

STEBEN COUNTY ADHOC COMMITTEE ON OFFICE SPACE

Wednesday, May 27, 2015

11:00 a.m.

*Legislative Committee Room
Steuben County Office Building
Bath, New York*

COMMITTEE: Robin K. Lattimer, Chair
Scott J. Van Etten
Lawrence P. Crossett
Brian C. Schu

STAFF: Mark R. Alger
Jack K. Wheeler
Patrick F. Donnelly

LEGISLATORS: Joseph J. Hauryski

ABSENT: Carol A. Ferratella, Vice Chair

OTHERS: Mary Perham

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. OVERVIEW

Ms. Lattimer stated that the purpose of this committee is to scope out the viability of providing additional office space for the District Attorney, Public Defender, Elections, Records and the storage of Elections Machines. Additionally, we also will be looking at the possibility of bringing in Mental Health.

Mr. Hauryski thanked the committee for accepting this task of looking at office space needs. He has had numerous discussions with Mr. Alger over the last year. After the sale of the Health Care Facility and the Certified Home Health Agency, he felt that the next issues to be addressed is office space needs. Going through this process will be no easy task. He feels that we have one more shot at getting this right. He has asked Mr. Donnelly to sit in on these meetings to provide guidance with regard to financing.

Mr. Hauryski stated that he has two additional items that he would like to add. The Corning Courthouse and the Hornell Courthouse. We have already received some inquiries about the Corning Courthouse. There are issues with both buildings and that is something we need to address. He appreciates the committee taking the time to participate and he feels that he has a good representation across the County. He asked the committee to be open-minded and to think outside the box.

Mr. Alger commented that the obvious first place to start is with Records and that is a fundamental first step. The other areas, with regard to the Hornell and Corning Courthouses, those buildings have never had anything done with them. They are out of date and have a number of issues. He is not sure what we could do with the Hornell Courthouse. The footprint is about six feet off the wall, and we do not have a right-of-way to the building. We may need to think about giving it away, or tearing it down. There is no long-term use for that building. Originally, the Courthouse sat in a park. The park is now gone and as a result, there is no access and no parking. We do rent a small lot from the school for parking for employees. The upper floor houses a theatre style courtroom. The main floor houses DMV, the Sheriff and the Department of Social Services. We also let Congressman Reed and Assemblyman Nojay use space as well.

Mr. Alger stated that the Corning Courthouse is more of an office-type building. That houses Probation, Public Health, Department of Social Services and DMV. Accessibility is an issue. We do not own much usable land. Three Rivers Development and Hunt Engineers have both asked if the County has an interest in keeping the building. We do need to keep DMV downtown in the City. That office does a lot of business and you would not want to move them.

Mr. Alger stated that with regards to Records, that is the kicking point for how far you want to go in dealing with space. One option is to do a small building that will house the Records Center and the voting machines. The other option is to go with a larger building downtown. Those were the two proposals that we asked for quotes on.

Mr. Hauryski commented that he wanted to look at Mental Health and see if we wanted to bring them into a new building. Mr. Crossett asked is there an issue with the building that the Veterans' Service Agency is in? Mr. Alger replied the building is in poor shape. We own two houses. The white house is where the Veteran's office is, with three staff. The house next door was previously used to house Special Childrens' Services. That house is in very poor condition and will fall down at some point.

Ms. Lattimer commented if you have office space in another building, that would free up space in this building and you would be able to absorb the Veteran's Service Agency. Mr. Wheeler presented a map that shows the footprint of the site across the street. We would also need to talk about the garage behind those three houses. This space would allow you to have a 8,000 – 10,000 square foot building. If you are talking about including Mental Health, we would have to look at some property acquisition as you would not have a large enough footprint to accommodate that. Mr. Alger commented you would also need to look at parking. If you include Mental Health, you would need to have parking for another 100 cars. Mr. Wheeler stated with traditional office space you still have accessibility issues and you would need a loading dock for Records. This particular location would give you a medium-sized footprint.

Mr. Crossett commented we have talked about Mental Health before. He does not think you can build a building for what you are paying now to lease it. Mr. Wheeler explained the lease we have with Yunis is \$8.75 per square foot. The yearly cost is \$252,000 per year. We also pay taxes of \$33,000 per year. So, the annual total cost is \$286,000. We also pay the utilities and the maintenance costs. The upkeep of the building was factored into the rate. The true cost is \$286,419 per year. The Liberty Street location is 29,000 square feet and that breaks out to \$9.92 per square foot.

Ms. Lattimer commented that with today's construction costs, we need to take a step back. She stated that the HSH&E Committee did tour the building and there have been huge improvements from four years ago. She was pleasantly surprised with how good it looked. She commented that she is a little ambivalent about it. Mr. Alger stated it is a 30,000 square foot building, which is a little bit less than a floor of this building. It would be tough and parking would be a bigger problem. Mr. Wheeler stated the other issue we have is we have a lot of land at the farm. He talked with Dr. Chapman about public transportation for the clients. There are no bus routes that go out to the farm. The Day Treatment Program has many clients that live in the Village of Bath and can walk to Mental Health. Ms. Lattimer commented she would think it would create a bigger problem for the people who use the clinic. Mr. Schu asked what would be the cost to acquire the building? Mr. Alger replied that is a good question. As a long-term solution, he would pursue purchasing the building as part of this analysis.

Ms. Lattimer stated overall, we need to look at the proposals separately and figure out what the cost will be and then decide if we want something downtown or out at the farm. The cost will be a real driver on this. That is our task. Mr. Alger stated we put out the RFP and received four responses. We interviewed three and then narrowed it down to two; Hunt Engineers and Labella. The choice is between a bare bones building at the farm, or an office building downtown. We have asked for budget numbers for both proposals and have also asked them to include a third option of a larger building. We want to get an order of magnitude estimate, then we will look at what we want to do and then begin the design.

Mr. Wheeler explained the way we structured the RFP was to have a building that would house Records, include the Elections Office, voting machine storage and conference space. This would free up the Elections space in the County Office Building, which allows for the Veterans' Service Agency to come in, or some other reconfiguration. This does not solve the space issues for the Public Defender or District Attorney.

Mr. Schu asked how much space do we need for Elections and Records? Mr. Wheeler replied if we were to put up a pole barn building, 11,000 square feet would be for Records, and 8,000 would be for Elections and storage for the voting machines. A total of 19,000 square feet on a single story, and the building would be slab on grade. We would keep

Records on the ground floor, and would need a loading dock for the voting machines. Mr. Alger commented you would also want to keep the voting machines on the ground floor as well.

Mr. Van Etten commented his opinion is that we do this one time and do it right. He does not think we should undersize anything. We have to look at needs 20 years from now. If you are looking at encompassing the other structures, you do an all-encompassing facility plan and sell that it will work for the next generation. It will be expensive, but we are paying someone \$300,000 annually for the lease of a building. He would like to see us get serious about the courthouses and putting in a building for Records and Elections.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN REGULAR SESSION AND RECONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC OFFICERS' LAW, ARTICLE 7§ 105.1.F. THE MEDICAL, FINANCIAL, CREDIT OR EMPLOYMENT HISTORY OF A PARTICULAR PERSON OR CORPORATION, OR MATTERS LEADING TO THE APPOINTMENT, EMPLOYMENT, PROMOTION, DEMOTION, DISCIPLINE, SUSPENSION, DISMISSAL OR REMOVAL OF A PARTICULAR PERSON OR CORPORATION MADE BY MR. SCHU. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETTEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0.

MOTION: RECOMMENDING AWARDING THE RFP FOR THE STEUBEN COUNTY RECORDS STORAGE FACILITY TO LABELLA AND ASSOCIATES MADE BY MR. CROSSETT. SECONDED BY MR. SCHU. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN EXECUTIVE SESSION AND RECONVENE IN REGULAR SESSION MADE BY MR. SCHU. SECONDED BY MR. CROSSETT. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0.

III. NEXT STEPS

Mr. Alger stated we will contact Labella and get them started on scoping the project once it is approved by AIP. Mr. Van Etten asked do we know the square footage of the offices in the Corning Courthouse? Mr. Alger replied yes. Ms. Lattimer asked that the square footage totals for the Corning and Hornell Courthouses be emailed to the committee. Mr. Wheeler replied he will email both the total square footage as well as the total square footage being used. Mr. Crossett asked if there would be room at Hornell City Hall for the Hornell DMV Office? Mr. Alger replied they would look into that.

IV. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 30, 2015, at 11:00 a.m. in the Legislative Committee Room.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MR. CROSSETT. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0.

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature

STEBEN COUNTY ADHOC COMMITTEE ON OFFICE SPACE

Tuesday, June 30, 2015

11:00 a.m.

*Legislative Committee Room
Steuben County Office Building
Bath, New York*

****MINUTES****

COMMITTEE: Robin K. Lattimer, Chair Carol A. Ferratella, Vice Chair Lawrence P. Crossett
Scott J. Van Etten

STAFF: Jack K. Wheeler Patrick F. Donnelly

ABSENT: Brian C. Schu

OTHERS: Mark R. Alger
Mark E. Kukulka, Labella Associates, P.C.
Mike Duel, Labella Associates, P.C.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. *Project Overview and Scope* - Ms. Lattimer welcomed Mr. Kukulka and Mr. Duel from Labella. The purpose of today's meeting is to provide scope of work and review the process. Mr. Kukulka provided an overview to the committee of their process. Discussion followed.

Mr. Van Etten stated that in his opinion, any court-related departments should be located where the courts are. Mr. Alger commented in determining the Public Defender and District Attorney's needs, you can come up with an area and then look at the space in the rest of the building that corresponds. Mr. Wheeler stated we also need to find a place for the Veterans' Service Agency. Mr. Van Etten asked is another consideration those departments that need to be in a secure building? Mr. Alger replied yes. Mr. Kukulka stated to summarize, we are looking at the Public Defender, District Attorney, Cornell Cooperative Extension and Veterans' Service agency as macro-level office space candidates. He commented that Mental Health was added to the mix as option 2b in the RFP. Ms. Lattimer commented that she thinks we have to at least look at it. Mr. Wheeler stated that with regard to Mental Health, in talking with Dr. Chapman, many of the clients walk or use public transportation, so we would want to keep them in the village. We also need to look at a footprint and parking implications and how we would structure that. Mr. Kukulka stated we can begin by looking at Mental Health at a macro-level and after we tour the existing building and look at the square footage, we can decide if we need to look at it more closely.

Mr. Kukulka presented a PowerPoint including aerial views of the County Farm property and County offices located within the Village of Bath. Mr. Alger provided a review of the various buildings on the County Farm property. Mr. Wheeler stated the site that Mr. Kukulka is looking at for a Records facility is where the County auction is held. That is something that we will need to address.

Mr. Kukulka commented the sites that we are looking at are not easily comparable. We can do a site selection matrix which can show the criteria, the weight we assign as to importance and comments. He distributed a copy of a sample matrix. The committee was in agreement that this would be a good tool to use.

Mr. Van Etten stated that his initial concern is that looking at the proposed schedule of tasks, we are looking at two and a half years and he doesn't know if the timing is acceptable to him. Do you phase it as a pole barn now, and then look to

see if you need to do something in addition? Mr. Kukuvka commented that the other question may be if this is actually two separate projects. Ms. Lattimer asked aren't we casting a net so that we do not have to do this twice? Mr. Alger replied within the first couple of months you will make that decision. If this is going to be a big project, you will look at whether you do the Records Center sooner. That is all part of the process. Mr. Wheeler commented the Records Center is an immediate need. We can come up with some sort of matrix to strategize the short-term needs and then have a plan.

Mrs. Ferratella asked do we have the option of renting space for our records in the interim? Mr. Wheeler replied there are companies like Iron Mountain that will store your records, and you pay a premium for that service. Our hope was that the Phillips property would become available soon to provide us with another option, but it doesn't look that that is going to happen. With the Old Health Care Facility, we run the risk that something will fail, and then what do you do? Mr. Alger stated your biggest exposure is keeping the Old Health Care Facility going and we have done that for quite a while. We also do not know what Center's plans are. With that facility, we want to be in the process of moving so that we do not get caught short. Currently we are monitoring the building and paying utilities. Center's does not have any cost in the building.

Mrs. Ferratella asked if we opted for the downtown space across from the County Office Building, would we be able to free up some space by moving Purchasing and Weights & Measures? Mr. Wheeler replied Weights & Measures would be a possibility. Purchasing is a large function with both mail delivery and the delivery of supplies and they would need access to a loading dock.

Mr. Van Etten asked have we looked more at the cost of digitizing records? Mr. Wheeler replied we should pursue that. There are some records that will still need to be physically kept. We have been reducing the number of records going into storage. He stated that we do have a contract in place with PMI and it may be time to put some additional money into that. Discussion followed.

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 11, 2015, at 11:00 a.m.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MR. CROSSETT. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 4-0.

Respectfully submitted by,

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature

STEUBEN COUNTY ADHOC COMMITTEE ON OFFICE SPACE

Wednesday, October 7, 2015

11:00 a.m.

*Legislative Committee Room
Steuben County Office Building
Bath, New York*

****MINUTES****

COMMITTEE: Robin K. Lattimer, Chair Carol A. Ferratella, Vice Chair Lawrence P. Crossett
Brian C. Schu Scott J. Van Etten

STAFF: Jack K. Wheeler Pat Donnelly Vicki Olin
Eric Rose Brenda Mori Andy Morse
Tammy Hurd-Harvey

LEGISLATORS: Joseph J. Hauryski K. Michael Hanna

OTHERS: Mark R. Alger
Mark E. Kukuvka, Labella Associates, P.C.
Mike Duel, Labella Associates, P.C.
Mary Perham

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 27, 2015, AND JUNE 30, 2015, MEETINGS MADE BY MR. SCHU. SECONDED BY MRS. FERRATELLA. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Chairman Hauryski thanked the committee once again for participating in this endeavor to solve the office space problem. Today he has asked Mr. Wheeler to provide you with a number of other items for your consideration. He commented that his hope is to have a recommendation from this committee by the December Legislative Meeting.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Labella

1. **Summary of Space Programs** – Mr. Kukuvka provided a review of the options:
 - a. *Option #1* – Metal building to be located at the County Farm that would house Records, Board of Elections and a Conference Center. This building would have 16,000 – 17,000 gross square feet.
 - b. *Option #2* – Two-story office building across the street from the County Office Building. This building would house Records, Board of Elections, a Conference Center, and the Department of Public Works. This building would have 20,000 – 21,000 gross square feet. Mr. Alger commented Public Works was included in this option due to the proximity of the building space. If we were to rearrange the District Attorney and Public Defender, that location vacated by Public Works would be more convenient to the courts. The space Public Works currently occupies has a good footprint of 3,500 square feet. Mr. Wheeler stated this option would include the Board of Elections as well as option #1, and opens space for Veterans.

c. *Option #3* – This takes Option #2 and includes Mental Health. The gross square footage needed just for Mental Health is 32,000, which would bring the total gross square footage of this building to 50,000. This would be a three-story building. Mental Health would also need to have 72 – 75 parking spaces, which is currently what they have now. That parking requirement does not fit on this particular site. With respect to the parking, we would need to look at cost, size and the impact.

Mr. Van Etten asked could you do parking underground? Mr. Kukulka replied that would make the building four stories and you still may not have enough space. Mr. Wheeler commented that with Records storage, we would also have the issue of weight. Mr. Kukulka stated that all of the options are slab on grade with no basement.

Mr. Kukulka stated preliminary, probable costs of Option #1 is \$3,843,400; Option #2 is \$9,194,100; and Option #3 is \$21,371,200. These figures assume ownership of the property and do not include what you may need for additional space, utilities, etc. He distributed a site selection matrix, which consists of 20 criteria. The County, as the owner, will determine the factor rating for each criterion with one being not important and five being extremely important.

Mr. Van Etten commented there are significant cost differences between the options. Have you considered a hybrid of Option #1 and Option #2 and build that at the County Farm and move Public Works? Then you would have an alternate site 20 years from now to do something and you gain space in the County Office Building. Mr. Wheeler replied we did not talk about that. Mr. Van Etten commented for that hybrid option it would not need to be a fancy building. Mr. Wheeler stated we talked about the traditional office space downtown. We did not talk about adding an additional 3,500 square feet to Option #1 at the County Farm.

Mr. Alger stated another option is to building an office building downtown to house records staff with frequently used records and build an archive building for permanent records with no staff. Mr. Van Etten stated he would think you could do the same thing with the voting machines. Mr. Alger stated the only difference is that you will want to have staff with those machines. Cold storage for records is something to discuss.

Mr. Crossett stated the difference between Option #2 at \$9.1 million and Option #3 at \$21.3 million is Mental Health. How much do we pay for that building lease? Mr. Wheeler replied we are paying \$320,000 per year just for the Bath office.

IV. NEXT STEPS

Mr. Wheeler stated this gives you a good basis for your discussions. Option #2 and the inclusion of Public Works does give you a good opportunity for growing capacity for legal and court related functions. With records storage, the only thing long-term that makes it more palatable downtown is as we get more toward digital, that may open up additional space and that will only expand in the future.

Mr. Alger stated there is an opportunity in the long-term with records to become digital, but you will still have paper that you need to store. You now have an order of magnitude. Options #2 and #3 addresses the needs of court related functions.

Mr. Van Etten commented with Option #1 we are adding 20 percent to what we currently have for records storage. Mr. Kukulka commented some of that is circulation. We measure not only the physical filing cabinets, but the space needed to walk about them. Mr. Van Etten asked does the cost include the addition of high-density storage units? Mr. Kukulka replied no.

Mr. Van Etten asked about the 3,000 square footage for conference space. Mr. Alger stated we currently do not have that space. Mr. Wheeler stated having a larger conference space would be ideal for day-to-day use. Mr.

Kukuvka stated we budgeted for a 150-person conference space with three dividing walls. Mr. Alger commented Elections needs a training space anyway.

Mrs. Ferratella asked what is included for the Board of Elections space? Mr. Kukuvka replied that includes office space and machine storage. Mr. Van Etten commented it looks like you have allowed for 500 square feet for the machines. Mr. Alger stated he believes we have 1,000 square feet where they are stored. Mr. Kukuvka replied we did not add space. Mrs. Olin commented we are looking at the possibility of having to add more voting machines. Mr. Alger stated Elections also has ballot storage and that will not go away right away. Mrs. Olin stated we have election books that we need to keep permanently, and currently we do not have the space to do that. Mr. Alger stated that can be part of Records. With that said, they still have a lot of paper. Mr. Van Etten commented it seems as though Elections may not have enough space.

Mr. Crossett asked are there any plans for the Balcom House after the Judge retires? Mr. Alger replied we do not have a plan at this point. He noted the courts have put a lot of money into that building.

V. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting has been scheduled for Monday, October 26, 2015, at 8:00 a.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to review the site selection matrix and assign factor scores to each of the 20 criteria. Mr. Wheeler stated the goal for this sitting Legislature is to lend your opinion as to the option going forward. Essentially, putting on record what you are looking at.

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. SCHU. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

MOTION: WAIVING THE RFP PROCESS AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO CONTRACT WITH LABELLA ASSOCIATES TO CONDUCT AN ENGINEERING STUDY ON THE BATH MENTAL HEALTH BUILDING, AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$30,000 MADE BY MR. SCHU. SECONDED BY MR. VAN ETTEN. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

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 5-0.

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

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature

STEBEN COUNTY ADHOC OFFICE SPACE COMMITTEE

Special Meeting

Monday, October 26, 2015

8:00 a.m.

*Legislative Committee Room
Steuben County Office Building
Bath, New York*

****MINUTES****

COMMITTEE:	Robin K. Lattimer, Chair Brian C. Schu	Carol A. Ferratella, Vice Chair Scott J. Van Etten	Lawrence P. Crossett
STAFF:	Jack K. Wheeler Eric Rose Kelly Penziul	Pat Donnelly Shawn Corey	Tammy Hurd-Harvey Alan Reed
LEGISLATORS:	Joseph J. Hauryski K. Michael Hanna Patrick F. McAllister Randolph J. Weaver	Eric T. Booth Hilda T. Lando Aaron I. Mullen	Dan C. Farrand Steven Maio Gary D. Swackhamer
OTHERS:	Mark R. Alger Mark Kukuvka, Labella Mike Duell, Labella		

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 7, 2015, MEETING MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MRS. FERRATELLA. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. *Project Review/Site Selection Matrix* – Ms. Lattimer stated the purpose of today’s meeting is to look at all of the options presented by Labella and to score them on the site selection matrix worksheet. At our last meeting, two additional options were added.

Mr. Kukuvka stated that Option #4 is taking all of the features of Option #1 and adding Public Works. Option #5a, is a 3,300 square foot building used for inactive records storage. Option #5b, is an 18,000 square foot building for records storage, Board of Elections, a conference center and Public Works and would be a two-story office building.

Ms. Lattimer commented Option #3 would bring the mental health operation downtown and would entail a larger building, which would present more challenges with regard to public flow, site acquisition and parking. Mr. Wheeler explained this option would be constructing a new facility for Mental Health. We have worked with an appraiser and Yunis to get an independent appraisal of the Bath office. The committee has authorized us to contract with Labella to complete an engineering study. We are working with Yunis to get their approval to do that. Currently we are leasing the office building for \$340,000 per year. The results of the engineering study will determine whether the County will continue to lease or purchase the building outright.

Mr. Schu asked how will we fund this building project? Mr. Wheeler replied if you do a bare bones project, such as Option #1, you would be able to pay cash for that out of your fund balance. Any of the other options would require you to borrow.

Mr. Van Etten asked for an explanation of why the cost of Option #4 goes from \$3.3 million to \$5.5 million? Mr. Kukulka replied we added to the subtotal, the costs for bonds and insurance and project and overhead, which gives us the total construction costs. Then we include a 5 percent construction contingency, a 15 percent design contingency and 20 percent project soft costs. Mr. Alger explained those account for unknowns such as soil condition, utilities, etc. At this point, we are not detailed enough to know what those costs may be.

Mrs. Ferratella stated Option #4 includes a conference center at the farm site. You would need to transport people out there. Is there any way that we could include a conference center at the County Office Building complex? Mr. Wheeler replied we currently do have issues with large meetings. That should not be a deciding factor in your decision. Having the flex space will open up smaller spaces. You need to have a large space for Elections. We currently have the Elections training at the Old Health Care Facility. He noted that the Civil Defense Center is a smaller space. Mr. Alger commented if you try to accommodate Elections, that additional space could be used for other things, particularly for larger trainings. Now we currently hold 15 sessions to get through our annual training.

Mr. Hanna asked has any consideration been given to upgrading the County Office Building? Mr. Wheeler replied we will do some work if we move the District Attorney's offices to Public Works. The only other thing that we have planned is to make some modifications to the Grand Jury Room, which is currently too small, and to the Law Library, which is currently too big. Mr. Rose and his crew have been doing a good job making improvements to this building. Mr. Alger explained the advantage you have with the space in Public Works is that it is very open. It would be fairly simple to put offices in. We did not include renovation money for this building as a lot of that work can be done in-house by Buildings & Grounds as we move forward. If there are issues with renovations here, we will want to budget for that. Mr. Hanna asked do we need to upgrade the major mechanicals? Mr. Wheeler replied we are in pretty good shape. We will start to budget for the control systems in the coming years.

Mr. Hauryski asked how does the option of purchasing the Mental Health Building impact these options? Mr. Wheeler replied all of the options, with the exception of Option #3 could include the purchase of the Mental Health Building. Option #3 is building a new building and moving in everyone from Mental Health.

Mr. McAllister asked which option takes into consideration future growth? Mr. Wheeler replied Option #1 does not whatsoever. That only takes care of Records and Elections and a small space would open up at the County Office Building. Option #4 does not help much right away, but does make land available for the future and would have some impact. Options #2 and #5 do take into consideration future growth.

Mr. Alger commented Option #4 envisions over time that records should shrink as you go to digital storage. That would give you space that you could use for other purposes. You should expect over time, to use that space looking forward and you are building some flexibility in the future. Mr. Wheeler stated Options #2, #3 and #5 provides more short and long term space because with that flexible conference space, it would open up the conference space in the County Office Building for discussion.

Mr. Hauryski asked does Option #4 include separate conference space? Mr. Wheeler replied yes. Mr. Hauryski asked does Option #3 include the acquisition of the land? Mr. Kukulka replied no.

Mr. Mullen asked what is the criteria we need for Records? Mr. Wheeler replied we need to have a high-density filing system and rolling racks for records.

Mrs. Ferratella asked will any of the five options open up space for DSS or Public Health? Mr. Wheeler replied no. Mr. Van Etten asked do we have estimates for project completion? Mr. Duell replied no. Mr. Kukulka replied Option #1 will be completed faster than Option #2 and Option #3 would take the longest.

Mr. McAllister asked is there a benefit to keeping the County office complex together? Would there be a cost savings? Mr. Kukulka replied the benefit is continuity of government. A lot of counties rented and leased space to try to accommodate growth and as a result have felt segregated. Over the last ten years, counties, when they have the option to consolidate, are. Mr. Wheeler stated we do have our mail run and the transportation of records. There is not a significant cost, but there is time, gas, etc.

Mr. Van Etten commented you have to consolidate Elections. We thought of Public Works because they have the least amount of interaction with the rest of the departments. He asked would there be security at the new building? He commented that he would not think you would need it. Mr. Alger replied you will end up with some kind of security, particularly with Elections. From his perspective, we built the County Office Building with the concept of consolidating everything into one building. It made operations and management much better and easier. When you start relocating to other locations, it is not as easy. It is an advantage to keep as many departments in one location as you can. Practically, if you can keep departments together, you are better off, however, sometimes you cannot. It is a balance between proximity and cost. With regard to moving Public Works out, he has mixed feelings about that. They are more independent than the other departments and have both the most money and the most personnel. The ability to manage having them nearby is an advantage. If you put them outside, you will have larger communications issues than what you currently have now.

Mr. Swackhamer stated 30 years ago if we had done what we said and built the complex at the farm, we would not have this problem. Now we have the chance to right what we did wrong and have a County complex. We should put everything out at the farm. We need to look at the future. We have spent all kinds of money on parking lots, houses and we could have done all of that out at the farm. This time, we have time to correct that. We have the property at the farm. We could make it one site and eventually move this complex out there. Mr. Crossett commented just the Mental Health option costs more than what we paid for this building back then. Mr. McAllister stated it makes sense, but what was done, was done. He cannot see abandoning this building. Ms. Lattimer stated Chairman Hauryski wants this committee to look at the options to make sure what we choose will last into the future. Mr. Alger stated we did buy this land and the County Office Building has lasted 30 years. The buildings across the street and parking lot have lasted 20 years and have held up pretty well. He stated Mr. Swackhamer is not wrong, however, it is a question of what you want to do. With this decision now, you can just do Option #1 and be done with it. The fact is you will have problems with finding space for the attorneys. The whole concept is what could we do that makes sense and will last for 20 years or longer. He commented that he does not see County government becoming a lot bigger than what it is. The Department of Social Services is contracting more, Public Health is smaller and we no longer have the Health Care Facility. We are really trying to maintain the organization.

Mr. Hauryski stated we would be foolish not to look at all of these options. After looking at the numbers for all five options, he does not feel that Option #3 is feasible and he asked that the committee take it off the table.

*****Secretary's Note: The committee agreed to remove Option #3 from the list of viable options.***

Mr. Hanna asked what about operational costs? Mr. Kukulka replied operational costs are not factored into these preliminary numbers.

Mr. Kukulka reviewed the Site Selection Matrix and the committee assigned values to each of the 20 factors. Each of the options was assigned a total factor score and they are as follows:

- ❖ Option #1 – 73
- ❖ Option #2 – 103
- ❖ Option #3 – 157
- ❖ Option #4 – 90
- ❖ Option #5 – 103

Mr. Van Etten commented until we get information about the Mental Health Building, we really cannot go much further. Mr. Schu asked with Option #4, could we build a separate stand-alone conference center on the existing site? Mr. Wheeler replied you could, however, you would still need to maintain some conference space with Option #4. Certainly,

if you did that, you could put it across the street. We could move Veterans' over and demolish the houses and add a parking lot. It would become space that could be whatever you want it to be. It does open up some potential. Mr. Alger stated if you moved Elections and the machines to the Records Center and had the conference center here, then it makes sense to leave Public Works where they currently are.

Mr. Farrand commented if you demolish the houses, then you have to look at the costs for abatement. Mr. Wheeler stated Mr. Rose and his staff are participating in training so they will be able to do abatement for small areas. Mr. Rose stated you would need to do asbestos abatement. Mr. Kuvuka stated with the size of those building, you could take the cost for that out of the contingency.

Mrs. Lando asked what is the next step? Mr. Alger replied now you need to absorb and talk about this information and come to a consensus on the direction you want to go. Mr. Wheeler stated we would like to have a recommendation from the sitting Legislature in December on the direction to go.

Mr. Hauryski stated if you could get the data on the Mental Health Building, we could have another meeting at the end of November. Mr. Crossett stated you either lease or purchase it. It is not even a consideration for which option you choose. Mr. Van Etten replied it is an issue because if the building is falling down, we will have to put that department some place. Mr. Kuvuka stated once we get the authorization from Yunis, it will take us about a month to put together some preliminary information.

IV. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting has been scheduled for Monday, November 23, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

Respectfully Submitted by:

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature

STEBEN COUNTY ADHOC OFFICE SPACE COMMITTEE

Monday, November 23, 2015

2:00 p.m.

*Legislative Committee Room
Steuben County Office Building
Bath, New York*

****MINUTES****

COMMITTEE:	Robin K. Lattimer, Chair Brian C. Schu	Carol A. Ferratella, Vice Chair Scott J. Van Etten	Lawrence P. Crossett
STAFF:	Jack K. Wheeler Shawn Corey	Eric Rose Tammy Hurd-Harvey	Pat Donnelly Alan Reed
LEGISLATORS:	Joseph J. Hauryski Hilda T. Lando	Eric T. Booth Gary D. Swackhamer	K. Michael Hanna Randolph J. Weaver
OTHERS:	Mark R. Alger Mark Kukuvka, Labella		

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 26, 2015, MEETING MADE BY MRS. FERRATELLA. SECONDED BY MR. SCHU. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

III. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. *Structural Review of Community Services Building* – Mr. Kukuvka informed the committee that last week they conducted a structural review of the Community Services Building located on Liberty Street in Bath. He provided a very brief overview and noted that they will send out a bound report within the next couple of weeks.

B. *Review of Site Proposals* – Ms. Lattimer stated last month we pulled Option #3 off the table. The committee has now had an opportunity to review the matrix and she opened the floor for discussion and questions.

Mr. Wheeler stated from a schedule standpoint, if more time is needed past today, we do not need to rush. The goal of Chairman Hauryski was to get the sitting Legislature on record as to which option you prefer.

Ms. Lattimer stated that she is really focusing on Options #2 and #5. Option #1 does not do enough and is not long-range. With Option #4, she is not really crazy about moving Public Works to the County Farm. If she were pushed to make a decision today, she would choose Option #5.

Mr. Hauryski stated the he would go along with Ms. Lattimer’s assessment. The scoring comes out equal between Option #2 and #5. He would prefer Option #5. Ms. Lattimer commented having a conference center downtown would be more efficient than traveling to the County Farm.

Mr. Crossett stated he is in favor of Option #5. He does not want to start decentralizing office space as that will lead to future departments being moved.

Mr. Schu commented he likes Option #4 if maybe we could also have the option of putting the conference center downtown. He is unsure about Option #5 because you are still moving offices out of the building. Mr. Wheeler commented generally, having departments across the street is easier than having them across town. With Options #2 and #5, it opens up the potential of having the South Conference Room available and some other small spaces. Employees could walk across the street to the conference center. Those options also provide an opportunity for future growth.

Ms. Lattimer commented you would be moving Public Works across the street, but by moving them out, it would open up space for the courts. Mr. Schu stated you still get that with Option #4. There will be problems with parking with Option #5, particularly with the conference center. Mr. Crossett commented that was only an issue if you also put Mental Health in there. Mr. Wheeler stated the only time there would be parking issues is when conferences coincided with training for Elections. Options #2 and #5 would require one additional parking space. If there is a larger training, we would need to find a place for parking and that would be an issue. Day-to-day we would be fine. Mr. Schu stated there is also a \$3 million difference.

Mr. Van Etten stated that he prefers Option #4. He understands the concerns about moving Public Works away from the County Manager and Finance, however, companies have plants all over the world and are able to manage. It is a function of how you manage and he does not think that is worth the \$3 million additional cost. Option #4 uses the County Farm and we still would have options here. He does not like the idea of a \$9 million project.

Mrs. Ferratella stated that she is also in agreement with Option #4. She feels that this option is the most practicable and allows for future development.

Mr. McAllister stated that he likes Options #2 and #5 and he likes the idea of keeping everything together. The only question is if we are going to build, we should look forward to the next twenty years. He would hate to build and then have to go back and build something five to ten years from now. Does Option #5 anticipate being able to handle growth in the future? Mr. Wheeler replied Options #2, #4, and #5 do a pretty good job of anticipating growth. There is open space across the street and area for growth. Option #5 as opposed to Option #2 does a better job of anticipating future growth. The trend for counties and municipalities is shifting and we are losing staff and shifting our area of focus. All of these options can accomplish this, but Option #5 does a better job if you are looking for office space across the street. Option #4 does with the caveat of leaving space in the complex to grow later if we need to. You will pay a premium up front with Option #5 for storage space and as we digitize more of our records, that will leave us with more space. Mr. McAllister stated he is in favor of Option #5.

Mrs. Lando commented from personal experience, it is difficult to manage when people are not together. You lose productivity, there is increased travel time and managing staff is difficult. She is not in favor of Option #4.

Mr. Alger commented this is the same problem the County has had for decades – whether to go to the County Farm or stay downtown. Part of the problem with this building is this is the County Seat. The Farm is not in the County Seat. You can move Public Works out of the County Seat and anything else other than the constitutional offices. Having Public Works at the Farm is not the end of the world. As you look forward at changes over the next ten years, you are looking at putting people in the right place. It is better to manage and have people working across the street, but you have to weigh if that is worth the extra \$3 million. If you build out at the Farm, the yellow house needs to come down and the white house also should and that would be used for parking. Mr. Alger stated he would lean more toward doing this downtown. You have to balance what you can live with in terms of the cost.

Mrs. Ferratella asked with Option #5 would we take the money out of fund balance and bond for the rest? Mr. Wheeler replied yes, we could comfortably take \$3 – \$4 million out of the fund balance and borrow the rest. With Option #4 you could potentially take the whole thing, but in his view, that would be the upper limit of what you would want to do.

Mr. Kuvka commented the difference in price between Options #4 and #5 is that Option #4 at the end of the day is a metal building. Mr. Crossett commented that in the village, utilities are Bath Electric, Gas & Water and they will be cheaper here than at the farm. Mr. Wheeler commented the estimated difference in price would be about \$10,000 - \$20,000 more at the Farm annually.

Mr. Van Etten stated Option #5 has a building on two separate sites. What is the cost of having the two different buildings? We are building a separate building to store inactive records, which represent 40 percent of all records. He does not think Option #5 is efficient. We should do this in an efficient way. Spending \$9 million versus \$6 million is a big difference. Mr. Kuvka replied once you select an option, we will be able to tighten up the specs and get more definitive figures.

Mr. Hauryski asked what is the thinking behind having storage at the Farm? Mr. Alger replied the cost per square foot is less at the Farm than it is here. This facility would be for the archived records. Mr. Schu commented this all started as storage for Records and Elections. Mr. Alger commented the electric at the old Health Care Facility is more than our total utilities downtown. When you compare the size of the building, the electric bill was that big. Mr. Van Etten asked how was their consumption compared to an office building and storage? Mr. Alger replied by way of comparison building to building, the consumption at the Health Care Facility was a 24 hour operation. Mr. Wheeler commented the electrical systems will be newer and more efficient. That is something to factor in, but should not be a game changer. Mr. Alger commented by moving the offices to the Farm, you may have more budget creep, but that will be a function of project management.

Ms. Lattimer suggested that the committee be prepared to make a recommendation at the December meeting.

Mr. McAllister asked will a lot of people be using our facility for training? Mr. Wheeler replied we do have the Civil Defense Building. We wanted an option for conference space to be more flexible and a little larger than what we currently have. Mr. McAllister commented it costs more money to put a conference center here, as a welcome to Steuben County, it would have more character if we kept it downtown with a nice building.

Mr. Schu suggested having an option where we have a separate conference center across the street. That is not one of the current options. Mr. Wheeler commented that with Elections, we would want their training specifically to be with the voting machines, where they are located. Mr. Alger stated there is no right or wrong. Either one will help with operational efficiencies.

MOTION: REMOVING OPTION #1 FROM THE SITE SELECTION MATRIX MADE BY MR. VAN ETTEN. SECONDED BY MR. SCHU. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 5-0.

Mr. Wheeler stated we will be adding an Option #4 a for conference space across the street from the County Complex. Do you need to look at the figures for that? Also, we would be reducing the conference space in Option #4. Mr. Van Etten replied if you can provide it, that is fine, but we are providing two conference centers. Mr. Schu stated you could rough it out. Mr. Hanna asked how would that downtown building look? Mr. Kuvka replied it would be a smaller construction, brick building that would complement the County Office Building.

Mr. Hauryski commented from the discussion today, it seems that the concern about Option #5 is the cost. He asked if Mr. Donnelly could attend the next meeting and give us an idea in terms of what our payment options would be. Mr. Kuvka stated \$15 million in construction costs equates to \$1 million debt service. For a \$7 - \$8 million project you would be looking at \$500,000 per year in debt service.

IV. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, December 8, 2015, at 11:00 a.m.

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

Respectfully Submitted by,

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature

STEBEN COUNTY ADHOC OFFICE SPACE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, December 8, 2015

11:00 a.m.

*Legislative Committee Room
Steuben County Office Building
Bath, New York*

****MINUTES****

COMMITTEE:	Robin K. Lattimer, Chair	Carol A. Ferratella	Joseph J. Hauryski
STAFF:	Jack K. Wheeler Andy Morse Shawn Corey	Vince Spagnoletti Eric Rose	Pat Donnelly Tammy Hurd-Harvey
LEGISLATORS:	K. Michael Hanna	Hilda T. Lando	Gary G. Swackhamer
ABSENT:	Lawrence P. Crossett	Brian C. Schu	Scott J. Van Etten
OTHERS:	Mark Kukuvka, Labella Mark Alger Mary Perham		

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Lattimer called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: APPROVING THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 23, 2015, MEETING MADE BY MRS. FERRATELLA. SECONDED BY MR. HAURYSKI. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 3-0.

III. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. *Financing* – Mr. Donnelly stated he had been asked to review Option 4a and 5 with regard to how they would be financed. He prefaced his discussion by saying the statistics he is giving with regard to the health of the economy reflects everywhere but here. Nationally, we’ve seen 17 months of job growth that exceeded 200,000 jobs per month. That is an indicator that the economy is relatively healthy. The Federal Reserve is planning to raise the short-term interest rates. Currently financing rates for ten-year tax-exempt bonds are 2 percent, 2.1 percent and 2.2 percent. Option 4a is a one-story pre-engineered building at Mt. Washington plus a one-story building on West Morris Street. The estimated cost of that project is \$7,179,000. If we assume the rate is 2.1 percent, we would take \$4 million out of surplus funds and bond \$3,150,000. Over seven years that would represent a debt service of \$480,000 per year with total interest cost of \$263,000. If we were to bond for 10 years, the debt service would be about \$350,000 per year with a total interest cost of \$376,000.

Mr. Donnelly stated Option 5 is a one-story pre-engineered building at Mt. Washington plus a multi-story office building on West Morris Street. The estimated cost of that project is \$8,618,100. We would take \$4 million out of our surplus funds and issue a ten-year bond for \$4,600,000 at 2.1 percent interest. The debt service would be \$517,000 - \$520,000 annually with a total interest cost of \$542,000. Option 4, is a one-story pre-engineered metal building at Mt. Washington. The estimated project cost is \$5,456,800. If we took \$4 million out of surplus, we would bond \$1,400,000. The total interest cost for a ten-year bond would be \$168,000 and \$116,000 for a seven-year bond. Annual debt service would average \$225,000 for the seven-year option and \$165,000 for the ten-year option.

Mr. Wheeler commented the difference between Option 4 and 5 is \$250,000 per year. Mr. Donnelly commented that if you went with Option 2, that would not be much different from Option 5. Mr. Hauryski asked have you looked into Rural Development financing? He asked Mr. Donnelly to look into that as it may be worth investigating.

Mrs. Ferratella asked how long will they hold these interest rates? Mr. Donnelly replied the Federal Reserve Bank has stated it will begin to increase interest rates in December, but we haven't seen anything yet.

B. *Public Works* – Ms. Lattimer stated that Mr. Spagnoletti would like to make some comments regarding the proposals. Mr. Spagnoletti stated that he wanted to make sure the committee had a good view of how his department operates. There is a lot of interchange between our department and other departments. We work very closely with Finance, Purchasing and the Law Department. The most important thing is you do not want a big department like this to go rogue. Mr. Spagnoletti stated he thinks it is important for a department of his size to be close to the main building. Why does Cornell Cooperative Extension have to be in this building and my department is being relocated? It is important for my department to have face-to-face interactions with the departments we work closely with.

Mr. Wheeler commented having the department across the road and co-located downtown would make it easier than having them at the farm.

Ms. Lattimer commented for the sake of discussion, the Public Works option was to provide space for the Public Defender and District Attorney. Mr. Spagnoletti does make some valid points. She stated that she is not in favor of locating them at the farm and she is sure we could adjust things to accommodate them.

C. *Discussion of Options* – Mr. Kukurvka informed the committee that they have included an Option 4a. This takes the reverse approach and puts everything at the farm and then a separate conference center on West Morris Street. This was done to accommodate the need for additional conference space. It was mentioned that Board of Elections does need to conduct periodic trainings. We added 1,000 square feet to the Elections space for the voting machines and a small training room at the farm site. This will help them when they receive ballots and when they need to conduct training. This option is more economical than Options 2 and 5, but is more than Option 4. Mr. Wheeler commented we absolutely would need to keep space for training and the voting machines with Elections. Having that separate would be a nightmare.

Mrs. Lando clarified when they do the training, they only have one machine and it is just as a display. Ms. Lattimer stated they have to have more training and currently there is no room big enough to accommodate that. Mr. Wheeler stated that for the custodians they do a more detailed training using the machines. It is a significant challenge finding space for them when they need to do recounts. Ms. Lattimer commented separating the staff from the machines and records is not efficient.

Mr. Wheeler stated last week he received an email from Mr. VanEtten asking about the space needs for conference and meetings. He distributed a handout showing the departments that would utilize additional conference space and the approximate number of annual events needing both small and large spaces. Our need for large space is significant and our need for small space is even more significant. The biggest user of small spaces is the Department of Social Services. Both the Department of Social Services and the Office for the Aging indicated that ideally would like to have private space to meet with clients, as currently privacy is a concern when they meet with clients. By having a separate conference space, it opens up the space that we have in this building. He commented that he feels the numbers provided by the departments are conservative.

Mrs. Ferratella stated one of her concerns is she wants to make sure we are not losing our small spaces in this building to accommodate a larger conference center. Some of these departments need space within their areas. It would be more efficient if the Department of Social Services did not have to go across the street to utilize conference space. The Office for the Aging is using the F1 Conference Room for privacy and she would hate to see that go to office space. Mr. Wheeler stated we would need to look at accommodating that. We may be able to renovate that room to make it a more subdivided room.

Mrs. Ferratella commented none of the options include the Mental Health building. Mr. Wheeler replied the Mental Health building is an option no matter which option you choose. Mrs. Ferratella stated the entire process was to decide whether to purchase or lease the building. Have we received any direction on that? Mr. Wheeler replied we are waiting for the final report from Labella. Once we get that, we will be at a point to discuss those options. He anticipates having the report at the beginning of the year.

Mrs. Ferratella stated Mr. Spagnoletti's point about Cornell Cooperative Extension is valid. She stated she does not know how much interaction they have with our employees here. Mr. Wheeler stated that is certainly an option. The last time we looked at the option of moving them was when we were looking at renovating the Old Health Care Facility. The issue was that when they scoped their needs, it ballooned. If we decide to move them to a new space, we will have to manage them with regard to their expectations. The construction of a kitchen space and other things they currently have now would be an additional cost. This is an option that we have talked about.

Mrs. Ferratella stated when you build this building it was decided not to build up. Is that an option for across the street and if so, how much more expensive would that be? Mr. Kukuvka replied it is a premium. Once a decision on an option has been made, we can articulate that premium for you. Mr. Hanna asked is it a set dollar amount per square foot? Mr. Kukuvka replied it is calculated on a case-by-case basis. It is one of the premiums we suggest you do. If you decide to exercise that option, you do not want to have to vacate those floors during construction. If you opt to want to do that, we build the roof as a reinforced floor. Mr. Alger commented if you build the structure to support another story, you should just put it up.

Ms. Lattimer stated she is still in favor of Option 5 and after looking at the financials, she does not see the difference over the long-term between that and Option 4a and having to scale back the plan and go through the angst of dividing up departments.

MOTION: RECOMMENDING OPTION #5 TO THE LEGISLATURE FOR CONSIDERATION AS THE PROPOSED NEW RECORDS STORAGE/OFFICE SPACE FACILITY MADE BY MS. LATTIMER. SECONDED BY MRS. FERRATELLA FOR DISCUSSION.

Mr. Hauryski stated he is in favor of Option 5. For all practicable purposes, we want to have some forethought into the future. For the price, this meets all of our needs in making operations more efficient and also meets the needs of our constituents.

Ms. Lattimer stated in the late 80's it was our foresight to make government operations more efficient and that is why this building went up. We do not want to embark on a project that does not make our operations more efficient.

Mrs. Lando commented that when she was working at Corning and the locations of her department were split, she spent most of her time going back and forth into Corning and they ended up moving us back to a central location.

Mrs. Ferratella commented that the reconfiguration of this building also needs to be studied.

VOTE ON PREVIOUS MOTION: ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 3-0. Resolution Required.

D. *Next Steps* – Mrs. Lando asked what is the next step if the Legislature passes this? Mr. Wheeler replied once the Legislature chooses an option, Labella will get more into the design of the facility. Mr. Kukuvka stated we will begin the schematic phases.

Mr. Swackhamer stated you also need to think about the maintenance and security of the new buildings.

Ms. Lattimer asked Mr. Donnelly to provide a handout of the figures that he presented today. Mr. Hauryski stated that he would also like him to provide any information that he gets from Rural Development.

Mrs. Ferratella asked what is the timeline that we will be looking at if this is approved? Mr. Kukulka replied a rough timeline would be 9 months to design. We then would anticipate 2 months to bid and award and then 9 – 12 months of construction. Keep in mind that we are also doing two buildings. The earliest you would have a ribbon cutting ceremony would be January – February of 2018.

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MADE BY MRS. FERRATELLA. SECONDED BY MR. HAURYSKI. ALL BEING IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIES 3-0.

Respectfully Submitted by

Amanda L. Chapman
Deputy Clerk
Steuben County Legislature