

PUBLIC PROPERTY/TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 27, 2013

The Public Property/Technology Committee of the Grant County Board of Supervisors met in the Grant County Administration Building, Lancaster, WI Room 266 on February 27, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. pursuant to the adjournment of the January 23, 2013 meeting.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Vincent Loeffelholz. The County Clerk, Linda K. Gebhard verified that the meeting was in compliance with the open meeting law posted in two places, published in the Lancaster Herald Independent and published on the County Web Site.

The following committee members were present: Lester Jantzen, Don Splinter, Dwight Nelson, Robert Keeney, Vincent Loeffelholz and Carol Beals who came late. Vern Lewison was excused. Larry Wolf, County Board Chair was also present.

Agenda: Don Splinter, seconded by Dwight Nelson made a motion to approve the amended agenda. Because of the bad weather, Larry Wolf asked that agenda item number 9 be moved up under line item 5 so Stephen E. Mar-Poul the presenter from Insite Consulting Architects could leave early. Motion carried.

Minutes: Dwight Nelson, seconded by Robert Keeney, made a motion to approve the minutes of January 23, 2013 with one correction. On page 1 a typing error be corrected, the word "draw" be changed to "drawer". Motion carried.

Correspondence: Linda Gebhard, County Clerk, asked on behalf of Becky Popp, who is helping organize a Benefit Bowling Party and Silent Auction on April 6, 2013 for Larry O'Neil, permission to place a banner on the Courthouse Lawn. They will place the sign around March 18th and take the banner down on April 7, 2013. Don Splinter, seconded by Lester Jantzen made a motion to approve the request. Motion carried.

Presentation: Façade and Moisture Infiltration Survey, Stephen E. Mar-Pohl, AIA, Insite Consulting Architects. On December 14, 2012 Stephen inspected the Courthouse to determine a plan for the moisture problems we have had in the Courthouse. He stated that the roof of the Courthouse is very good shape and commended the County for its aggressive maintenance management to keep the roof functioning through the years. The stone on the Courthouse is believed to come from Madelyn Island, Lake Superior in Bayfield County. The stone is called Brown Stone. Because the grain of the stone, the stones were cut vertically which is one reason why the attempted repairs through the years has not stood up.

The following observations were made:

1. Moisture and moisture-related damage in several interior offices.
2. Moisture related damage to exposed structural interior steel.
3. Efflorescence in the brick and stone masonry above and below grade and at interior and exterior.
4. There were buckets and tarps over construction at the dome interior.
5. There have been drywall overlay repairs at interior perimeter in some of the offices.
6. Damaged and failed mortar was observed at the exterior brick and stone masonry.
7. Numerous failed patch mortar repairs at the stone masonry walls were visible.
8. Numerous patch mortar repairs that appear to be performing at the stone masonry wall were observed.
9. They observed limited instances of failed brick at the exterior masonry walls.

10. There is failed sealant at the sheet metal wrapped windows.
11. They observed egregious contractor error at the chimney at tuck pointing repairs.
12. They observed improper fastener selection, improperly sized and differential metals.

The following priority list was compiled by Insite Consulting Architect:

Priority 1: Life safety issues are imminent; deferral is not an option.

Priority 2: Failed building component(s) were observe that will require immediate attention; deferral is not an option

Priority 3: Failed building component(s) were observed that represent limited risks; deferral is typically not recommended but may be possible with aggressive monitoring by architect and staff.

Priority 4: Notable conditions were observed. With Priority 4, no action is required aside from additional monitoring.

The following conclusions have been developed based in part on the observations in the field and the architects experience with this type of construction.

Significant moisture is entering the building from below grade (basement foundation walls) and above grade (numerous mortar failures.) The overall condition is critical and is considered Priority 1.

Significant moisture is entering the masonry wall construction through open mortar joints and failed stone and brick masonry. The overall condition is severe to critical and is considered priority 1.

The moisture is affecting interior finishes: foundation, walls, paint and plaster. The overall condition is severe to critical and is considered Priority 1.

Moisture is affecting the exterior wall materials, stone, brick and mortar. The overall condition is severe to critical and is considered Priority 1.

Interior moisture levels have contributed to corrosion of metal, steel, structural elements and therefore have been periodically high. The overall condition is fair and is considered Priority 4.

Efflorescence is the migration of soluble salts from the passage of moisture from the inside out. The overall condition is poor and is considered Priority 3.

Active leaks have occurred throughout the building at lower perimeter walls and at the dome. The overall condition is poor and is considered Priority 2.

Cover-up repairs have been executed but are generally considered as successful. Observed moisture-related damage at the drywall overlays was observed. The overall condition in severe and is considered Priority 1.

Patch mortar repairs have failed due to unabated moisture infiltration, the size and configuration of the patches and the differential in porosity and permeability between the stone and patch material. The overall condition is critical and is considered Priority 2.

Most of the patch mortar repairs that are performing are at higher elevations on the facades. This is believed to be a significant contributing factor for the moisture below and adjacent to grade. The overall condition is fair and is considered Priority 3.

The number of cracked/spalled face brick is negligible. The overall condition is poor and is considered Priority 4.

The building sealants are near the end of their useful service life. The overall condition is poor and is considered Priority 3.

The following are recommended courses of action:

Short term (1-2 years)

Improve moisture handling at subgrade exterior walls; this will require the improvement of drainage conditions at the building's perimeter.

Perform proper tuck pointing at all masonry walls, 100% tuck pointing is required with historically precise mortar.

Repair/replace moisture damaged patch repairs and stone masonry, this work may be phased.

Repair all active roof leaks, which will be an ongoing process for the remainder of the roof's service life.

Repair all active window and door leads, which will be an ongoing process for the remainder of the windows/doors service lives.

Long range (3-10 years)

Restore all stone masonry including patch mortar that is failing in aesthetics only.

Replace roof system

Continue aggressive maintenance approach

Cost Statement of probable construction costs:

Option 1, Single Phase Project:

Setup/Mobilization	\$50,000	
Scaffold	\$250,000	1 Set
Waterproofing	\$550,000	Excavate at perimeter to expose foundation wall, perform necessary repairs, waterproof/drainage plane, drainage medium, drain tile.
Tuck Pointing	\$177,000	100% tuck point at all areas to bring to a weathertight condition.
Masonry Repair	\$71,250	Repair damaged masonry, where appropriate
Masonry Replacement	\$190,000	Replace masonry, only as absolutely required (budget includes 150 stones).
Redress Stone	\$213,750	Redress stone, whenever possible in lieu of replacement (budget includes 450 stones).
Replace Sealants	\$52,500	Replace all building sealants.
	\$1,554,500	Construction Total
	\$155,450	Contingency (10%)
	\$341,990	Fees & Permits
	\$2,051,940	PROJECT TOTAL

Option 2, Three Phase Project:

PHASE 1

Setup/Mobilization	\$15,000	
Waterproofing	\$550,000	Excavate at perimeter to expose foundation walls, perform necessary repairs, waterproof/drainage plane, drainage medium, drain tile.

	\$565,000	Construction total.
	\$56,500	Contingency (10%).
	<u>\$124,300</u>	Fees & Permits.
	\$745,800	Phase 1 Total
PHASE 2		
Setup/Mobilization	\$36,750	
Scaffold	\$157,500	½ building: 1 st set
Tuck pointing	\$92,925	100% tuck point at all areas to bring to a weathertight condition.
Masonry Repair	\$37,406	Repair damaged masonry, where appropriate.
Masonry Replacement	\$99,750	Replace masonry, only as absolutely required (budget includes 150 stones).
Redress Stone	\$112,219	Redress stone, whenever possible in lieu of replacement (budget includes 450 stones).
Replace Sealants	\$27,563	Replace all building sealants.
	\$564,113	Construction Total
	\$56,411	Contingency (10%).
	<u>\$124,105</u>	Fees & Permits
	\$744,629	Phase 2 Total
PHASE 3		
Setup/Mobilization	\$38,500	
Scaffold	\$165,000	½ building: 2 nd set.
Tuck pointing	\$97,350	100% tuck point at all areas to bring to a weathertight condition.
Masonry Repair	\$39,188	Repair damaged masonry, where appropriate.
Masonry Replacement	\$104,500	Replace masonry, only as absolutely required (budget includes 150 stones).
Redress Stone	\$117,563	Redress stone, whenever possible in lieu of replacement (budget includes 450 stones).
Replace Sealants	\$28,875	Replace all building sealants.
	\$590,975	Construction total.
	\$59,098	Contingency (10%).
	<u>\$130,015</u>	Fees & Permits.
	\$780,087	Phase 3 Total
	\$2,270,516	Project Total For 3 Phases

Questions asked by the committee:

How long would a onetime restoration project take: It would be a two year project, bids would be taken worked on as soon as a contract would be signed to contract with CA Architect; construction could start in early spring/summer of 2014.

If the County does nothing how long would it be before the Courthouse would demand the repair work: 5- 7 years would be the time frame and the cost would probably double at that time.

Would the County have a warranty: There would be a 5 year warranty provided by the company, labor being the biggest part, very few materials would be needed for this project.

How is the project managed: CA Architects is strictly the Architect, they will manage the project from start to finish, they maintain very detailed documentation throughout the project, meeting on a daily bases with the site manager. The onsite manager would be on the project at all times during the construction. Local contractors would be used as much as possible; some of the work would require

construction workers with more specific skills which would have to come from out of the County or State. The contractors would be interviewed by CA Architects extensively so the best and most skilled workers are contracted to work on the project.

Credentials of the company: The State Historical Society has recommended this firm to handle the assessment of the problems of the Courthouse; they have worked on many other historical buildings. They have offices in St. Louis, Naples, Chicago, Milwaukee and Madison.

Child Support Copy Machine: Verda Nemo, Child Support Director asked the committee to approve the purchase of a Universal Send Kit to be added to their copy machine. This will allow them to scan documents to a folder, PC or laptop. It would also allow them to scan and email directly from the machine. The cost is \$940.00, the State will reimburse Child Support 66% of the total cost; Verda is asking the County to pay \$319.60 toward the upgrade. Robert Keeney, seconded by Carol Beals, made a motion to recommend to the Executive Committee the approval of the purchase for a Universal Send Kit to be added to the copy machine in the Child Support Office for a cost to the County of \$319.60. The approved amount of \$319.60 will be sent to the Executive Committee for their approval to be paid out of the General Fund. Motion carried.

Signage for County Buildings: The Security Committee in the Courthouse asked Larry Wolf to bring to the Public Property Committee the possibility of updating of the No Weapon Carry signs that are currently in place at the Courthouse and Administration Building. The Security Committee feels that the word temporary should be taken off and more permanent signs should be in place. Todd Infield will look into the proper wording that the signs should have and if there is a possibility of combining the no smoking verbiage and no weapon carry on one sign. The committee will address this issue at the March meeting when additional information is available.

Maintenance: Mark Udelhofen, Courthouse Maintenance reported that the new boiler has been installed and is working fine. He submitted a bid for the purchase of a second boiler which was comparable to the first of \$16,000.00 with the rebate of \$1,000.00 from Focus on Energy. The committee felt that this issue could wait until the end of the year, to help maintain a balance in the Maintenance budget for issues that may come up throughout the year. Mark will bring this back to the committee around September for further discussion.

Terry Clark, Administration Maintenance updated the committee on the water leaking problem in the County Clerk Storage Room and now there is a small leakage issue in the furnace room. Terry has contacted Dave Lambert, Highway Commissioner to inspect the base of the Administration Building to possibly apply a sealcoat to help close the cracks between the building and cement.

Insurance: Brent Straka, TRICOR updated the committee on the HRA. They are still monitoring the program, in April he will be able to provide a report that will be more complete based on the fiscal reporting for the program. In the Insurance industry there has been some information coming out on a charge for tobacco users who are covered by the HMO's of the County. He will have more on that at a later time.

Randy Peterson, TRICOR, stated that some questions had come up about a highway truck that had been salting and slid off the road. It had to be pulled out of the ditch, in doing so the pin was broke off. The pin was covered under warranty; the towing of \$689.69 was not. The question was regarding the towing charge; could that be covered under the collision self insurance if the damage was not related to an accident. Discussion followed, the committee decided that the charge should be paid out of the Highway budget. Randy reported that there are 5 open claims at this time. There was a \$20,000 payout on a claim regarding an accident with a snow plow hitting a car. There has been \$39,000 paid on a defense cost on one of the claims and the attorneys were taking care of this claim at this time.

Carol Beals asked Randy if he would bring back to the committee some information on Cyber Liability for the County at the March committee meeting for discussion.

IT Update: Jeff Anderson, Information Technology Director, the committee asked Jeff what safe guards are in place at this time to protect us from Cyber Attacks. Jeff stated that Cyber attacks are a growing problem for many organizations in this day and age. The County has a firewall in place and antivirus protection in place but nothing is 100% safe. He stated the IT Department had changed the antivirus protection from Symantec four years ago to a better working and more robust protection suite that does not take up as many system resources on the computers. The IT Department has remote access to shut down the County systems at any time if they are not on site if there would be a major threat. Jeff stated that with all the systems the county has in place there is a large virus exposure. Jeff explained that the County has blocked the use of Face book unless the department uses it directly in their departments, such as the Courthouse, Fair, and Law Enforcement.

Jeff stated there are a many things he would like to implement for more protection for the county; unfortunately these things tend to cost money, they are as follows:

1. Redaction of Social Security numbers on county records.
2. Hold more training for the employees to make them aware of Cyber attacks and how to protect their systems better.

Jeff informed the committee that Grant County had just signed on with Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (MS-ISAC). This provides the County with regular updates of problems that may have invaded organizations anywhere in the world, whether it is Federal, State, or County Systems. They send out warnings to IT so the problem can be assessed immediately, Jeff is very impressed with the level of cooperation between entities.

Jeff touched on the new internet connection that he is trying out in the Courthouse; video conferencing has not been working very well for the Courthouse system to the Jail. IT had an antenna installed on the outside of the Courthouse using the wireless signal from a tower installed at Tricor that points to the Platteville Mound by You Squared out of Dubuque. He will be able to report more on this issue at the next meeting.

Jeff stated that the annual May IT Convention is in La Crosse this year and he would like to attend along with the two other employees in the IT Department. He wanted the approval from the committee because this would leave no one in the IT office at that time. Jeff explained they can do things remotely from La Crosse if there are problems and someone would be able to come back if need be. Larry Wolf, County Board Chair stated some reservation regarding all the IT Staff being gone at the same time. A poll was taken among the committee members; they stated that as long as things were covered in the county and the Departments knew that the IT employees would be gone, they did not see a problem with all the IT staff attending the convention. Jeff was going to address this with the department heads at the next department head meeting to make sure they were comfortable with this as well.

Adjournment: Dwight Nelson, seconded by Lester Jantzen, made a motion to adjourn the meeting pursuant to the next meeting of March 27, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. Motion carried.