

**PHYSICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**(REMOTELY)  
MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 2020  
3:30 P.M.**

PRESENT: Barry J. Cheney, Chairman  
Leigh J. Benton, Katie Bonelli, James M. Kulisek, Joseph J. Minuta,  
Michael D. Paduch, Paul Ruskiewicz, Peter V. Tuohy

ALSO

PRESENT: L. Stephen Brescia, Chairman  
Thomas J. Faggione, Legislator  
Kevin W. Hines, Legislator  
Kathy Stegenga, Legislator  
Antoinette Reed, Legislative Counsel  
Harry Porr, Deputy County Executive  
Dan Bloomer, Director of Operations and Cost Control  
Langdon Chapman, County Attorney  
Stacy Butler, Senior Assistant County Attorney  
James P. Burpoe, Commissioner, General Services  
Erik Denega, Commissioner, Dept. of Public Works  
Travis Ewald, Deputy Commissioner, Dept. of Public Works/Engineering Div.  
Robert Gray, Deputy Commissioner, Dept. of Public Works/  
Environmental Facilities & Services  
Edward Magryta, Director of Aviation, Orange County Airport  
Deborah Slesinski, Budget Director  
Deanna Crawford, Budget Analyst  
Desmond Smyth, President, SW24  
John Colgan, Chief Operating Officer, SW24  
William Cole, **Chief of Staff, Executive Vice President, SW24**  
Zach Baxter, Vice President of Presentation Products, Inc. (PPI)  
AV Design, Installation, and Support

Chairman Cheney opened the committee meeting at 3:30 p.m. by asking everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. All committee members were present.

Mrs. Bonelli moved the request confirming and, to the extent necessary, authorizing the transfer of funds from Beaver Dam Lake Operating Budget Fund Balance to Capital Project No. 852, for the Beaver Dam Lake Protection and Rehabilitation District, \$659,000.00 (supplemental appropriation required), seconded by Mr. Paduch.

Mr. Denega explained that the department previously requested the application be submitted to the Comptroller's Office to revise the ceiling on the project for an additional \$659,000.00 to complete construction. Through that process, the application was submitted, and the

public hearing was held. At this point, the Comptroller's Office has yet to respond to the application. However, the County Attorney's Office gave them notification and that is why the extent approval is needed.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Tuohy moved to approve the request for supplemental appropriation to the Capital Projects budget for capital improvements to the solid waste operations at the Orange County Transfer Station #1 (Trailer Parking Pad – required by the DEC). This project has been approved under the 2020 Capital Plan as Project No. 75. Upon approval a new capital project will be created, \$180,000.00 (bonding), seconded by Mr. Kulisek.

Mr. Denega stated this is for the New Hampton Transfer Station and is mandated by the DEC to help capture the seepage out of the trucks with the solid waste as they sit and wait to be transferred. It is a pad like a storm water basin where everything would be collected into a basin for proper collection for environmental protection.

Mr. Gray added the pad is 10,000 square feet and is made of concrete that is six inches thick.

Mr. Kulisek clarified that the department has the funds budgeted for this project.

Mr. Gray stated that is correct.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Kulisek moved the request for supplemental appropriation to the Capital Projects budget for Runway/Taxiway Slurry Sealing and Painting. This project has been approved under the 2020 Capital Plan as Project No. 28. Upon approval a new capital project will be created, \$50,000.00 (bonding), seconded by Mrs. Bonelli.

Mr. Denega stated slurry sealing and painting can be related to the safety and longevity of the life of the asset.

Mr. Magryta explained that this specific item is related to the FAA grant assurances for pavement in order to maintain and keep the pavement in good to excellent condition through the expected lifespan of the pavement. This would include any necessary repairs and preventive maintenance that would prevent the pavement from going into the fair or poor category prior to its useful life. There are a couple of taxiways and aprons that are very much in need of this work and are at the point where the longevity of this pavement lasts until the next FAA grant window for pavement replacement which is around 2024-2025.

Mr. Kulisek commented that safety concerns and pavement markings are paramount to the airport, so it is very important that the funding be approved.

Mr. Minuta asked what the expected lifespan of the pavement and what will be done to maintain it so it can be budgeted for the future.

Mr. Magryta replied the expected life for pavement is 20 years and there is a masterplan for any premature failures that occur beyond the control of the airport. He stated the FAA wants to make sure pavements last for a minimum amount of time which is typically 20 years. The issues related to one of the taxiways goes back to the 1990's and the base material that was set up for that specific taxiway. What is happening is the pavement is separating away from itself, so any cracks are moving from each side and becoming an inch to three inches wide which then becomes a safety factor for aircraft nose wheels. Recently there was a New York airport that was sued because the maintenance of the ramp was not sufficient, and an aircraft went into a pothole that caused the propeller to strike the asphalt.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Tuohy moved the request for supplemental appropriation to the Capital Projects budget for Airport Infrastructure capital improvements. This project has been approved under the 2020 Capital Plan as Project No. 10. Upon approval a new capital project will be created, \$50,000.00 (bonding), seconded by Mr. Kulisek.

Mr. Magryta stated that as previously mentioned the airport is 97% full and one of the things that has come to focus is the condition of some of the pavements in areas where there were vacancies and are now full with tenants. There are also areas of pavement that are well passed their useful life in fair to poor condition. He added these areas need to be reclaimed and repaired with new pavement.

Motion carried. All in favor.

Mr. Ruskiewicz moved to approve the request confirmation of appointment to the Board of Directors of the Orange County Soil and Water Conservation District as "at-large member" (J. Wright), seconded by Mr. Kulisek.

Mr. Cheney explained that at last month's Physical Services Committee meeting, there were three confirmations of appointments for three members and there was a vacancy that came about around the same time. This request is for the individual to fill the vacancy that has been proposed by the County Executive.

Mr. Ruskiewicz added that Mr. Wright has been on the board for several years as well as served as the Farm Bureau representative.

Motion carried. All in favor.

The last agenda item was a discussion with Secure Watch 24 regarding the A/V System in the Legislative Chamber.

Mr. Burpoe addressed the committee by stating that the A/V system in the chamber is a state-of-the-art system that is put in chambers across the country. There were two companies that installed the system. He understands that some legislators would like to see some changes made to the system such as the removal of the monitors, but before doing so, he would like everyone to listen to the two presidents of both companies who did the install. Furthermore, when things get back to normal everyone can be trained and then a decision can be made as to how to proceed. He introduced Desmond Smyth from Secure Watch 24 (SW24) and Zach Baxter from Presentation Products, Inc. (PPI).

Mr. Smith stated SW24 was the primary vendor for the security technology at the government center and the primary sub-contractor on the av equipment for both the courts and legislative chamber was PPI. Mr. Baxter, who is also in attendance and will explain the system is very knowledgeable about this equipment.

Mr. Baxter explained Presentation Products Incorporated (PPI) is a design-built A/V integration firm based out of New York City who do sizeable commercial A/V installs in the New York City area and throughout the country. The firm was brought into this project somewhat late as construction was in the works and requirements were gathered by others on the project team. In broad strokes of what he understood the system needed to be for the legislative chamber is it had to be able to make presentations so the public can see the contents being displayed by a member as well as show things from laptops throughout a few locations in the room. There is also a place to connect a support monitor so that the legislators do not have to look up at the projection screen. Furthermore, there are cameras in the chamber to capture events taking place either for streaming and recording or for remote video sessions. The most important part of the system and the one everyone has challenges with is the audio. He stated there are two things producing the audio; the wireless microphone and the tabletop microphone that are on the desks throughout the chamber. Those mics are part of the delegate system which consists of a microphone and a speaker which are important because they capture your voice and amplify what is being said to everyone in the room and other microphone units. He understands this may not be how the system was experienced with some initial sessions, and he thinks that occurred because there needs to be a hand-over in training session with the operating team. Through the chaos of construction, the people that needed to be involved in the process did not have a smooth hand-over with his team as they finalized and handed over the system. They are here to continue to support the system and make sure that happens. In regard to the major elements of the system which are known as the "bones" of the system, it is state-of-the art that should last through the foreseeable future and be relatively modular to make modest and/or changes if a new source needs to be added. One main thing in this new post Covid-19 world is he imagines the legislature will be doing hybrid sessions very frequently and would like to make sure everyone knows the chamber has the infrastructure to do this and manage sessions remotely. He asked for feedback from the committee regarding the usage the legislature is not getting from the system.

Regarding training, Mr. Paduch commented that everyone should be concerned about it and when it comes to the contractual obligation, he clarified that training was included in the contract because it has been over a year and nothing has been done.

Mr. Burpoe stated training was in the contract. By the time the building was complete, and everyone was moved in, it was too much to handle. They were fine tuning everything while trying to get their own equipment throughout the building to work including the security in the building. It was massive.

On behalf of PPI and their experience with other large commercial handoffs, Mr. Baxter stated this is not uncommon that in the chaos of a move, technical training is rushed, the right people are not in attendance and/or identified. He pointed out this is not the first time this has happened.

Mr. Paduch stated it has been a lot more than a few months and the fact is, he heard about additional costs and would like to know why there would be any if training is in the original contract and if the companies were paid in full.

Mr. Baxter replied that he believes he and Mr. Smyth were both paid in full.

Mr. Smyth explained that it was difficult getting the whole chamber together for a single training session and was with Commissioner Burpoe on several attempts. Again, that is the nature of the size of the project. They were trying to get the IT personnel trained because they would have more day-to-day contact with the legislative office. As this began to extend for over a year, PPI had fulfilled their part of the contract up to that point, so by OGS requirements they had to pay them before the county could be billed for the money; therefore, it is not PPI's fault that the training was not finished, it was more of an organizational issue. He stated that things did not flow as smoothly as anyone would have liked it to, not that it cannot be fixed moving forward, but at that time training was difficult to pull together.

Mr. Paduch commented that the way this is being introduced today, sounds like the training should have been looked at a lot sooner than it was. The legislators discussed why the equipment was in the chambers and how it was in the way and/or not being used several months ago and nothing has changed. He stated the IT should have been trained sooner; therefore, he is confused as to why Mr. Burpoe could not make this happen because it is very important. He then asked if the IT employees are unavailable.

Mr. Smyth replied they had a meeting in November to set up a training schedule, then again in February and as we all know, COVID-19 happened in March. They met with several people about the schedule and then everything was put on the back burner. As the primary technology provider on the project, he proposed that once the chambers can be used again, sessions begin and any changes are made to the system in a drastic way which would cost money at some point, that he would like to see what the legislators like and do not like. He added it is not possible to use the system the way it was designed without training.

Mr. Burpoe stated they were trying to get the training done before November, but there was a lot of training to do on other things and it was unclear as to who would be in charge of running the system such as DPW, the IT staff, the legislative staff, or a combination of people. Trying to get that filtered through was not easy at all. He added the IT Department did the best they could especially since there is only so many people. To this day they are still trying to fine tune everything. The A/V system is great, and he would like the legislators to utilize all that is available on it. He would like to be there when the system needs changes. Regarding Microsoft Teams, there are two people from IT being utilized to set up meetings for the legislature, if they do not do it, then a legislative staff member would have to, so there is only so many people that can help. Furthermore, they are doing their best to get everyone trained on everything, but now it is difficult to get companies to come through the door during this pandemic.

Mr. Paduch responded that he understands, but Mr. Burpoe stated he tried to set up training in November and then not again until February; therefore, that timeframe allows for plenty of other times to make training available. He reiterated that he understands what Mr. Burpoe is saying and the pandemic has an affect on this, but the fact is everything must be done and not because legislators would like the parts of the system removed.

Mr. Burpoe stated he will make sure this gets done.

Mr. Baxter pointed out that these are A/V systems, just like one would invest in an IT infrastructure does not mean there is no IT staff to manage and run it to make sure the end users get the value of it. He thinks these systems are complex enough that people need to understand there is an ongoing support and service aspect of having an investment like this.

Mr. Paduch asked if there will be an additional charge to have training since it was not completed at the time it was supposed to be.

Mr. Smyth replied he would like to further discuss it with the Commissioner to see if they can come up with something since there were major delays on both ends. He thinks they will be able to figure out a way to get the key people trained so then others within the organization can be trained. He asked if that would satisfy the needs of the legislature.

Mr. Paduch replied he cannot give permission to do that, but there is a majority leader, a Physical Services Committee chairman and Chairman Brescia who could speak to that.

Mr. Cheney thanked Mr. Paduch and stated it is fair to ask Commissioner Burpoe to work with the two organizations that have supplied the systems and come up with a detailed plan to move forward by the next meeting.

Mr. Tuohy commented that the legislature moved into the new building almost three years ago which means the devices have been on their desks for that time and nothing took place. He understands there was a lot happening and then we got hit with the pandemic, but he does not understand why it took even two years to get training.

Mrs. Reed stated about a year ago in August, the legislative staff and IT members met with Mr. Smyth in the legislative chamber. She asked if he recalls that meeting.

Mr. Smyth replied that he does remember several meetings.

Mrs. Reed then stated that one of the problems the Legislative Office had from the beginning was when the A/V system was being installed because it was not what was asked for. It was difficult to understand why there were presentation screens on the desk because what was asked for was the ability for legislators to be able to hook-up their laptops and phones; therefore, we were taken off-guard as to why this very sophisticated system was installed. She apologized for her lack of sophistication on the system, but no one understood why it was installed being it was not asked for. The system does not serve any purpose because legislators can bring in their laptops and still see what is being presented on the big projection screen. She is unsure of why the system is in the chambers and then when we were told that it records everything, we found that the staff cannot take the recording to transcribe the minutes because it is not compatible with the computers in the

office. Furthermore, it did not meet the needs of the legislature and she is still unsure as to why this was purchased. When she and Mr. Smyth spoke, she thought they were going to work on those issues, but that was over a year ago.

Mr. Smyth responded that he remembers those meetings and being a part of the new Government Center was a point of pride for himself and his company. The architect had specifications for the courts and the legislature which were directed to him. He does not like "kicking the can down the road," but they did follow a specification sheet that was not initially theirs and it was good, but they understood it as the system that the legislature wanted. There may be parts of the system that can be modified, but they do not know yet because it has not yet been used for a full legislative session; therefore, he would like to get to a point where a fair percentage of legislators tell him what they want to change and what they hate, but those changes have a price connected. He is not sure the county would want him to move full steam ahead and tear equipment out then install even more expensive equipment to meet the changes being asked for.

Mrs. Reed asked Mr. Smyth to explain the purpose of the monitors because they take up a lot of space. If it is purely a monitor, that is a lot of money in a system for something that is not a computer.

Mr. Smyth replied the milling and placement of the monitors is beautiful and the space given was cumbersome which he understands, but that is a design milling problem. He referred to Mr. Baxter for further explanation of the monitors.

Mr. Baxter explained the microphone and speaker are attached to the monitor and the purpose of it is so that any sources that other legislators have connected such as their laptop to share on the projection screen, would be displayed on the monitor as well. A lot of the seating angles do not have an easy shot to the projection screen, so the intent was to minimize the need of people having to turn their head and cram whatever power point is being displayed. From previous conversations, he understands that it is not a voting system or platform to dictate how the legislative sessions are run. It is purely a display monitor for convenience.

Mr. Reed clarified that the monitors also control the sound system and microphone.

Mr. Baxter stated yes, it is the microphone, speaker and the display. In his opinion, he thinks it is appropriate for the space and how it is laid out.

Mrs. Reed reiterated that the A/V system is not what was asked for.

Mr. Benton commented that if the A/V system cannot function for legislative staff, there is no way it can function for the legislators. He is glad to hear Mr. Burpoe is on top of this because he was one of the legislators who kept requesting that the system be modified. Maybe simple modifications can be made so that it is functional in the way Mrs. Reed previously described; therefore, he is happy to hear this is being discussed. Furthermore, like Mr. Paduch stated, there should not be a charge for any modifications after such a long period of time and delays prior to the pandemic.

Mr. Minuta stated the thick of this is there is a unit that has been in the chambers for three years that is a very expensive glorified nameplate. It has been used for one session; therefore, he would like a copy of the specifications from the architect that was cited as well as the approval by the architect. Both of those documents go into the contractual obligations, but he will not speak on

it. Regarding the units themselves, they are intrusive and there is no space on the platform to do anything other than look at it. He would like to see all the documents he requested presented so the legislature can make a true evaluation and thanked the IT Department for all their hard work during these difficult times.

Mrs. Bonelli commented this discussion should have taken place more than two and a half years ago before anyone even walked into the building. As Mrs. Reed stated, the legislature was never consulted and anticipated there would only be microphones on the platform. When everyone walked into the chambers and saw the presentation monitors, they were surprised and again, that was two and a half years ago. There was no training discussion, and this has been a long-standing issue that should have been dealt with three years ago. She understands that they are not familiar with the capabilities because they were not trained and even though it is difficult to get everyone together for a training she believes when there is a will, there is a way. As Mr. Minuta and Mr. Tuohy previously stated, this legislature did not miss a beat when the pandemic hit. She does not know who dropped the ball, but everyone needs to move forward to find out how the system works. Furthermore, this is a discussion that is too late.

Ms. Stegenga agrees with everyone's statements and comments, but pointed out that when Mr. Smyth was speaking, he claimed that he was aware everyone would have issues with the room prior to installing these on the desks. If they are looking at being trained and moving forward, that is still not going to fix the problem that they cannot put their laptops in front of them and/or any papers. The units are beautiful to look at it but does not give the legislators the room to have what they need for meetings.

Mr. Ruskiewicz mentioned that it is not a strain to look at the main screen and clarified that electronic voting is not a capability because that is something he was under the impression they had that capability.

Mrs. Reed stated the electronic voting will take place through the ICompass software program. She is unsure how it will be done through these monitors.

Mr. Tuohy commented that there have been two presentations in the chamber and several in the committee room and they have had good exposure to it. We need to move through this and learn from it. He expects more than just presentations and would like to see more information if this will cost money.

Mr. Kulisek requested that a report be generated on the cause of this and specifications in chronological order, so the legislature can sort this out from the beginning to the end.

Mr. Burpoe responded yes, he was already in the process of preparing one.

Mr. Cheney stated he will work with the chairman to make sure this discussion does not fall to the waste side and continues until the legislators get the resolution they are looking for.

Mrs. Reed mentioned to Mr. Burpoe that when this meeting was originally setup with Ms. D'Amico, our understanding was the consultants would tell the legislature all the great things about the system that was purchased as well as how it is not being used properly and we can get the best "bang out of our buck". She stated she is waiting to hear that pitch and asked for someone to expound about it.



Mr. Baxter gave the committee a brief summary of the system which included the microphone system and monitor which is an important cost driver of the system.

Mrs. Reed commented that there is a lot involved and there has been no understanding of how everything that needs to be done, gets done. The IT Department has been phenomenal, and it is greatly appreciated. Regarding the statutory committee room, she stated there has been issues with echoing, the system going down and complications with the smart screens. It is very disappointing when there is a meeting, the system goes down, and there is no IT available because it is after hours. She suggested that when they do train everyone, that room needs to be included.

Mr. Cheney thanked Commissioner Burpoe and SW24 for attending the meeting today. He will speak with Chairman Brescia regarding everyone's concerns, how it will be addressed and will continue to discuss this in committee until all issues are resolved.

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.