

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: NOVEMBER 6, 2014

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS GIRARD
WOOD
STROUGH

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

SUPERVISORS WESTCOTT
MONROE

OTHERS PRESENT:

JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS
SHAWN RAYMOND, ENGINEER, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
JON NORRIS, CLARK PATTERSON LEE
MATTHEW SMULLEN, CLARK PATTERSON LEE
KEVIN B. GERAGHTY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
FRANK E. THOMAS, BUDGET OFFICER
SUPERVISORS BROCK
CONOVER
KENNY
MCDEVITT
SEEBER
SIMPSON
TAYLOR
HON. J. TIMOTHY BREEN, FAMILY COURT JUDGE
HON. DAVID B. KROGMANN, SUPREME COURT JUDGE
HON. JOHN S. HALL, JR., COUNTY AND SURROGATE COURT JUDGE
KATE HOGAN, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
MICHAEL SWAN, COUNTY TREASURER
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
THOM RANDALL, *ADIRONDACK JOURNAL*
CHARLENE DIRESTA, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Girard called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 10:30 a.m.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the agenda and conceptual floor plans for Concepts 1,2 and 3, as well as a Summary and Conceptual Project Cost Comparison of the three concepts were distributed to the Committee members; *copies of same are on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Girard explained Clark Patterson Lee (CPL) had worked diligently on the conceptual floor plans based on the direction received from the Committee that the entire Court System would remain together on the Municipal Center Campus. He noted Concept 1 had been reviewed at the October 28, 2014 County Facilities Committee Meeting and all three Concepts would be presented and reviewed at this meeting. He commented two of the concepts included the possibility of relocating County Departments offsite and renovating their existing office space for use by the Court System.

Matthew Smullen, of CPL, pointed out copies of the three concepts (schemes) had been distributed to the Committee members and he would keep the presentation as brief as possible to allow time for discussion. He noted they would also review the cost estimates of the three concepts. He expressed there were three schematics of each of the three concepts: the first of which represented a square footage of the concept; the second represented a color coded schematic delineating use of the space; and the third represented a color coded schematic delineating the project phases.

Pertaining to Concept 1, Mr. Smullen reminded the Committee members the use of the space for the addition to the Municipal Center for this concept had been reviewed at the previous Committee Meeting. Referring to the color coded schematic delineating use of the space for Concept 1, he advised some changes had been made to this schematic based on comments received at the previous Committee Meeting, in order to detail the usage of the existing Family Court following renovations.

Concerning the Concept 1 Summary, Mr. Smullen noted it included the following attributes:

- ▶ no County Departments would require relocation;
- ▶ there would be a newly constructed addition for the Family Court, allowing for a more efficient layout with the entire Court System located together;
- ▶ there would be one centralized magnetometer screening area;
- ▶ the District Attorney's (DA) Office would be expanded into the existing Supreme Court Library space;
- ▶ the renovations would not be too complex other than the removal of existing columns in the Multi-Purpose Courtroom/Jury Assembly Area and some sprinkler implications; and
- ▶ the constructed addition for the Family Court would be less disruptive to the entire Court System compared to the other concepts.

Concerning the color coded schematic to delineate project phases for Concept 1, Jon Norris, of CPL, listed the phases, as follows:

- ▶ Phase I - construct the addition for the Family Court and relocate the Family Court upon completion;
- ▶ Phase II - renovate the current Family Court space and relocate the Commissioner of Jurors and temporarily relocate the Chambers for the Hon. Robert J. Muller, Supreme Court Judge, to the Visiting Judge Chambers upon completion;
- ▶ Phase III - renovate the current space for Judge Muller and the Commissioner of Jurors;
- ▶ Phase IV - renovate the County Court to provide some Court-Ready Space, accessibility and a Judge Waiting Area within the Judge's staff area for the Hon. John S. Hall, County and Surrogate Court Judge; and
- ▶ Phase V - renovate the Large Courtroom.

Mr. Norris explained this would be a stepped approach which would involve relocation of courts upon the completion of the construction and/or renovation of their new offices. Mr. Smullen asked if there were any questions pertaining to Concept 1 and no questions were asked.

Concerning the Concept 2 Summary, Mr. Norris pointed out the following details:

- ▶ the Public Health, WIC (Women, Infants and Children) and Tourism Department Offices would be relocated to offsite facilities;
- ▶ there would be circulation of the public through the Family Court Waiting Room and one of the Family Courtrooms would be some distance from the Family Court support staff requiring more circulation by staff;
- ▶ one central magnetometer screening area;
- ▶ complexity of renovations would include the removal of existing columns in the Multi-Purpose Courtroom/Jury Assembly Area, some sprinkler implications, renovation of the Supreme Court Library and Grand Jury Room as a Family Courtroom and Hearing Room, the current DA and County Attorney Offices renovated as Family Court Clerks Offices, and the Hon. David B. Krogmann, Supreme Court Judge, Chambers renovated for use as offices and jury deliberation rooms; and
- ▶ the construction phases would be more disruptive to the Courts and County Departments and parking needs would require review.

Mr. Norris commented CPL had been directed by the County that the Public Health, WIC and Tourism Department Offices could be relocated to offsite facilities. Mr. Smullen pointed out the intent with relocating these Departments offsite was to reduce the necessary square footage of the addition to be constructed. He said Concept 1 would include the construction of an addition of approximately 20,000 square feet, while Concept 2 required an addition of approximately 11,000 square feet. Mr. Norris informed the magnetometer screening area was currently on the north end of the building but for Concept 2 it would be relocated to the south end. Kate Hogan, DA, asked if the Grand Jury Room was included in the schematic and Mr. Norris replied affirmatively. Mr. Norris explained this would require the relocation of the DA's Office and the Grand Jury Room within the secure perimeter of the Court System and he pointed out Concept 2 involved a much more complex phasing than Concept 1. He mentioned the Probation Offices would be relocated to the existing Public Health and WIC Offices. Ms. Hogan asked if the DA's Office would be connected to the Grand Jury Room and Mr. Norris replied affirmatively. Mr. Kenny asked if there would be any available reimbursement for the rent of office space for the Public Health and WIC Offices and he mentioned the cost of renting Tourism Department Office space would be covered by Occupancy Tax collections. Paul Dusek, County Administrator, responded he had not researched the matter but he would do so. Mr. Norris stated currently there was a private corridor between the Large Courtroom and Judge Krogmann's Chambers which would become a public corridor and be a spine which would traverse from the addition to the Surrogate Court Offices. He mentioned the existing magnetometer screening entrance on the north end of the building would become an emergency exit only. Mr. Norris explained when members of the public entered through the new magnetometer screening area on the south end, they would enter into a waiting room for both Family and Supreme Court with a Family Court Petitioning area on one end.

Referring to the color coded schematic which delineated the project phases for Concept 2, Mr. Norris reviewed the phases, as follows:

- ▶ Phase I - relocate the Public Health, WIC and Tourism Department Offices to offsite facilities; renovate those offices as needed for use by the Probation Department; renovate the existing Probation Offices for use by the DA's Office; renovate the existing Tourism Office and Conference Room for use by the County Attorney's Office; relocate Judge Krogmann's Chambers temporarily to a trailer located outside of the County Courtroom; and relocate the Supreme Court Law Library temporarily to a trailer outside of the Surrogate Court Clerks Offices;
- ▶ Phase II - construct the Family Courtroom 2, Judge's Chambers, Court Security Area and Family Court Waiting Room; renovate Judge Krogmann's Chambers for use by the Commissioner of Jurors, Jury Deliberation, Offices and Conference Room; renovate the existing DA and County Attorney Offices for use by Family Court Clerks; renovate the existing Grand Jury Room to be used as a Court Magistrate Hearing Room; renovate the existing Supreme Court Law Library for use as Family Courtroom 1; and relocate the Family Court Judges and support staff to the newly renovated space;
- ▶ Phase III- renovate the existing Family Court Space for use as a Twelve Jury Courtroom and relocate Judge Muller upon completion; renovate Judge Muller's existing Chambers, the existing Commissioner of Jurors Office and the existing Court Waiting Room to be used as a Jury Deliberation Room, Visiting Judge Chambers and Judge Krogmann's Chambers; and relocate Judge Krogmann and remove temporary trailer;
- ▶ Phase IV - renovate County/Criminal Courtroom; construct Court Ready addition outside of the County Courtroom; construct Surrogate Court vault; and
- ▶ Phase V - renovate existing space for Supreme and County Clerks and Public Waiting Areas.

Mr. Norris reiterated Concept 2 required a much more complex phasing than Concept 1 requiring several relocations and renovations before the Court functions could be addressed. Contrary to

Concept 1, he continued, the addition for Concept 2 would "hug" an exterior wall and create a lot of complications. He explained the Court areas would relocate in phases upon the completion of renovations to ensure the entire Court System was not interrupted at one time. He noted there were some column obstructions within the existing Family Court space which would require removal for both Concepts 1 and 2. He added there was one column in the existing Supreme Court Law Library which supported the roof and would require shoring. He advised although Concept 2 would involve less square footage of constructed addition there would be more square footage of renovations which would cause more disruption.

Ms. Seeber stated it had been mentioned in the past that Warren County was one of the few Counties which did not have a Jury Assembly Room and she asked if one was included in Concept 2. Judge Krogmann responded he had discussed the need for a Jury Assembly Room with Mr. Norris relative to all three concepts. He noted in Concept 1, the Multi-Purpose Courtroom would double as a Jury Assembly Area. Mr. Conover asked if the square footage for the Departments to be relocated to offsite facilities (Public Health, WIC and Tourism) was reflected in the total square footage for the concepts indicated on the Conceptual Project Cost Comparison and Mr. Smullen replied in the negative. Mr. Conover asked the amount of square footage necessary for offsite facilities to house these Departments and he noted the estimated expense for these facilities should be known when addressing Concepts 2 and 3. Mr. Smullen replied they would discuss the cost estimates for each concept following the review of the floor plans. He commented a dollar amount had not been determined for the lease of offsite facilities which was listed as an additional cost on the Conceptual Project Cost Comparison. Mr. Conover asked if the project time lines for the three concepts were comparable and Mr. Smullen replied they had not completed detailed scheduling but due to the complexity of Concepts 2 and 3, they would take longer to complete. A brief discussion ensued.

Pertaining to Concept 3 Summary, Mr. Norris stated the following attributes were included:

- ▶ the Public Health and WIC Offices would be relocated to offsite facilities;
- ▶ the Family Court Space would be located together but there would be long paths of circulation for the Court Clerks and Security personnel;
- ▶ there would be two magnetometer screening areas: one for Family Court; and one for Supreme, County and Surrogate Courts and the Jurors;
- ▶ the DA's Office could be expanded into the existing Supreme Court Law Library and the future needs of the Probation, Public Defender and Assigned Counsel Offices could be addressed;
- ▶ complexity of renovations would include the removal of existing columns in the Multi-Purpose Courtroom/Jury Assembly Area, some sprinkler implications, and the need to consider confidentiality issues with the renovations; and
- ▶ the construction phases would be more disruptive to Courts and County Departments and parking needs would require review.

Mr. Smullen noted Concept 3 was similar to Concept 2; however, he continued the addition for Concept 3 would be located on the east side of the building, as opposed to Concept 2 where the addition would wrap around the south end. Mr. Norris explained the floor plans for Concept 3 only detailed the addition to the building and the existing Public Health and WIC Office space and did not show the Supreme, County and Surrogate Courts portion of the concept which would be similar to the floor plan layout in Concept 1. He apprised the entrance near the existing Public Health Offices would be public and include a magnetometer screening area for Family Court. He pointed out the existing WIC Offices would become the Chambers of one of the Family Court Judges, Judge's Staff Offices and Visiting Judge Chambers. He commented there would be a distance of approximately twenty feet between the existing back side of the Municipal Center (east side) and the proposed addition. He added there was a bulkhead door in that area which was utilized for Tourism Department access to the basement for storage purposes which would remain accessible. He pointed

out the Incarcerated Holding Area and the Vehicle Sally Port were part of the addition for Concept 3.

Concerning the color coded schematic which delineated the project phases for Concept 3, Mr. Norris listed the phases, as follows:

- ▶ Phase I - relocate Public Health and WIC Offices to offsite facilities and renovate those offices for use as Family Court Clerk space, some Court Security functions and Judge's Chamber; consideration for Tourism basement access, as well as incarcerated access to the Large Courtroom during renovations; and construct the Family Court addition;
- ▶ Phase II - construct the Commissioner of Jurors and Magnetometer Screening Area addition at the north end of the existing Court Facilities with a temporary magnetometer screening area to be established; renovate existing Family Court space as a new Courtroom, Jury Deliberation Room and Visiting Judge Chambers; relocate Judge Muller temporarily to the Visiting Judge Chambers; relocate the Commissioner of Jurors to the newly constructed space; and relocate portions of the Supreme and County Clerks Office to the newly constructed space;
- ▶ Phase III- renovate the existing Commissioner of Jurors Office, Judge Muller's Chambers and Public Waiting Room for use as a Jury Deliberation Room, New Judge Chambers and Visiting Judge Chambers; renovate existing Supreme Court Law Library for use as Court Reporters and DA Office space; and relocate Judge Muller to his new Chambers upon completion;
- ▶ Phase IV - relocate Judge Hall temporarily to the Visiting Judge Chambers behind the new Courtroom; construct the Surrogate Court vault addition; construct the Court-Ready addition for the County Court; renovate the County Courtroom and Judge Hall's Secretary's Office; and relocate Judge Hall to his new Chambers upon completion; and
- ▶ Phase V - renovate the existing Large Courtroom; renovate remaining Supreme and County Deputy Clerks Offices and Records Storage Area; and renovate the County Court Public Waiting Room.

Mr. Smullen asked if the Committee wanted to review the Conceptual Project Cost Comparison first or discuss the three concepts. Mr. Girard stated it would be helpful to the Committee members to hear comments from the Judges first.

The Hon. J. Timothy Breen, Family Court Judge, stated in Concept 2, the distance between the two Family Courtrooms was great and he saw lots of logistical issues with that, as well as the location of the Family Court Clerks Offices. He noted the entrance of Concept 2 would require the public to enter into a combined waiting area which he said would be awkward noting Concept 2 would not work very well. Judge Breen apprised Concept 3 would have two separate entrances into the Court System which he noted would be problematic and inefficient. He stated his preference of the three concepts would be Concept 1 which was the most efficient and would be the least disruptive to the Court System.

Judge Krogmann commented the Hon. Michael V. Cocomo, Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for all New York State Courts outside of New York City, and the Hon. Vito C. Caruso, 4th District Administrative Judge, had addressed the problems with Concept 3 during the core group meeting on October 28, 2014. He mentioned the additional security area requiring additional personnel would result in a more heightened review of the plan by the New York State Office of Court Administration (NYSOCA) because of the budgetary effects. Pertaining to Concept 2, Judge Krogmann agreed with Judge Breen's assessment.

Judge Hall opined Concept 1 was the only way to proceed as the other two concepts would cause disruptions and logistical problems. He commented the concept of Judge Krogmann being temporarily relocated to a trailer would be costly and it made sense to construct the new addition in Concept 1. He expressed the series of relocations and renovations in Concepts 2 and 3 would be disruptive to the Courts.

Mr. McDevitt mentioned an article in the November 5, 2014 *Times Union*, which spoke to the commonalities and the not so common matters of this issue. He informed the City of Troy had expended \$1.55 million to purchase a new building and had discussed issues, such as night hours, mandates and more State Aid. Mr. McDevitt asked about the possibility of additional State Aid being identified for this project. Mr. Dusek explained the County was entitled to maintenance in lieu of rent for the Court space and the NYSOCA had indicated there would be reimbursement on the interest rate of approximately one third, provided the County bonded the project costs through the Dormitory Authority. He commented that was the limitation of the funding which he was aware of but he noted he would continue to search for additional funding sources.

Pertaining to the Conceptual Project Cost Comparison, Mr. Smullen mentioned the handout had been distributed and was displayed on the screen for the Committee members. He pointed out a presentation had been given to the Board of Supervisors at the October 7, 2014 Special Board Meeting during which the Court Space Expansion Needs Assessment and Concept 1 had been reviewed. Mr. Smullen advised that in past meetings, CPL had presented a cost estimate for Phase 1 of Concept 1 (the addition) which had been \$8.6 million with the cost estimate for the renovations being reviewed separately. He mentioned the Conceptual Project Cost Comparison presented the total project costs of both the additions and the renovations. He advised the project costs had been estimated by using a cost of \$260 per square foot for construction and \$190 per square foot for renovations for all three concepts. He said contingency costs had been included at 18% for construction and 20% for renovations for all concepts. He added the higher percentage for renovations was due to the fact that were more unknown costs associated with renovations compared to new construction. He noted 22% had been included for other project costs for all three concepts and he mentioned these costs included design construction, administration and owner soft costs. He compared the following information for the three concepts:

	CONCEPT 1	CONCEPT2	CONCEPT 3
Total Square Footage	48,255	48,810	50,995
Total Construction Costs	\$11,200,000	\$10,600,000	\$11,400,000
Total Project Costs	\$16,300,000	\$15,500,000	\$16,500,000

Concerning the additional costs related to relocation of County Departments to offsite facilities, Mr. Smullen commented there were no additional costs with Concept 1 and the costs for Concepts 2 and 3 had not been quantified at this point. Mr. Conover asked if the total square footage necessary for the Public Health, WIC and Tourism Departments was known. Jeffery Tennyson, Superintendent of the Department of Public Works (DPW), responded that based on their current square footage he would estimate 7,000 square feet for the three Departments and Mr. Smullen interjected it was approximately 8,000 square feet. Mr. Tennyson noted past conversations relative to relocating the Tourism Department offsite had pertained to their need for additional space. Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings, countered the estimated 8,000 square feet was for the Public Health and WIC Departments and did not include the Tourism Department. Mr. Smullen agreed and noted the total square footage for all three Departments was probably closer to 10,000 square feet. Mr. Tennyson stated that at an estimated cost of \$17 per square foot, the cost of renting 10,000 square feet of office space would be approximately \$170,000 per year. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Brock asked if the total project costs included the costs associated with bonding and Mr. Smullen replied in the negative. Mr. Brock asked if the total costs including interest on bonds was known and Mr. Dusek responded he had asked the County Treasurer to complete a bonding comparison based on the current County Dept Service assuming total project costs of \$16 million and total construction costs of \$8.5 million. He advised the Future County Debt Service Chart had been completed and copies of same were distributed to the Committee members; *a copy of the Future County Debt Service Chart is on file with the minutes.* Mr. Dusek informed if the total project costs of approximately \$16 million were bonded, there would be a significant increase to the Debt Service of about \$1 million in 2016; however, he continued, by 2020, the Debt Service would return to approximately the same level as it was currently. He commented the anticipated annual payment for Debt Service in 2015 was \$4,444,984 and if \$16 million was bonded, the anticipated annual payment for Debt Service in 2020 would be \$4,387,067. Mr. Dusek mentioned he and JoAnn McKinstry, Assistant to the County Administrator, were updating the Multi-Year Financial Plan Summary and would email it upon completion to the Board of Supervisors. He said there was no question that the bonding of approximately \$16 million would negatively impact the Fund Balance for 2016, 2017 and 2018. He noted the Fund Balance would be decreased to the point that it might become necessary to borrow money for cash flow purposes; however, he pointed out, there were scenarios which would allow the County to recover the Fund Balance over time. He stated Warren County was on a positive financial trajectory and this would be a set back which would decrease the Fund Balance for a few years. He commented a 3.5% interest rate on the bonding had been assumed for the Future County Debt Service Chart which did not take into consideration any reimbursements which might be received by bonding through the Dormitory Authority.

Mr. McDevitt opined the Public Health Department needed to be located on the Municipal Center Campus and the Tourism Department could be located anywhere. Mr. Conover recalled when Concept 1 was originally presented there had been an indication that some of the renovations could be completed by DPW staff and he asked if the \$190 per square foot assumption for the cost of renovations had considered this option and Mr. Smullen replied in the negative noting it was for comparison purposes. He asked if the timing requirements for Concepts 2 and 3 would allow renovations to be completed by DPW staff and Mr. Smullen replied not as well because there would be some urgency in the time lines for Concepts 2 and 3. Mr. Smullen explained that working through the phases of Concept 1 would involve vacant spaces which would allow DPW staff members to complete some of the renovations without disrupting the Courts. Mr. Conover asked if it was fair to assume the total project costs for Concept 1 could be slightly decreased by lessening the costs associated with renovations completed by DPW staff and Mr. Smullen replied affirmatively.

Mr. Girard mentioned at the October 28, 2014 core group meeting with the Courts, the Judges had expressed concern with the project being completed in a timely manner. He said they had stressed the importance of timetables being established for each phase of the project. He noted there was some fear that some of the time lines would be exceeded. Mr. Girard stated it was important to determine which work could be completed in-house and which work would require contractors beforehand so there would be no time line delays. He expressed the Judges were not opposed to work being completed by DPW staff, they just wanted to ensure the work was completed in a timely manner.

Ms. Seeber recalled Mr. Dusek had previously mentioned the possibility of grant funding being available for new construction, as opposed to renovations and Mr. Dusek responded he had not found any available grant funding but he would continue to pursue this option.

Mr. Girard asked what CPL required from the Committee in order to move forward with the Court Space Expansion Project and Mr. Smullen replied the next step would be for the County to formally

adopt the Court Space Expansion Project Needs Assessment which had been Task 1. Mr. Smullen continued that Task 2 had been the exploration of options and three options had been presented at this meeting. He said if the Committee felt a significant amount of information had been presented, the next step would be to select an option to move forward into a schematic design of the selected concept. Mr. Girard commented CPL had done a good job on the Needs Assessment and their explanation of how they had derived the necessary square footage. He asked if any of the Committee members had any questions for CPL regarding the Needs Assessment.

Mr. Conover asked if the incarcerated entrance continued to be included in the Needs Assessment or if it had been eliminated. Mr. Smullen explained a Vehicle Sally Port had originally been proposed on the backside of the Municipal Center building for Concept 1 but had been changed to a fenced in area in order to reduce costs and square footage. Mr. Conover asked if the Vehicle Sally Port was reflected in the total project costs and Mr. Smullen replied affirmatively. Mr. Smullen pointed out in Concept 2 the Vehicle Sally Port was on the front side of the building and therefore had been anticipated to be constructed of brick and mortar. Mr. Norris added a brick barrier wall would be constructed on the facade facing Route 9, as opposed to the fenced in area for Concept 1.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to adopt the Court Space Expansion Project Needs Assessment as prepared by Clark Patterson Lee. *The necessary resolution was authorized for the November 21, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Mr. Girard asked the Committee members opinions on which concept the County should consider moving forward with and Ms. Wood replied she supported moving forward with Concept 1. Ms. Wood stated CPL had done a great job presenting the options. Mr. Strough commented there was not a large difference in the total project costs for the three concepts noting there was an \$800,000 difference between Concept 1 and Concept 2. Concerning the Future County Debt Service Chart, he asked where the figure of \$8.5 million had been derived and Mr. Dusek replied this figure had been presented as the anticipated cost of constructing the addition for Concept 1. Mr. Strough stated a lot of information had been presented today and he was leaning towards Concept 1 because the benefits to the Court System seemed to be significant.

Mr. Girard explained the process had started for him in 2006 when a study had indicated the Family Court was about 6,500 square feet undersized. He said there was a need at that time but now a second Family Court Judgeship would commence in January of 2016 and the need was greater. He informed Judges Coccoma and Caruso were visiting the Court Facilities of the Counties which would receive additional Judgeships to ensure the accommodations were moving forward. In 2008, Mr. Girard continued, Warren County was having a financial crisis and could not complete the Court Expansion. He said at that time, CPL had given a presentation with suggestions for a Tourism Center constructed in front of the Municipal Center, an addition for Family Court and the Human Services Building. He added the County had opted for the construction of the Human Services Building in order to keep the cost of borrowing down. Respectfully, Mr. Girard commented, the Court had not pushed the County on the Court Expansion because they were aware of the financial crisis. He stated now the Court Space Expansion Project was paramount and the County had been fortunate no one had been injured due to the crowded space in the Court System. He expressed the Needs Assessment was appropriately completed and the County was required to provide office space and a Courtroom for the new Family Court Judge. He said he wanted the input of all the Supervisors present because it was necessary to move forward with one of the three concepts.

Mr. Brock said if the County needed to rent 10,000 square feet at approximately \$9 per square foot the cost would be \$900,000 over a ten year period and he stated he was in favor of Concept 1. Mr. Kenny mentioned based on the simple economics of the three concepts, he would be in favor of

Concept 1 because Concepts 2 and 3 required the rental of office space offsite. Mr. Taylor pointed out he had been a proponent of researching the possibility of offsite facilities. Since then, he continued, the decision had been made to keep the entire Court System together on the Municipal Center Campus; therefore he stated he was in favor of Concept 1. Mr. McDevitt opined in any form of construction the greatest variable was the fear of the unknown and Concept 1 would provide the highest degree of certainty and predictability. Chairman Geraghty apprised he was in favor of Concept 1 since the beginning. He added in discussions with the Judges, they expected the County to move forward with the project. He expressed there was the possibility of asking State representatives to assist with some sort of funding and the reimbursement of interest by bonding through the Dormitory Authority would reduce costs. He opined Concept 1 would be the least disruptive to the Court System and would be the most efficient. He stated he did not like the idea of renting office space for County Departments and he felt it was convenient for the residents of Warren County to have all of the County Departments located on one campus.

Mr. Dusek apprised everyone was in agreement about the need to complete the Court Space Expansion Project and he pointed out currently the interest rates were very low and now was the best time to borrow money. He said he would suggest they borrow the amount necessary to complete the entire project and he noted the interest rates were anticipated to remain low for the next year. He acknowledged bonding the necessary money would negatively impact the Fund Balance; however, he pointed out the Fund Balance would be increased by matters, such as the sale of Westmount Health Facility, the sale of the additional parcel of land adjacent to the Facility and other properties which could be sold. A brief discussion ensued.

Judge Krogmann explained that Judge Cocoma had visited Warren County to determine where the County was in the process and had left the meeting very satisfied with the progress. Judge Krogmann recalled Judge Cocoma had asked for some conceptual indication as to the project by mid December so he could report that Warren County was attending to the requirements of the additional Family Court Judge. Judge Krogmann opined Warren County was right on track with the expectations of the NYSOCA. He recalled Judge Cocoma had indicated that if Warren County made a conceptual decision they would be way ahead of many of the other Counties in a similar situation. Judge Krogmann suggested it was important to look into the possibility of bonding through the Dormitory Authority because the reimbursement would be a huge benefit to the County. He thanked the County and CPL for the hard work that had already gone into this project.

Chairman Geraghty opined the County had worked through a financial crisis in 2009 and he was not concerned with the ability to keep the County in good financial shape because he had confidence in the Budget Team. He said he understood the concept was daunting but there was the potential for huge savings by bonding through the Dormitory Authority.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood and seconded by Mr. Strough to move forward with Concept 1 presented by CPL with the intent to borrow the full amount necessary to complete the project, estimated at \$16.3 million; and to research the possibility of bonding the necessary amount through the Dormitory Authority in order to qualify for reimbursement of interest from the NYSOCA and to explore any other possible financial resources.

Mr. Dusek suggested the motion also include the understanding that to the extent possible, any work which could be completed by DPW staff would be, in order to reduce the total cost of the project. Ms. Wood amended her motion to include Mr. Dusek's suggestion and Mr. Strough amended his second to the motion.

Mr. Girard said the discussions of the core group had been positive and he opined with input from Mr. Tennyson, Mr. Morehouse and the Engineers, there was the possibility of saving a significant amount of money by doing things a little differently with the bidding process and completing a certain amount of the work with DPW staff. He stated he felt Concept 1 would present the County with the best opportunity to do so.

Mr. Tennyson expressed the need to approve a Letter of Authorization to allow CPL to advance a schematic design and/or final design of Concept 1 for the purpose of developing an RFP (Request for Proposals) which would be the next step in the process. He said the Letter of Authorization could be presented at the November 12, 2014 Finance Committee Meeting for approval. He added once approval was received at the November 21, 2014 Board Meeting to move ahead with Concept 1, CPL would commence work. He reminded the Committee members that it was apparent that temporary space would be needed for the additional Family Court Judge but every day that work was delayed was important. If the next phase of engineering work was not advanced, he continued, in time for the November 21, 2014 Board Meeting, an additional month would be lost on the construction schedule. Mr. Strough clarified that Mr. Tennyson was requesting the support of the County Facilities Committee for CPL to advance to the next stage of design and engineering and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively.

In preparation for the November 12, 2014 Finance Committee Meeting, Mr. Dusek stated it would be necessary to determine a source of funding and how that funding would relate to the bonding which would be necessary for the Project. He advised the County had already contracted with a financial consultant and should discuss the matter with him prior to the Finance Committee Meeting. Mr. Tennyson reminded the Committee members the Board of Supervisors had previously approved an increase to the Capital Project for the next phase of work which had not been expended because it had been decided the review of offsite locations would not be necessary. He said he believed there was approximately \$60,000 remaining in the Capital Project.

Mr. Girard called the question and the motion was carried unanimously to move forward with Concept 1 presented by Clark Patterson Lee with the intent to borrow the full amount necessary to complete the project, estimated at \$16.3 million; to research the possibility of bonding the necessary amount through the Dormitory Authority in order to qualify for reimbursement of interest from the New York State Office of Court Administration; to explore any other possible financial resources; and with the understanding that to the extent possible any work which could be completed by DPW staff would be, in order to reduce the total cost of the project. *The necessary resolution was authorized for the November 21, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to approve a Letter of Authorization to allow Clark Patterson Lee to advance a schematic design and/or final design of Concept 1 of the Court Space Expansion Project and to refer same to the Finance Committee to determine a source of funding.

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Ms. Wood and seconded by Mr. Strough, Mr. Girard adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Charlene DiResta, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist