

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
SPECIAL MEETING – FIRE BUILDING**

**JUNE 11, 2013
APPROVED**

The Board of Supervisors of Springettsbury Township held a Special Meeting on Tuesday, June 11, 2013 at Noon at the Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, PA.

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Bill Schenck, Chairman
Don Bishop, Vice Chairman
Mike Bowman
George Dvoryak
Julie Landis

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: John Holman, Township Manager
Charles Rausch, Solicitor
John Luciani, Civil Engineer
Dennis Crabill, Environmental Engineer
Robert McCoy, YAUFRR Chief
Jean Abreght, Stenographer

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Opening Ceremony

SCHENCK Chairman Schenck called the meeting to order at 12 Noon. He stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed new fire building.

2. COMMUNICATION FROM CITIZENS

SCHENCK Chairman Schenck called for comments from the public. Hearing none, he moved into the agenda.

3. ENGINEERING REPORTS

A. Architect/Project Manager – Fire Building

CRABILL Dennis Crabill of Buchart Horn introduced Scott Loercher, Architect for the project, and Carol Ann Denning, the Project Manager.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher had provided the board with a copy of the post-bid project costs, and he reviewed the statistics from the bid process. He indicated that the bidding was very competitive.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman stated that he had provided the board with the Buchart-Horn project bid costs for the fire building. His report discussed the possible alternates which would be considered for the total project cost.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher reported that they had met with the Building Committee and the Township Manager to review the bids and look at some of the alternates. A summary of the alternates follows:

- Replace utility sized brick for a deduction of \$37,000.
- Add Second Floor and Multi-Purpose Room carpet tile for \$4,500.
- Delete underfloor insulation associated with underfloor heating for deduction of \$6,600.
- Replace underfloor radiant heating in garage bay for \$88,000 savings.
- Hard costs are prices from vendors for the IT work, AV work, security, Plymovent (vehicle exhaust system) for bays and station alerting.
- Soft costs for professional fees such as land development, geotech, design fees, project management, resident management for construction. Additional soft costs would include furniture, fixtures and equipment, independent QC testing/special inspections.

LANDIS Ms. Landis asked how the replacement of brick would affect the life expectancy of the building.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher responded that the change in brick would not change the durability for the lifespan and would greatly benefit the expectancy long term.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak questioned early discussion about geothermal heating and its value.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher responded that the issue had been removed in early design development.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak asked about operating cost differences between bay gas heaters versus radiant heat.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher responded that the cost difference would not be significant, but there would be less of a comfort level because the heat is coming from above to the floor rather than from the floor up.

LANDIS Ms. Landis asked about potential problems with underfloor heating and the cost of repairs.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher responded that repairs would be very costly; however, he noted that the underfloor system is very reliable.

LANDIS Ms. Landis questioned the deduction for perimeter sidewalks and crosswalks.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher responded that the item was not included as the township is responsible for the sidewalk installation.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak noted that the \$4.4 million was a post-bid project. He questioned whether that figure included all costs incurred to get to this point with pre-engineering.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman responded that the figure included everything to date.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher added that only the construction phase remains, which is 20% to 30% of the total cost.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak asked what types of change orders could be expected.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher responded that they like to carry one to three percent contingency.

SCHENCK Chairman Schenck commented on the cost to add underfloor radiant heat. He added that it was a board question; however, he thought there was value not only to the bay personnel, but also snow and ice hanging on the bottoms of trucks.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher noted that the underfloor heating assists with the garage doors not freezing and thawing and also assists in the gear rooms with hose drying, etc.

ECKERT Mr. Eckert commented that continuous overhead heat down on the apparatus, hose bays on top of the apparatus, does have an effect on the life of the hose and other equipment.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher added that the gas-fired heaters that were selected are approved for this type of application. There would be increased deterioration of the vehicles at that level; however, it is still acceptable.

MCCOY Chief McCoy stated they visited two fire stations that had the underfloor heating, and they had been able to keep their building at a temperature of 60 to 62 degrees. He added an additional issue with an epoxy floor, coming in and out during wintertime there is water that lies on the floor and slippage.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak asked what the rationale would be for pulling it out.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman responded that the rationale was the cost-saving option for heating.

BOWMAN Mr. Bowman asked about the reliability of the underfloor system and costs to repair over time.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher responded that the underfloor tubing is very long lasting and very reliable. The system pumps into a manifold, which might need to be replaced over time. However, they had not seen the need to repair any units.

B. Civil Engineer – First Capital – Fire Building

LUCIANI Mr. Luciani stated that he did not have anything to add to Mr. Loercher’s report. He stated they had been working toward some value engineering, along with evaluating the engineering as the bids are awarded. They will have the opportunity to negotiate with the low bidder to remove items to reduce costs and save some additional costs after the bids are formally opened.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman reported that the contractors will come in with item ideas for where costs can be saved. The engineers and staff will be meeting with them. Change Orders will come in with deductions. One area for review was the electrical contract where there can be reduction for lights of approximately \$33,000 in savings.

SCHENCK Chairman Schenck noted that a question he had was with the resident inspections. He stated that when the township building was built, as well as the park, etc., they actively engaged Public Works. He thought the township got a better product because of that.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman responded that Charlie Lauer will be the every-day person for the township as part of the plan. He will work with the part-time Buchart-Horn Inspector who will be there weekly or bi-weekly.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak asked for a presentation on the plan for paying for the project.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman had provided documentation for the board showing the plan for payment. Total Cost of the project \$4,396,505. Funding availability is \$4,326,945, which is 98% of the estimated project cost. He reviewed additional items noted on his spreadsheet. Additional funds will be moved from surplus to cover costs, and capital funds set aside for engineering and architect for the police and admin building will be moved into construction of the fire building. He and Mr. Hadge had reviewed all the funding which is available and the total amount of surplus for 2012 was \$275,000. Funding can be recovered when permanent financing is sought in 2015 as that option is available. In addition, Change Orders will be tightly controlled.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak asked when the debt service will be completed.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman responded that in 2015 the current note will be retired and turned into a bond, which will be floated out for 20 years at approximately 3.5% or 3.7%. Cash flows will be balanced out as neutral. In addition there should be some savings on the pension payments.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak asked about the original numbers for the sale of the existing fire building after costs would be approximately \$1.4 million. He noted a figure of \$550,000 for proceeds. He asked about the difference.

ECKERT Mr. Eckert responded that the actual net numbers following the action of the fire company board are as follows:

- Sale money minus expenses cash available is \$500,000.
- Relief - \$200,000
- Piece of property - \$592,000
- Alerting system – Paid for by the volunteers (\$4,500 down payment)
 - Grant - \$11,000
 - Second Grant - \$11,000
- Cash from sale of Station 89.1 is projected at \$500,717.
- Total volunteer fire company money towards project: \$1.330 million.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak asked about the contract for Station 89.1.

ECKERT Mr. Eckert stated that the Sales Agreement included eight three-month periods of extension. In addition, a local developer had placed \$30,000 in escrow for the property. Mr. Eckert was concerned how with how long it had taken to get to this point, and he hoped that the building would become reality before the end of the extensions.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak restated Mr. Eckert’s comments. The fire company can remain in the building with the options until July, 2014. The buyer has no options to walk away.

ECKERT Mr. Eckert responded that the end buyer, Auto Zone, can walk away. The developer would lose the \$30,000 if he walked away as he is the buyer.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak asked about a timeframe if the project was approved this date.

LOERCHER Mr. Loercher responded that the contract will take four to six weeks to mobilize. The specifications call for 365 days from Notice to Proceed.

BISHOP Mr. Bishop stated that he agreed with Chairman Schenck to proceed with the radiant flooring under the assumption that saving that \$90,000 is pennywise and pound foolish in the long run and will definitely be better off.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman noted the changes that would take place.

- General Contracting bid to \$2,272,500
- HVA bid to \$ 580,000

- Plumbing bid \$ 324,000
- Electrical bid \$ 609,000

LANDIS Ms. Landis provided her perspective on the underfloor radiant heat. She stated that none of the fire stations in Springettsbury currently have this type of heating. Additionally, there have been no major issues in the past with the overhead heating, such as causing expensive problems, headaches to employees or damage to the equipment. It is a nice wish list item but not necessary.

MCCOY Chief McCoy responded that he was certain over the course of time there had been slips and trips in the firehouse on the wet floors. He was sure the overhead heaters in the bay during winter will run 24 hours a day. The firehouses that they had visited with radiant floor heating were able to shut their heaters off and maintain a 60 to 62 degree range and felt that their utility bills came down.

LANDIS Ms. Landis questioned how the snow and ice had been dealt with before.

MCCOY Chief McCoy responded that the floors stayed wet, and they just kept sweeping everything away from the apparatus.

ECKERT Mr. Eckert added that he had discussed underfloor radiant heating with other stations, the ice and snow dries up and they do not have the need to constantly squeegee the floors. An additional factor is that the bottom of the doors do not freeze as the floor heat tends to keep that thawed and free of ice.

LANDIS Ms. Landis questioned whether he had visited any of the different states that have harsh winters and whether their fire stations have the radiant heat.

ECKERT Mr. Eckert responded that he had not visited them.

BOWMAN Mr. Bowman noted that in their business they have a similar type of heating in the ceiling and it runs constantly. They are noisy, and it's cold on the floor. He indicated he thought the radiant heat would make sense even though it's an added expense.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak commented that there had been a point in the process where he had objected, but it had moved forward with what he characterized of giving the volunteer fire company and YAUFR a blank check to design and build the fire station they wanted. The process moved forward. The outcome of that process is a total net cost of approximately \$3.7 million versus preliminary estimates not based on any architectural or design studies of \$2.1 million cost to the taxpayer. He thought that the way the process went forward resulted in costs far greater than anticipated, but at this point must move forward. Mr. Dvoryak stated that it sounded to him like the radiant heat made sense to include in the project.

LANDIS Ms. Landis asked if the \$3.5 million Line of Credit would go for this project.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman responded that she was correct and that additional funds would be pulled from surplus in the General Fund.

LANDIS Ms. Landis asked when the \$3.5 million note is up.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman responded that it would be June 10, 2015, timed to tie into when the previous note was retired.

SCHENCK Chairman Schenck called for a motion.

MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE AWARD FOR GENERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR SPRINGETTSBURY FIRE STATION IN THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$2,272,500 TO LOBAR, INC., DILLSBURG, PA. BID AWARD BASED ON THE BASE BID AND GENERAL ALTERNATES AG-2 AND AG-4.

MR. BISHOP FURTHER MOVED TO AUTHORIZE AWARDED BID FOR PLUMBING/FIRE PROTECTION CONTRACT FOR THE SPRINGETTSBURY FIRE STATION FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$324,000 TO SILVERTIP, INC., LEWISBURG, PA.

MR. BISHOP FURTHER MOVED TO AUTHORIZE AWARD OF HVAC CONTRACT FOR THE SPRINGETTSBURY FIRE STATION FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$580,000 TO GARDEN SPOT MECHANICAL, MANHEIM, PA.

MR. BISHOP FURTHER MOVED TO AWARD THE ELECTRICAL CONTRACT FOR THE SPRINGETTSBURY FIRE STATION IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$609,850 TO SHANNON A. SMITH, INC. OF MYERSTOWN PA.

MR. BOWMAN WAS SECOND. MOTION CARRIED 4/1; MR. BISHOP, BOWMAN, DVORYAK AND SCHENCK VOTED IN FAVOR; MS. LANDIS VOTED OPPOSED.

BISHOP Mr. Bishop questioned whether Mr. Holman would be interested in any further discussion or decisions in terms of financing.

HOLMAN Mr. Holman responded that the issue will be discussed at the next meeting. He will provide additional details and resolutions at that time.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Board of Supervisors Member - Union Negotiation

SCHENCK Chairman Schenck brought forward the matter that had been discussed during a previous public meeting. A representative from the Teamsters Union asked specifically if the board would place a Supervisor on a negotiating team.

Chairman Schenck indicated that a decision should be made so that an answer could be provided to the Union representative.

BOWMAN Mr. Bowman stated he was not in favor of doing so.

LANDIS Ms. Landis stated that they haven't had a contract for over a year and something needed to be done to assist. As had been stated, when there were two Supervisors involved in the negotiations when there were issues, it seemed as though things became easier toward finishing up the negotiations. She thought it was worth a try.

BISHOP Mr. Bishop did not think it should be done based on a recommendation of the Union representative.

LANDIS Ms. Landis stated that the Union representative hadn't made the recommendation. He had asked to have a Supervisor sit.

BISHOP Mr. Bishop asked whose idea it was.

LANDIS Ms. Landis indicated it was someone in the police department who had stated that there was an issue and they had two board members sitting in with them.

BISHOP Mr. Bishop questioned what the police department had to do with a Teamster negotiation.

LANDIS Ms. Landis responded that it was an employee who had come and they were having issues with the negotiation process with their contract and they had asked for Supervisors. She noted it was not uncommon for municipalities to have supervisors sitting on the negotiation team with the manager to resolve issues and complete the negotiations.

BISHOP Mr. Bishop noted that he did not think it was a compelling argument coming from the Union rep.

DVORYAK Mr. Dvoryak commented that, if there is a board member who would like to participate in that and could add value to the process, he would not stand in their way toward doing what they think they could accomplish. He, personally, would not volunteer to do that.

SCHENCK Chairman Schenck stated that he had no interest in changing the format. He had experience talking with other townships where Supervisors had sat in, and it is a skill set. He added that he thought the contracts were handled well just the way they currently are negotiated.

BOWMAN Mr. Bowman added that he had done so, and he didn't think it was of benefit to anyone. He added it was not his skill set.

BISHOP Mr. Bishop commented from a historical perspective and from the time that he had been on the board. When there was a Supervisor involved in those negotiations, it was always because a permanent manager was not in place. When Mr. Bowman had been involved, it was during a time when there was an interim manager, and the board was not comfortable and felt the need at that time to be more directly involved in the process.

Consensus of the board was to not involve a member of the Board of Supervisors in the union negotiation process.

5. ADJOURNMENT

SCHENCK Chairman Schenck adjourned the meeting at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Holman
Secretary

ja