

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: **COUNTY FACILITIES**

DATE: **FEBRUARY 28, 2007**

Committee Members Present: Others Present:

Supervisors	Haskell	William Thomas, Chairman
	O'Connor	Joan Parsons, Commissioner of Administrative and Fiscal Services
	F. Thomas	Joan Sady, Clerk
	Champagne	Paul Dusek, County Attorney
	VanNess	Hal Payne, Administrator, Westmount Health Facility
	Geraghty	Fred Austin, Building Projects Coordinator
	Girard	Supervisors Belden
		Bentley
		Caimano
		Kenny
		Monroe
		Stec
		Tessier
		William Lamy, Superintendent, DPW
		Frank O'Keefe, County Treasurer
		Julie Pacyna, Purchasing Agent
		Teri Ross, Deputy Director, Real Property Tax Services
		Tom Garrett, Siemens Building Technologies
		Gary Geartz, Siemens Building Technologies
		Representing Schermerhorn Properties:
		Richard Schermerhorn
		Jonathan Lapper, Esq.
		Kurt Schwarz
		Chuck Poe
		Bob Walker
		Chris Connors
		Connie Farrington, Town of Queensbury
		Nicole Livingston, Deputy Clerk

Mr. Haskell called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Haskell apprised there were two items on the Agenda. The first, he said, was with regard to the energy savings contract with Siemens Building Technologies. The other item, he noted, was a presentation by Schermerhorn Properties.

Mr. Haskell requested a motion to un-table the energy savings contract with Siemens

Building Technologies for further discussion.

Motion was made by Mr. F. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Geraghty and carried unanimously to bring the energy savings contract with Siemens Building Technologies from the table to the floor.

Motion was made by Mr. F. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to authorize the energy savings contract with Siemens Building Technologies, as previously approved in a prior meeting. The necessary resolution was authorized for the next board meeting.

Mr. Haskell extended privilege of the floor to Jonathan Lapper, Attorney for Schermerhorn Properties, to begin the building presentation.

Mr. Lapper expounded they had brought representatives of British American with them today and they would be outlining design alternatives which would be cost savings for the County.

Richard Schermerhorn, of Schermerhorn Properties, summarized his previous proposal for the Committee members, which was \$17.50 per square foot, for the comparative design to Clark Patterson Associates design.

Mr. O'Connor entered the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

Mr. Schermerhorn stated he was at the meeting to discuss alternative possibilities for lowering the cost without compromising the building. He introduced Chuck Poe, of British American, and asked that he discuss some of the possibilities that could be explored for reducing the cost of the new building.

Mr. Poe apprised there were a few design items that they needed clarification on, as to why certain items were included in the original design plan, and whether or not these items were options. He referred to the classification of the 2A Building, and questioned if that classification could be limited to certain areas, due to the cost. He noted the classification of a 2A Building could be a \$500,000 to \$1 million item. He added another costly issue was with regard to the HVAC System. He said that it was a good system; however, he questioned if the HVAC System could be revised or was the Committee confident with the current design, because there could be a savings of a couple hundred thousand dollars with a different HVAC System.

Mr. Haskell responded that the classification of the building had been discussed at great length and the decision was to stay with the Class 2A Building.

Mr. Poe referred to the rubber membrane at the exterior wall and asked what the purpose of that was and also if it was a requirement. Mr. Poe introduced Bob Walker to further discuss some items included in the original design plan.

Mr. Walker said with regard to the rubber membrane at the exterior wall, they generally did not see that type of application. Mr. Haskell asked what the dollar value of the rubber membrane was and Mr. Walker replied it was approximately \$79,000 for that one item.

Continuing, Mr. Walker apprised that, from a value engineering standpoint, perhaps reducing the number of stairs from four sets to three sets, which would be a savings of between \$15,000 to \$17,000. He noted an additional one inch foam layer of insulation was included on the exterior of the building, which typically was not done on a six inch stud and brick construction; however, they had kept it in their design to present a more accurate comparison.

Mr. Haskell questioned if six inch was an R-19 value and stated he believed the building code was R-21. Mr. Walker agreed that the insulation itself was an R-19 value, and the associated cost for that was \$28,000. Mr. Walker expounded they had also looked at revising the specification on the roof, rather than going with a thirty-year TPO Roof, perhaps considering a twenty-year .060, single-ply, fully adhered and mechanically fastened roof, which would be a savings of approximately \$140,000.

Mr. Walker said that one item that could save money would be to complete the door and window schedule. He stated that there were excess funds allocated in that budget area, which he did not think would be necessary. He added that another cost saving area could be the terrazzo flooring, and they had looked at possibly substituting that with either porcelain or ceramic tile, which could be a savings of \$100,000 or more.

Mr. Walker noted another cost saving measure would be to revise the window shades that had been specified, to a horizontal blind, which would be a \$40,000 savings associated with that item. He said another area which could be a cost savings was the cabling requirements; however, he did not have a dollar value for that item. He also questioned the lightning protection for the building. He said they had done buildings in this area with it and some without, and it could be a savings of \$25,000 if it was not included. Mr. Walker added he did not have a cost figure for the next item; however, he advised they used PVC piping for above slab sanitary and waste lines, which could be underground in the area, which was code acceptable, and could be a significant savings. He mentioned the possibility of using floor mounted plumbing fixtures, as opposed to wall mounted, which could eliminate additional costs. He concluded that revising the HVAC System could be a huge savings in the project.

Jon Norris, of Clark Patterson Associates, reviewed the items listed by the representatives with Schermerhorn Properties, and explained why Clark Patterson Associates had included each item in their design plan.

Mr. Caimano expounded the issue at hand was whether it would be less expensive for the County to build or to lease with regard to the new Health and Human Services Building.

Mr. Schermerhorn apprised if the County were to choose his proposal, there would be no out-of-pocket expenses to the County while the building was being constructed. He noted that the County could lease the building for forty-two years and all the maintenance and the burden of the building would be placed on the landlord, not the County. He added that from the leasing aspect, there would be no hidden surprises to the County, the landlord would bear all expenses for maintenance. He concluded that unfortunately, under Municipal Law, he could not give an absolute buy-out price at the end of ten years; it would have to be based on fair market value.

Mr. Stec questioned when a municipality bought real estate, was there a law that stated the municipality was prevented from paying more than the fair market value. Mr. Dusek replied under ordinary circumstances, a municipality could purchase property at a good deal; however, he said, when leasing a building, the courts become suspicious and question why a bond was not being requested.

Mr. O'Connor questioned if the County went with the proposal from Schermerhorn Properties, a lease with the option to buy, was the County locked into purchasing the building after the lease had expired. Mr. Dusek explained his understanding was that the County would lease the building for ten years and at the end of the ten years, the County would have the option to buy the building at fair market value or to continue the lease for another ten years.

Mr. Haskell recommended reviewing the information that was provided to the Committee members today and to have an additional meeting at a later date.

Before adjourning, Mr. Haskell stated that Teri Ross, Deputy Director of Real Property Tax Services, was present to discuss a piece of County owned property located across the street from the Municipal Center, that the Committee had requested an appraisal on.

Ms. Ross explained the parcel of property consisted of 7.16 acres and she had reviewed sales from January 2005 to the present and a vacant commercial property, which was what this parcel was considered, had four good sales in the neighborhood, which meant a like property, and the average price per acre multiplied by the 7.16 totaled a market value of \$822,000. She further noted that the proposed equalization rate for the Town of Queensbury was 77%.

Mr. Haskell noted the request for the appraisal was to determine if the parcel could be sold to help finance the new building.

Mr. Dusek clarified that by Law, if the County was interested in selling a piece of property, they were required to go out to public bid.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion by Mr. Champagne and seconded by Mr. VanNess, Mr. Haskell adjourned the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Livingston, Deputy Clerk