

Seneca County Board of Supervisors

Special Meeting

March 26, 2012

6:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Chairman Hayssen called the meeting to order at 8:03 p.m.

Roll Call of Members by the Clerk

Nine members of the Board of Supervisors answered roll call. Not present were Mr. Kaiser, Mr. Lafler, Mrs. Amidon, Mr. Westfall, and Mr. Kubasik.

Pledge of Allegiance

Presentation

The Board of Supervisors met in open session for the purpose of meeting with Popli Design Group, the engineering firm that developed the Space Needs Analysis for the Seneca County Courthouse project. Representing Popli was Rohit Agrawal, Principal / Space Planner and Jessica Colangelo, Architectural Designer.

A PowerPoint presentation showed the analysis of current deficiencies and projected space needs for the long term planning for the courthouse. Three options were presented. Option A – would correct only critical deficiencies; Option B – would correct major deficiencies related to code compliance and building performance; Option C – would correct all the deficiencies.

The conclusion of the Seneca County Courthouse Space Needs Analysis Report as outlined by Popli Design Group is stated as follows:

“The space needs analysis shows that an additional space of 3,893 sf is required to house the District Attorney and expand the E911 backup center. In addition, a sally port is recommended for secure transfer of prisoners to and from the facility. Relocating the E911 backup center from the courthouse facility would provide some cost savings to the project by not to the county overall, as the costs of providing a new location would be more in the long run. While Option A was deemed feasible, it addressed only portions of what an ideal facility would be. Option B addresses all major issues and provides a long term solution while limiting areas of disturbance. Option C provides a comprehensive solution to the facility as a whole, correction all known deficiencies and making building-wide improvements that would serve for a long term. Based on a review with the stakeholders, Option C was preferred as an approach while realizing that the optimal solution may lie between Options B & C. It is recommended that the project be carried into the design phase with a project budget range of \$3.5M to \$4.1M in mind, with a fixed project budget to be established at the end of schematic design after a more exhaustive cost-benefit study of design options to provide the best value to the County. Additional

funding needs should be explored at that time, taking into account potential reimbursable costs from the State.”

Following the presentation there was an open floor discussion on the advantages of Option A, B, and C vs. the cost associated with each option. A concern shared by the members of the Board of Supervisors was how much the cost would increase if the County chose to delay some of the improvements until a future time.

Chairman Hayssen referred the matter to the Public Works Committee for its meeting on April 27, 2012.

Special Order of the Day

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.