

**ORANGE COUNTY BUILDINGS COMMITTEE MEETING  
MINUTES**

**MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2015  
2:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: L. Stephen Brescia, Chairman, Orange County Legislature  
Christopher W. Eachus, Majority Leader  
Michael Amo, Independence Party Leader  
Katie Bonelli, Legislator, Chairwoman, Physical Services Comm.  
Barry J. Cheney, Legislator  
Myrna K. Kemnitz, Legislator  
Steven M. Gross, Commissioner, Department of Human Resources  
James P. Burpoe, Commissioner, Department of General Services  
Christopher Viebrock, Acting Commissioner, Public Works/Engineering Division  
Jim Brooks, Deputy Commissioner, Public Works  
Anthony Capozella, Director of Facilities, Department of Public Works  
John McCarey, Director, Real Property

ALSO

PRESENT: Leigh J. Benton, Legislator  
James Kulisek, Legislator  
Michael D. Paduch, Legislator  
Paul Ruskiewicz, Legislator  
Roseanne Sullivan, Legislator  
Matthew A. Turnbull, Legislator  
John S. Vero, Legislator  
Shannon Wong, Legislator  
Antoinette Reed, Legislative Counsel  
Harry Porr, Director of Operations  
Langdon Chapman, County Attorney  
Tim Tucker, Budget Analyst  
Phil Clark, CEO, Clark Patterson Lee  
Susan Clark, Designer, Clark Patterson Lee  
Mark Johnson, Senior Architect, Clark Patterson Lee  
Phil Stiller, Construction Manager, Holt Construction  
Howard Protter, Jacobowitz and Gubits, LLP  
Thomas, Kiselack, Town of Crawford  
Tom Cahill, Houston, Texas

Mrs. Bonelli opened the meeting at 2:02 p.m. All committee members were present with the exception of Majority Leader Bonacic who was absent.

Chairman Brescia introduced Mr. Viebrock and thanked him for all he has done for the county over the last few months.

Mr. Viebrock stated that he has representatives from Clark Patterson Lee here as well as Phil Stiller from Holt Construction to give an update on interior finishes, the Division II façade, roofing design and an approach to value engineering for the Orange County Government Center. At

each interval he would like to stop and get a consensus from the committee members on what their thoughts are on what was presented.

Ms. Clark addressed the committee with the first part of the power point presentation (see original minutes) in regard to the interior finish as well as showing samples of all the materials which included colors, tiles, and carpeting.

Ms. Kemnitz asked why they wouldn't go with the 12x24 tile.

Ms. Clark replied that the larger tiles are harder to install and 12x24 is a nice balance, 12x12 is too standard; therefore, 12x24 is more modern. She added that if they were to go larger there's a possibility of cracking issues.

Ms. Kemnitz stated that she just re-did one entire wing of her house in floor stone tile and she went with 24x24 and because that part of the house has the cement slab which is what the government center has as well. It came out beautifully and they had to use over 300 24x24's.

Ms. Clark explained the tile comes in multiple sizes so if the group feels they should be looking at that size it can certainly be done. Personally, she thought the 12x24 felt more modern and appropriate for this application especially because there are long corridors; however, 24x24 would work fine too.

Mr. Gross asked what the price differential is between the tile, the laminate and the carpet.

Ms. Clark replied that material is about \$10.00 to \$15.00 a square foot which is about three times the cost.

Chairman Brescia asked what the cost differential would be for the 24x24.

Mr. Stiller replied that it would be the standard dollar labor rate a square foot.

Ms. Clark added that the tile is American made; it is not any fancy Italian tile. It has a very nice, simple, timeless look.

Ms. Clark moved on to discuss the walls (see original minutes).

Before moving on to questions, Mrs. Bonelli asked Mr. Viebrock what the committee needs to have a consensus on that will be forwarded off to the County Executive's Office.

Mr. Viebrock replied that the general scheme that's been presented is one of the more favorable. If there is something that is not liked, it needs to be expressed but he would like a general consensus that everyone is onboard with the way the scheme is going, where they are going with the colors, the ideas of the tile and the wall treatments.

Mrs. Bonelli clarified that they are not picking one particular carpet over another.

Mr. Viebrock stated that is correct. The general scheme is acceptable and they can continue on.

Ms. Kemnitz asked where the Rudolph colors are because he was more into vibrant purples and contrast, instead of just an orange it was coral. She stated that it was a very rich red-orange coral and she doesn't see that here.

Mrs. Reed pointed out that for those who have been around for a while; the colors were a vibrant orange. The upholstery in the chambers was a vibrant orange so it seems that the colors go back to the original way the building was made.

Chairman Brescia stated that maybe Rudolph used orange and purple in other buildings, but it wasn't in ours.

Ms. Kemnitz stated that the Carney library that was redone had them as well as Yale.

Chairman Brescia commented that he would rather not see it incorporated here.

Mrs. Bonelli asked that Ms. Clark show the committee some of the colors that would be used for the offices and carpet.

Ms. Clark showed everyone samples of different colors and stated that large spaces can handle large pops of colors, small spaces cannot. She added that color is very subjective, not everyone will be pleased and that is why they are recommending which color scheme goes on which floor. If the committee would like them to meet with the departments and give them a choice that is fine but not recommended.

Mr. Eachus stated that many in his caucus do not approve of this scheme and that is because there's not nearly enough of the split-faced block. To his knowledge, no one had a discussion, or made a decision about this. He understands Ms. Clark's comments about taking some of the block out to make room for ADA but this doesn't look like it saves enough of the split-faced block whether it is new or used.

Ms. Clark stated that she doesn't know the details of this project and whether they were getting all new systems at the time but in order to get all new systems; lighting, heating, ventilation, etc., it has to come down. There is no way for them to penetrate the entire block where it is.

Mr. Viebrock added that the other issue is that some of the chases in the block have asbestos. There are pipes with asbestos insulation wraps and they need to get to them in order to eradicate the area.

Mr. Turnbull commented he is hearing reasons that now make a little bit of sense on why they would have to open up a wall.

Mrs. Bonelli stated that they will discuss the walls later on; right now she is looking to get a consensus on the color scheme.

Mr. Viebrock suggested that he will take the recommendation back to Clark Patterson Lee to try to integrate more of the orange and maybe coral where deemed appropriate.

Ms. Clark stated that they need consensus on the specialty areas and whether or not they should be different or just fall in line with the three schemes.

The committee then looked at the color scheme samples for a few minutes.

Mr. McCarey commented that this is a good color combination and the only exception should be to accept the concept with the hope that they may include a little more split block to give it more of a Rudolph effect.

Mr. Burpoe agreed with Mr. McCarey and stated that he likes the orange for Orange County.

Chairman Brescia agreed with Mr. McCarey and Mr. Burpoe.

Mr. Cheney stated that it would be a good idea to use vibrant colors in the larger spaces as well as match things up with the exposed concrete that is going to remain.

Ms. Kemnitz agreed with Mr. Cheney's statement.

Mr. Eachus commented that he would look for the split-faced block in the larger areas, not the smaller ones.

Mrs. Bonelli clarified that Mr. Viebrock is content with the input received in regard to the color scheme.

Mr. Viebrock stated that is correct.

The next part of the power point presentation was the façade for Division II. Ms. Clark showed the committee three options; a darker metal panel, a lighter metal panel and the split-faced block. She added that their recommendation is to go with option number one which is the darker metal panel and the vertical application.

Mr. Viebrock stated that he is looking to get a consensus from the committee on one of the options.

Mr. McCarey commented that metal panels start to get water stains after four of five years. He asked which option is easier to maintain, the metal panel or the block.

Ms. Clark stated that this type of metal panel is easier to maintain and less expensive. The block would cost about \$10,000 more because more support is needed.

Mr. Capozella added that the metals nowadays are made differently.

Mr. Viebrock commented that his recommendation is maintenance. After being in the acting commissioner spot, his big focus is long-term maintenance and energy efficiency of all the buildings. He stated that initial cost is one thing but those dollars add up 50 years from now. Furthermore, he doesn't have as many workers to go around and do maintenance; therefore, he is more for whatever is less maintenance and cost efficient.

Mrs. Bonelli clarified that would be option one or two.

Mr. Capozella stated that is correct.

Mr. Eachus stated that the options they are looking at are exactly the same, most of it has glass. He certainly understands what Mr. Viebrock is saying but they have to remember that the building they currently have and have had for 40 years has had no maintenance to it at all. For a building like that to have no maintenance and still look the way it does with the stains it has on it, that's not bad. It was through the lack of maintenance that it fell into disrepair. He thinks that comments were made that the new block is as durable as the block that is being taken down. Again, he can only speak for himself but he can't compromise to tear Division II on the thought that they were going to do everything in their power to maintain the Rudolph architecture.

Ms. Kemnitz commented that since she has to choose one option, she would certainly choose the one that compliments what they currently have which is option 3.

Mr. Cheney commented that he feels by going with option 3; they are trying to pretend they are Paul Rudolph. It is important to draw distinction between what his architecture is and what this new architecture is; therefore, he finds option 2 to be most preferable.

Chairman Brescia agreed with Mr. Cheney. He stated that a lot of money was spent on maintenance over the years, maybe not to what a lot of people think it should have been, but they've spent a lot of money on structural repairs.

Mrs. Bonelli echoed what Chairman Brescia stated. She added that in defense of the Department of Public Works, they have done a good job as far as that is concerned. While she respects the comments of those that are supporting option 3 in an effort to preserve the Rudolph look, she thinks it is a better respect to accent it.

Mr. Viebrock clarified that there is a consensus on option 2.

Mrs. Bonelli stated that is correct.

Mr. Johnson addressed the committee with the roofing options part of the power point presentation and showed samples (see original minutes).

Mr. Stiller showed the committee a few slides regarding an approach to value engineering (see original minutes).

Ms. Kemnitz asked what the boilers are made of.

Mr. Stiller replied that they are made of electric coils which are limited to hot water usage.

Mr. Viebrock reiterated that everyone needs to think of long-term use and maintenance instead of the expense.

Mr. Turnbull asked if there was a bid award for the demolition.

Mr. Viebrock replied yes.

Mr. Cahill addressed the committee with a brief discussion regarding a roof system analysis for waterproofing. He stated that this is the first time he is in Orange County and about a week ago he began to look at the roof; there are a lot of complexities. It is a real challenge and he

will do his best today to not sell. His expertise is in every variety of roofs and every variety of weather conditions. He pointed out that he has a good bit of knowledge on EPDM and TPO as well as all the various membranes when it comes to roofing. Furthermore, he is a cool liquid manufacturer/supplier and has his own manufacturing facility in Houston, Texas where he owns the design of this product and the formulation. He then went on to tell the committee about the product and its history. In closing, he stated that in terms of removing the roof on the government center building, it is not going to be as expensive as everyone would imagine, it is very straightforward. In this particular case anyone who works on the roof can get to the concrete very quickly, it won't be constant labor. He would love the challenge of working on this roof.

Mr. Turnbull stated that there is a concrete topping on the roof and asked if Mr. Cahill is aware of that.

Mr. Cahill replied yes, he is aware.

Mr. Turnbull stated that there was a forensic study done on the roof that established the structural condition of it and Mr. Cahill should review it.

Mr. Cahill responded that he will do that and his visit today was to get a deeper view of the roof and come back to do a good study of it. He stated that he needs every resource available in order to prove that the roof won't leak ever again.

Chairman Brescia stated that when he saw this system he was very impressed.

Ms. Sullivan asked Mr. Cahill if he has done any work here.

Mr. Cahill replied that the closest roof he did is located in Staten Island. It was a 45,000 square foot chocolate factory that was repurposed.

The committee adjourned at 3:36 p.m.