Richland County
Campus Reconfiguration Committee

October 22, 2024

The Richland County Campus Reconfiguration Committee convened on Tuesday, October 22, 2024 in person and virtually at 5:01 PM in the County Boardroom of the Richland County Courthouse.

Call To Order: Committee Chair Turk called the meeting to order at 5:01 PM.

Roll Call: Clerk Kalish conducted roll call. Committee member(s) present: Steve Carrow, Ingrid Glasbrenner, David Turk, and Steve Williamson. Committee member(s) absent: Marty Brewer. Committee Member Bob Frank joined the meeting at 5:57 PM.

Verification Of Open Meetings Law Compliance: Clerk Kalish confirmed the meeting had been properly noticed.

Approval Of Agenda: Motion by Williamson second by Glasbrenner to approve agenda. Motion carried and agenda declared approved.

Approval Of Minutes From October 1, 2024 Meeting: Hearing no additions or corrections to the minutes as presented, Chair Turk declared the minutes from October 1, 2024 approved.

Public Comment: Brandon Fetterly stated that he was aware of equipment from the campus being given to the Fire Department and asked if there are other organizations in the community that are just as deserving as the Fire Department to receive items from the campus.

Reports – Detailed Presentation Of Venture Architects Facilities Assessment Findings: Kyle Knop of Venture Architects introduced himself, reviewed the scope of services conducted for the facilities assessment study, and noted that a space needs analysis for county functions was also completed. Knop reviewed the data analysis tools used to complete the facilities assessment study and reviewed the assessment definitions. Knop noted that a portion of the campus buildings are in good condition, but that a larger portion need significant attention. Knop also noted that the campus buildings have a relatively specialized nature from a use and reusability perspective. Knop noted the following during his presentation of findings:

Building A (Science Building):
*many great enhancements made to building
*limited for reuse for county purposes due to specialty items in the building

Building E (Cafeteria & Theater Building):
*limited reusability for county purposes to due specialized purpose
*significant ADA challenges that would need to be addressed
*kitchen in good condition
*open common area has in potential for reuse for county departments that need communal kitchen space

Richland County
Campus Reconfiguration Committee

Building B (Arts & Education Building):
*two unique structural systems in building
*cost create open space in building is significant
*location of building in comparison to parking lot may be an issue
*commercial equipment in building was replaced with residential equipment
*new commercial mechanical equipment is needed
*a number of ADA issues need to be addressed
*deferred maintenance cost of critical items only: $632,040
*building renovation cost: $3.5 Million
*building replacement cost: $4.2 Million
Supervisor Carrow asked what level would the renovation costs bring the building up to and Knop replied by noting that good condition – above fair – close to very good. Supervisor Carrow asked what remaining life the building would get out of the renovation costs and Knop replied by stating that addressing the deferred maintenance issues would add 10-15 years of observable remaining life. Knop noted concerns with the air handling units and their placement.

Building C (Library Building):
*Knop reviewed possible solution of installing ductwork on outside of building for existing air handling unit concerns
*carpet is beginning to fail due to tiles beneath
*bathrooms do not meet ADA compliance standards and additions to the exterior of the building would need to be completed to address compliance issues
*roof and bricks are in relatively good condition

Building D (Melvill Hall Administration Building):
*addition is in good shape
*original building brings other values down
*few elements are restrictive for future use
*$155,120 cost of deferred maintenance is low due to building addition
*$4.45 Million to replace as office/administration building

Building F (Gymnasium Building):
*must consider the size of the building when looking at costs
*roof is original and unique to other campus buildings
*building would need new roof system
*restrooms need accessibility upgrades and water damaged areas need repaired
*replacement cost of $9.7 Million
*mechanical systems are original
*building acts as pseudo-central utility plant for all other buildings
Committee Chair Turk asked if there are other doorways/entryways that need attention. Knop answered by stating that at some point, doorways/entryways will need some attention in each building. Knop also noted that significant deterioration of concrete is present in each building.

Supervisor Carrow asked why the numbers for Building D changed and Knop stated that the original numbers were reviewed by the engineering team and reassessed. Knop noted that the parking lots are in need of complete resurfacing and regrading, the walkways are deteriorated or are heaving, and the costs to repair the walkways are not included in the building costs. Committee Chair Turk asked if the parking

proximity impacts viability and Knop replied by stating the intended use of building determines the impact. Knop stated that the site has some potential but questioned whether or not that potential could be sustained. Supervisor Glasbrenner asked if the final report will include the bridge on campus not being addressed and Knop replied by noting that it would be included.

Richland County Health & Human Services Building:
*building has grown over time and is a high-level building in good condition
*difficulties repairing exterior of building when damaged due to building material
*a number of the windows are insulated glass which is good
*some windows have water damage and are compromised
*exterior and roof are good – fair
*there are 14 residential furnaces used within the building
*in terms of space needs, the building has the best potential of any in the county and additional efficiencies could be optimized
*building could serve county for a good amount of time
*entryways/exit ways are phenomenal for the aging population and the building is in an ideal location to serve those in the aging population
*possible solution to reduce number of furnaces within building is to utilizes electric for heating purposes

Supervisor Carrow asked about high velocity ducting systems and Knop replied by noting he was unaware of said systems. Knop again noted the Health & Human Services building as the greatest potential for reuse by the county. Committee Chair Turk asked about the utilization of solar panels and Knop replied by noting that the roof would be a good area for that.

Richland County Courthouse Building:
*replacement cost for a government building with similar square feet and uses (Courthouse, Jail, Sheriff, and County Administrative offices) within is $69.5 Million
Knop reviewed Supreme Court facility regulations regarding SCR 68, noted that the departments they met with are making do with they have, and that optimizations may be available.
*concerns noted with County Board Room and paths of egress from the jail addition being in the County Board Room
*restrooms meet required fixture amount to the 2015 IBC standards
*number of facilities are equal to the number of minimum requirement
*current restroom does not function and accessibility clearances are not present

Richland County Jail:
*difficulties with current footprint

Richland County Courthouse Building:
*first floor has thick walls and the planning for offices is disjointed and inefficient
*second floor has thick walls and limit expansion
*courtroom is well beyond required size noted in SCR 68
*courtroom has operational inefficiencies/concern relating to layout
*courtroom can be reconfigured without radical renovation
Supervisor Carrow noted that recent roof repairs and Knop noted that he would update that information. Supervisor Carrow asked about the amount of remaining life that would be observed for the Courthouse

if the deferred maintenance costs were addressed and Knop stated he would need to verify with the team. Committee Chair Turk asked if there was underutilized and/or wasted space in the Courthouse and Knop replied by stating that there is based off the layout of the building. Knop also noted that spaces on the third floor can be reconfigured with renovation and that right-sizing may optimize use.

Reports – Update On Committee Document Filing Structure: Administrator Pesch noted that MIS Director Scott was exploring document filing structure options. Supervisor Frank noted that instruction on the current document filing structure would be beneficial and Administrator Pesch noted training could be scheduled. Supervisor Glasbrenner noted the document retrieval process is clunky and Supervisor Carrow asked how documents are filed county-wide. Discussion on general document retention procedures and file structure continued. County Clerk Kalish noted that a county-wide records management system would be most beneficial and should be looked into. No action taken on this item at the meeting.

Discussion & Possible Action – UW Redevelopment Grant: Administrator Pesch noted that the UW Redevelopment Grant application has been amended with the prohibitive language removed. Administrator Pesch noted that she will submit the application as soon as possible and noted that recent partnerships played a helpful role in getting the grant language amended.

Discussion & Possible Action – Inventory Of Campus Items & Associated Cost(s): Administrator Pesch noted that Highway Commissioner Elder is working with SCH Consulting to obtain inventory options. Administrator Pesch noted a company has been identified to completed the inventory and the auction of the items. Supervisor Carrow asked if there was still flexibility to consider Brandon Fetterly's concerns and Administrator Pesch noted that there is still flexibility as nothing has been signed. Administrator Pesch reviewed the items repurposed at this time. Supervisor Glasbrenner questioned the timing of the repurposing of items and Administrator Pesch noted she sent an email to Department Heads per the committee's direction and that she will continue to review the requests for items as received to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of the items. No action taken on this item at the meeting.

Discussion & Possible Action – Campus Reconfiguration Committee Name Change: Committee Chair Turk noted that he has received a few suggestions and Supervisor Glasbrenner noted the scope of the committee's work needs to be taken to the full County Board for review. Administrator Pesch noted that the immediate needs like the winterization of the buildings needs to be considered. Supervisor Glasbrenner noted that the committee should continue to focus on the big picture and Committee Chair Turk noted that the issues the current committee may face may be larger than what the group was originally chartered to do. Committee Chair Turk noted that a situation in which the committee will have no answer for may arise and further consideration will be given to keeping the current committee or making modifications. Discussion regarding the committee's scope of work continued. No action taken on this item at the meeting.

Correspondence: County Clerk Kalish noted he received a request to include the last names of committee members in the roll call section of the minutes from Dean Amundson. Several committee members noted receipt of emails from Alan Lins.

Richland County
Campus Reconfiguration Committee

Future Agenda Items:
Discussion & Possible Action: Winterization of the campus buildings
Discussion & Possible Action: Space needs analysis findings
Discussion & Possible Action: Future planning proposals from Venture architects
Discussion & Possible Action: Inventory of campus items and associated costs

Next meeting scheduled for November 6, 2024 at 5 PM.

Adjourn: Motion by Glasbrenner second by Frank to adjourn. Motion carried and meeting adjourned at 7:05 PM.

Derek S. Kalish
County Clerk