted the contract would be reviewed by the engineer, Superintendent of DPW, and in a form acceptable to the County Attorney.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne and seconded by Mr. Girard to authorize the request as presented.

Mr. Haskell commented that he had originally hoped the work could have been done in house. He said he understood that Mr. Remington felt the scope of the project was intricate enough to warrant hiring outside professionals.

Mr. Champagne urged the Committee to follow Mr. Remington's and Mr. Lamy's recommendations to hire an outside firm to install the new system.

Mr. Geraghty, as Supervisor for the Town of Warrensburg, declared his biggest concern was that the Town wells would NOT be impacted by the new installation. He asked if Mr. Lamy could guarantee the Town would not be faced with a situation similar to the Washington County Fair Grounds well contamination.

Mr. Lamy emphasized there were two major differences: 1) the separation distance of today's standards was being met; and 2) the Town of Warrensburg chlorinates the Town water. However, he said, he could NOT guarantee there would NEVER be a problem. He repeated the new system meets all of today's design standards and will meet all of the criteria established by DEC and DOH (Department of Health). Therefore, he said he felt it was reasonable to expect the combination of design standards and the chlorination process would prevent any adverse effects on the Town wells.

Mr. Remington noted the new system will be relocated to a better area which should further safeguard against interference with the wells. Mr. Lamy invited Mr. Geraghty to visit his Office for a more comprehensive review of the design.

Responding to Mr. Girard's question, Mr. Lamy explained the project was covered under the SPDES (State Pollutant Discharge Eliminations Systems) permit issued to the County. He said the County was allowed to contract with a design engineer to act as an Agent for the County which puts the onus back on the contractor. Which meant the contractor was required to provide certification back to the County that the construction was completed in accordance with the approved plans, he said.

Mr. Lamy pointed out that any and all of the sewer projects have been conducted with the same requirements.

Mr. Girard compared the projected to the failure of the Hadlock Pond Dam in Washington County. He noted there had been confusion over exactly which party was responsible for the final review and he wanted to be sure Warren County avoided such problems.

Mr. Haskell called the question and motion was carried unanimously to authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder on the Countryside Adult Home Septic System Project, provided the contract would be reviewed by the engineer, Superintendent of DPW, and in a form acceptable to the County Attorney; and to authorize a resolution be prepared for the April 13th Board meeting. A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes.

Mr. Remington returned to Pending Item 7, a list of maintenance personnel throughout the County. He noted the last page of the Agenda packet illustrated the staff at Westmount Health Facility, Countryside Adult Home and the Corrections Facility.

Mr. Champagne queried how the maintenance staff was supervised at the Westmount Health Facility and Countryside Adult Home. Mr. Payne noted there was one Maintenance Mechanic at each building who supervised the staff. Mr. Haskell clarified the Maintenance Mechanics both report to Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne pointed out the two laborers at Countryside Adult Home also do housekeeping and van driving duties.

Mr. Remington reported Pending Item 8, "rough draft" of proposed renovations at Municipal Center and building addition, was included with the Agenda packet. He pointed out he had taken the building's floor plan and "wrote in" the proposed changes, which was more legible in the full size drawing. (A written description could be found on page 2 of the RFP.)

Mr. Remington summarized the drawing and noted:

- 1) the Public Health area would become the new home for the County Auditor, Purchasing, Self-Insurance, Planning and miscellaneous offices;

- 2) the Personnel Office would become the Information Technology expansion area.
- 3) the 1st and 2nd floor, the District Attorney, Planning and Tourism Departments would become the new Courts Area;
- 4) the old Sheriff's Offices would become Probation and Public Defender's Offices; with the lobby of the jail would become the Print Shop, Stock Room, Mail Room, Shipping/Receiving, Tourism storage, voting machine storage with a new loading dock;
- 5) the second floor of the jail will have long term storage for furniture and mechanical space for equipment to track the humidity levels required for the voting machines;
- 6) the old Sheriff's garage space would become more short term storage for boxes and auction items;
- 7) the new addition would be home to Personnel, Board of Elections, Fire and Building Code Enforcement, two meeting rooms, Tourism, Real Property expansion and a rest stop area on the 1st floor; and
- 8) the 2nd floor of the addition would be for the Board of Supervisors, County Attorney, Board Room, Committee Room and a break room.

Mr. Remington reminded the Committee all of the changes he just listed were tentative to get the RFP issued for the County Attorney's Office. He acknowledged that ideas and suggestions were sure to follow as the project moves along.

Mr. Morehouse noted the original, full-sized rough draft was available at his office if anyone wanted to review it later on.

Mr. Haskell reported a number of Supervisors had expressed an interest in relocating the Board of Supervisors to the ground floor to facilitate handicapped access.

Mr. Remington commented that he felt the entire County Facilities Committee would want to do a walk through with the consultants to get a better picture of the proposed changes before anything was finalized.

Mr. Morehouse reported on Pending Item 9, "No Weapons" Signs and he stated he was waiting for the County Attorney's Office to advise on how he should proceed. Mr. Dusek explained that his office had not received any notification of the request.

Mr. VanNess stated there had been a discussion regarding what action could be taken if a person who had a permit to carry a concealed weapon entered the building with the weapon in his coat. He said he understood the question was that what would be required to safeguard against weapons being carried into the county buildings.

Mr. Dusek explained the county did not have a current policy or local law on this issue. He said a policy, alone, would not contain any enforcement rights. Therefore, he said, a policy and a local law would be necessary for the Sheriff to have authority to enforce the policy.

Mr. Merlino left the meeting at 1:50 p.m.

Mr. Morehouse clarified he had brought the sign request to the attention of the

Committee because a Public Health nurse had asked that the signs be posted at the Public Health entrances to the Municipal Center.

Mr. Dusek stated that it would be fine to post "No Weapons" signs on the County buildings. However, he cautioned, that he felt the signs would not prevent anyone from violating the policy and he stressed the use of metal detectors was the best solution, if security was the main objective.

Mr. Morehouse pointed out the magnetometer stations had been discussed several times in the past. In addition, he said, the installation had been placed on hold, in view of all pending building renovations and new construction.

Mr. VanNess commented that he felt the County had been put on notice with the Public Health Nurse bringing her concerns forward.

Mr. O' Connor observed that even with the new tighter security plans for the new building and renovations, he whole-heartedly supports the concept of establishing the local law. He said he felt it was important the "No Weapons" signs would have "some teeth to go along with it."

Following an extensive discussion, motion was made by Mr. VanNess and seconded by Mr. O'Connor to authorize the County Attorney to draft a local law prohibiting weapons in the County buildings, for review by the Committee at the next meeting.

Mr. Champagne stated he would prefer the question be put in front of the full Board of Supervisors before a local law was drafted.

Mr. Haskell reminded the Committee of the weapons question being raised at the Department of Social Services building. When a worker reported she felt threatened by a client, the County acted immediately and installed the magnetometers, and he said he felt, the Public Health Nurse's situation was the same type of situation.

Mrs. Parsons explained that a prison inmate had been released from prison and had taken up residence in Warren County. She noted the Social Services personnel have expressed their strong objections to the individual being in their Offices without special security measures in place. Consequently, she reported special steps have been taken so that each time the individual needs to be in the building, special measures are in place. She stressed the fact that the employees have felt very threatened, even with the magnetometers in place.

Mr. Haskell reiterated his concerns over the liability issues and the County's responsibility to provide a safe work place for its employees.

Mr. Dusek concurred the situation does seem to warrant posting the "No Weapons" signs. He noted that even though the local law may never need to be used, but at least it would be there, on the books, as part of the record.

Mr. Remington commented that he agreed with the concept behind establishing the local law. With the signs being posted before the local law was in force, he echoed the concerns that the Sheriff would not be able to enforce a violation of the signs.

Mr. Wm. Thomas left the meeting at 2:02 p.m.

Mr. O'Connor observed that the employees in the Department of Motor Vehicles, Treasurer's Office, and Public Health were all dealing with a populace that was much angrier than in years past. He said he felt it was much more feasible in this day for the need to safeguard against it. He acknowledged Mr. Champagne's suggestion to bring the matter to the full Board. However, he declared the Committee system was how these issues should be handled. He pointed out it was the Committee members responsibility to discuss the matter and then make a recommendation to the Board. If the full Board shoots the idea down, he said he felt it was up to the Committee to clarify why it was recommended in the first place.

Mr. Champagne said he would redraw his earlier comments and he could see Mr. O'Connor's point regarding the committee system.

Mr. Dusek stated that he would draft the local law, as requested. However, he emphasized there was a distinction between a local law to "give teeth" to posting signs as compared to magnetometers and secured entrances. He cautioned against a false sense of security from posting a sign and passing a law.

Mr. O'Connor said he felt everyone was aware that no sign ever prevented someone from killing someone else; no sign prevents someone from speeding down the Northway; signs are just there to remind people, like locks are there to keep honest people honest.

Mr. VanNess said he felt the signs and local law would relieve at least some of the County's responsibility to provide a safe work place for the employees.

In response to Mr. Haskell's question, Mr. Morehouse confirmed he could have the signs posted before the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Haskell called the question and motion was carried by majority vote to authorize the County Attorney to draft a local law prohibiting weapons in the County buildings, for review by the Committee at the next meeting, before sending it on to the full Board. Mr. Champagne abstained from the vote.

Returning to Agenda review of Pending Item 10, Mr. Morehouse reported he addressed the fire alarm compliance at the Department Head meeting held on March 21, 2006.

Mr. Haskell remarked that he was in attendance at the meeting and he felt Mr. Morehouse had adequately addressed the issue. However, he pointed out that the actual sound of the fire alarm was similar to a duck quacking. He expressed his concern that the general public would not recognize the sound as a fire alarm and may

elect to ignore it.

Mr. Morehouse further noted the Safety Committee was working on a new evacuation plan. He said that once that was in place, it may be appropriate to put something in writing about the fire alarm compliance, as well.

Mr. Lamy left the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Mr. Dusek reported a problem he had witnessed was that when the fire alarm sounds, people start to evacuate and then the alarm stops sounding. At that point, he said, people stop the evacuation process and stay in the building, feeling it must have been a false alarm. He suggested the alarm should continue sounding until everyone is out of the building.

Mr. Morehouse clarified that when the alarm goes off, the procedure to test for a false alarm is to reset the panel. At that point, the alarm sound terminates if it was in fact a false alarm. He stated that he would consult with the alarm company to determine if there was a different procedure that could be followed.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. F. Thomas requested a new referral be added to the Clerk's list of Pending Items. Specifically, he said he felt, the request for a new building for the Soil and Water Conservation Office should be placed in front of the Committee until it was resolved.

Mr. Haskell said he understood one proposal had been to build on some of the vacant land at the Fish Hatchery in Warrensburg. Mr. Dusek explained the deed for the Fish Hatchery property contains some land use restrictions. He reported on a series of correspondence between the attorneys for both the Office of General Services and the NYSDEC. To date, he said, his phone calls of 3-4 weeks ago have not been responded to, although he would pursue an answer in time for the next Committee meeting.

Mr. F. Thomas declared the need for the new building was very real. He urged the Committee to keep the matter on the Agenda until a solution could be found.

Mr. Remington reported the DPW Offices in the Town of Warrensburg had some open area that he felt may be appropriate for the Soil and Water Offices. With the parking lot, sewer and water hook-ups already at the site, he offered the property as an alternate site.

Mr. Remington summarized the Pending Items list and said he felt all of the items have been dealt with, except for numbers 6, 9 and 10.

Agenda review was resumed at Item 3, Old Business, as Mr. Remington reported there were a couple of open contracts that need to be closed out. He reminded the Committee of the recent decisions to move in a different direction with regards to the board room renovations and cooling tower replacement. Therefore, he presented

resolution requests to:

1. terminate the contracts with Foit-Albert regarding preliminary design on board room renovations and the Health and Human Services Building. (WC61-05)
2. terminate the contract with Greenman-Pederson for Geothermal Study/Cooling Tower Replacement (WC60-05).

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Geraghty and carried unanimously to authorize the resolutions requests as presented, and to authorize resolutions be prepared for the April 13th Board meeting. Copies of the resolution requests are on file with the minutes.

Mr. Remington returned to the Agenda review at Item 4B) engineering proposals regarding the Health and Human Services Building and Municipal Center addition/renovation. He reported the RFP had been issued in accordance with the Committee's instructions and 6 responses were received. Attention was directed to page 6 of the Agenda packet, and he said he had met yesterday with Messrs. Haskell, Dusek, and Morehouse to review the bids in detail. As a result of that meeting, he noted, the group felt they wanted to interview the 2 lowest bidders, LaBella Associates, P.C. and Clark Patterson Associates.

Mr. Haskell said he would like to interview the 2 firms as quickly as possible so the Finance Committee could consider the project for funding. If everything went well, he also felt a resolution awarding the bid could be brought to the full Board at the April meeting.

Mr. Remington clarified the bids had been reviewed for qualifications, schedule of work, and pricing structure. He said the interview process would give them a better idea of the project manager's characteristics. In addition, he noted he had called all of the references listed by both firms with good results all around.

Following a brief discussion it was determined the Committee would hold a special meeting on Thursday, March 30, 2006 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. for the purpose of interviewing these two firms.

Mrs. Parsons left the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

General discussion ensued.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion by Mr. F. Thomas and seconded by Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Haskell adjourned the meeting at 2:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Carlene A. Ramsey, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist