

# DELAWARE COUNTY

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

P.O. BOX 311

DELHI, N.Y. 13753

**WAYNE D. REYNOLDS, P.E.**  
COMMISSIONER

Main Office and Yard  
Page Avenue  
Delhi, N. Y. 13753

Question #1. The present building is 42,000 sq. ft. why do we need 80,000 sq. ft.?

A. The current DPW facility on Page Avenue in Delhi is made up of 8 separate and distinct buildings having a total footprint area of 59,346 square feet. Two of these buildings have full second floors and a number of them have mezzanines. The second floors are used for the DPW and Planning offices in one building and Elections, OET and Veterans in the second building. The mezzanines are used for offices, record storage, parts inventory and light construction material storage. All of the mezzanines are accessed by stairs only (not handicap accessible) and all of them are limited to one point of access. The approximate area of mezzanines and second floors is 11,168 square feet. Therefore the total available floor space that the department has is approximately 70,514 square feet. The County's consultant has proposed a program of 78,897 square feet which is approximately 12% larger than the current facilities. This slight increase in building size takes into account the new codes and also some operational improvements. Some of the operational improvements include having the road patrols separate from the mechanics so there is less interference at the beginning and end of each workday. Historically, the patrol trucks have been parked in the way of the mechanics so it prevented them from going to work until the plow trucks were moved out and they had to quit before the trucks were moved back in at night. That is not currently the case with the Wickham garage but there is not enough room in the Wickham garage for all mechanics to work so some work has to be done outside in the elements. The proposed program would eliminate both of those situations. It should be noted that the Bridge Crew facilities and the current offices are not in dire need of replacement. Those facilities could be postponed until some point in the future when they have reached their useful life. However, the Committee has chosen to make sure that the site selected has enough room to accommodate these facilities when the time comes. That is why the entire space is listed. The space requirements for those two facilities is approximately 23,300 feet. When you remove that from the total, the highest priority space required at this time is approximately 55,600 square feet.

Question #2. The 2017 budget doesn't reflect an overage of \$14 million. Where is it?

A. The \$14 Million is a combination of several funding sources as shown in the presentation. The Department has 5 separate funds, Machinery, Road Maintenance, Capital Roads and Bridges, Solid Waste Operations and Solid Waste Capital. For this project funds will be pulled from the first three of these as shown in the presentation for a total of \$11,500,000.00. The remaining funds are made up of the County's CHIPS funds and bonding as shown in the presentation.

Question #3. The \$23 million to build the proposed building includes the rehab of the existing property except for asbestos removal. There are reports that this will run \$10 million. How accurate is this?

A. We are unaware of the source of that estimate but it is not accurate. The County is still studying alternative solutions for the demolition and has yet to identify the most economical method but the

Questions from cards.docx

current estimate is between \$500,000 and \$750,000.

The most cost effective way to demolish the building would be to mitigate the asbestos first and tear the building down after that. However, the asbestos is encapsulated in the old roofing material. That roof was covered by a contract in 1990 with a system of purlins, pressure treated plywood, gypsum board and an EPDM rubber roof. The 1990 roof system would have to be removed before the asbestos containing material could be exposed and removed. Using that procedure, a specialty and fully licensed asbestos abatement contractor would be retained to remove and dispose of the asbestos first. Once that is gone, the rest of the building could be demolished by the DPW. However, the metal roof decking material has deteriorated to the point that this procedure will most likely have to be eliminated for safety concerns. The roof decking will probably not adequately support the contractor to remove the asbestos material. Therefore, we anticipate that a "controlled demolition" contract will be required. Using that method, the entire building has to be demolished by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor and the work will be monitored by an independent environmental monitoring firm. Calculations indicate that there is approximately 3,777 tons of waste to dispose of.

Question #4. What is the price estimate for the proposed bridge?

A. The estimated cost as shown in the presentation made on July 21, 2017 was \$4,000,000. This estimate was developed by DPW staff. It is a conservative estimate based on a limited amount of site data. A more refined number cannot be made until more geotechnical information is obtained. Wendel Engineering has subsequently performed an independent estimate and they believe that the bridge can be constructed for \$1,900,000.

Question #5. You mentioned the Delancey property is the #1 option; however we watched a presentation almost entirely on a different site. Why was more detail not provided on other top options?

A. The majority of the presentation was created prior to the results of Wendel's latest criteria study. Thus the majority of the presentation was based on site # 3. There are updated presentations on the County's Website, they can be found at:

[http://www.co.delaware.ny.us/departments/dcan/dpw\\_siting.htm](http://www.co.delaware.ny.us/departments/dcan/dpw_siting.htm)

As the work continues, there will be more information provided.

Question #6. Del. Co. Waste Mgmt is the same as septic plant Mr. Frisbee mentioned?

A. No. The Delaware County Solid Waste Management Center is located at 32230 St Hwy 10 in Walton. The Septic Plant referenced by Mr. Frisbee is owned and operated by the Village of Delhi and is located at 42032 St Hwy 10, Delhi.

Question #7. Any sites in Meridale?

A. No.

Question #8. Is only Lewis property going back for tax and other open space left still off?

A. Depending on what alternative is selected, the County will work with the local governments to determine how the excess property will be handled.

Question #9. How will any of these plans benefit the taxpayer of Delaware County?

A. All of the plans being considered are for the benefit of the taxpayer of the County. Some of the alternatives will benefit the County more than others. The whole idea of the plan is to construct a

facility that will serve the taxpayer well for the next 50 to 75 years. The facility will allow for the efficient maintenance and storage of the taxpayers equipment. The facility needs to be able to accommodate existing and future needs of the crews that maintain the County's Roads and Bridges. A new facility which is out of the floodplain will allow our Crews to respond faster in the event of flooding as we will not have to spend hours making our building secure before we go out to take care of the roads and bridges.

Question #10. Is the Bishop property in Hamden near the NYSEG property being given serious consideration?

A. All sites are being considered seriously. The fact that the site is more than 10 miles from the current site is certainly not a benefit but there are other positive attributes to the site. The initial asking price for the property rendered it to be not cost effective as well as too far away for operations so it was not a good alternative. The property costs have recently been lowered substantially making it more attractive to the Board. The site will certainly not work for the entire facility because it is completely unacceptable to have the response time to the people served by the Delhi patrols increase by 20 or 30 minutes. It is being evaluated as a location for the maintenance shop and some storage while keeping the patrol garage in Delhi. Under that scenario, the outside agencies will have further to travel to have their vehicles serviced. That will be an ongoing annual cost to the taxpayer.

Question #11. Has the State been approached to share its property across from the firehouse with the County?

A. Yes. They have indicated that they do not have any room for the County even on a temporary basis.

Question #12. What about the property of the Delhi landfill?

A. This property is an old landfill; it was used as such prior to the development of the County landfill. In order to build here the landfill would need to be remediated prior to development. The exact extent of the remediation is not known. In addition, the access from Route 10 at this location is not suitable for a significant increase in traffic.

Question #13. What is the current School and property tax to be lost on each property?

A.	Site #1	Property Tax	\$1,669.25	School Tax	\$900.88
	Site #3	Property Tax	\$173.79	School Tax	\$183.79
	Site #3	Property Tax	\$5,123.91	School Tax	\$5,734.35
	Site #7	Property Tax	\$1,677.33	School Tax	\$2,448.31
	Site #9	Property Tax	\$3,558.70	School Tax	\$3,919.23
	Site #11	Property Tax	\$1,285.59	School Tax	\$1,475.79
	Site #11	Property Tax	\$1,519.32	School Tax	\$1,393.11
	Site #11	Property Tax	\$746.93	School Tax	\$844.89

Question #14. How much of the River View Farm will be returned to private use?

A. As much as possible, approximately 145 Acres. All the existing buildings would be subdivided off and returned to the tax rolls. The South side of County Route 18 would also be returned to the tax rolls. The river flats would be retained by the County but leased to a farmer to keep it in production.

Question #15. Will the public have an opportunity to vote yes or no on bond issue?

Questions from cards.docx

A. No. The Board of Supervisors will vote on this.

Question #16. Please let us know the results of a long term evaluation of DPW's future needs relative to operations and staff.

A. Numerous discussions have been had by the Public Works Committee and the Board of Supervisors about alternatives to maintaining County infrastructure. There has been discussion about the County going out of the road maintenance business and letting the Towns maintain all the roads and the County would just maintain the bridges and do the specialty work of guiderail installation, line stripping, vacuum truck culvert cleaning and signing. There does not seem to be any support for that change. There has also been some limited discussion on the County taking over all the Town roads to centralize labor negotiations, bidding and procurement, minimize duplication of equipment etc. but there does not seem to be any support for that either. The planned project is predicated on the County continuing to maintain the 260 miles of roads and the 293 bridges.

Question #17. Please provide us with maps, site studies, environmental reviews, SEQRA, search parameters for all sites being considered.

A. DPW will not do environmental and SEQRA reviews until a final site has been selected. To do them on all 11 parcels would be extremely expensive. Presentations to the Board of Supervisors will be added to the website.

Question #18. Are grants being applied for? How much \$ has been awarded? Where is \$23 million coming from?

A. Grants will be applied for once a final site has been selected. The \$23 million was explained in the presentation. \$11,500,000.00 from DPW fund balances, \$3,083,076.00 in CHIPS funding and the balance to be bonded.

Question #19. Who are decision makers relative to the new site?

A. The Board of Supervisors will make the final decision.

Question #20. Please provide their names and contact information.

A. This information can be found at: <http://www.co.delaware.ny.us/departments/cob/bos.htm>

Question #21. What supervisors are in favor of the McFarland farm?

A. A formal vote has not been taken on this so we do not know.

Question #22. Note: Hamlet expansion area was intended for village expansion (not government)

A. The designation of the Hamlet Extension Area allows the property to be developed under less restrictive NYC DEP rules and regulations. There is nothing in the regulations that indicates that it cannot be used for governmental use. In fact the program was developed to allow the communities to have expansion areas for community use. That includes governmental facilities as required.

Question #23. What is the minimum size property needed for the DPW project?

A. The siting study parameters call for 25 acres. This allows for space to accommodate the buildings as well current storm water requirements. Size will vary depending on site topography and soil conditions. The steeper the site and the more impervious the soil the more property that is required.

Question #24. Cost and timing of Page Ave remediation and reclamation?

Questions from cards.docx

A. The Page Avenue site will be reclaimed as soon as possible. We are currently in the process of removing everything from the building. The current estimate for the remediation of the asbestos is discussed in a previous answer. Once the asbestos has been abated and the building removed DPW forces can do the site grading and other work.

Question #25. You say facilities will not be moved until a later date, what is the cost for those items that will be moved later?

A. Costs estimates are time sensitive and are dependent on inflation of materials. The goal of the committee was to have enough property to accommodate the entire facility over time. It is certainly the most cost effective to construct as much as possible at one time due to economy of scale. However, having a reasonable budget is also important. For those buildings that are not in immediate need to be replaced, they can be delayed until such time as they need to be replaced and money has been saved to move them. The important thing is to have a site that will accommodate the remaining buildings as they are needed.

Question #26. Site 2 from Wendel- why not build a new access road?

A. A new access road at this site would be longer and require a longer bridge than site 3.

Question #27. What about downstream Flood mitigation to help with Bridge St. Sherwood's, and Kingston Street bridge flooding? Would help with access (IE not closing bridges) and reduce floodplain at current site. Also potential for outside funding.

A. Downstream flood mitigation is being evaluated by the Delhi Flood Commission working in conjunction with the Delaware County Soil and Water Conservation District. The flood analysis that they have performed does not identify any real solutions to the Sherwood Road Bridge. It does provide some alternatives that will benefit Kingston Street and Bridge Street but it is not able to eliminate the flooding of the approach to Bridge Street. All three existing bridges are in low areas and will not be able to be protected to the point that access is ensured from one side of the river to the other during times of flooding.

The question on funding was addressed in the answer to question #18.

Question #28. How would new bridge for site 3 not be in floodplain similar to other sites?

A. The proposed location of the bridge is in a very unique location due to topography. It is actually the very best location for a bridge that exists from Deposit to Stamford. As explained at the meeting, the location is somewhat artificial. The natural floodplain on the north side of the river was filled by NYS DOT when the rock cut was made for Route 10. The rock spoil was placed in such a way that elevated the riverbank to above the floodplain elevations. That combined with the natural plateau on the south side has created this unique situation. Ordinarily, the artificial modification of floodplains results in less than desirable results. However, at this location, the river has gone through many major flooding events and it has remained very stable. There are no signs of distress on either bank of the river.

Question #29. Why is proximity to current operations an issue? Isn't everything moving?

A. Everything will move eventually. However, the infrastructure necessary to support the facility is best provided in a location close to the rest of County Government. The need to communicate daily with 111 Main Street, the fiber and computer technology necessary to support the offices, all of these things are better served being closer to the Village. We also need to remain fairly close as the Public Safety building serves as the Emergency Operations Center and we provide essential support from

our facility. It is important for the snowplows that service county routes 14, 16, 18, 5 and 6 to remain in close proximity to them for quicker response times.

Question #30. Has this been voted on by the Board of Supervisors?

A. No.

Question #31. Will there be a Public Hearing?

A. That will be determined by the Board of Supervisors, not the Public Works Department.

Question #32. How is this legal to purchase McFarland Farm when it was designated as land part of hamlet?

A. The Hamlet designation prevents the owner from selling to NYC. It does not prevent a sale to anyone else as further explained above.

Question #33. How many properties has the County bought in the Town of Delhi and have taken off the tax rolls?

A. There are numerous County owned properties in the Town of Delhi. Delhi is the County Seat which is why the County has a focus there. The County's GIS data show 6 parcels in the Town outside of the Village and 16 in the Village for a total of 22.

Question #34. If you knew the existing site was in the floodplain, why did you keep buying property in that area instead of looking for another site?

A. The County purchased the Wickham property to address an immediate need to get the mechanics out of a shop that was no longer adequate to house them. It was a goal to use the property for future development but after years of evaluating alternatives of developing in the floodplain and determining that there was not a way of doing so without increasing the backwater for adjacent properties, it was determined that it was not feasible.

Question #35. Why did the County specifically buy Wickham's if they knew they were not going to expand in that area?

A. At the time the property was purchased it was the Department's intention to build on Page Avenue. As the project progressed it became apparent that this was not a suitable option as any construction done here has adverse effects on both upstream and downstream properties. The Department and the Public Works Committee agree that any negative impact from a flooding perspective is completely unacceptable. We have also been informed by NYS DEC that we cannot site a critical facility such as a Highway Garage in the flood plain.

Question #36. What are the other choices?

A. Please see presentations located on the County Website @ [http://www.co.delaware.ny.us/departments/dcan/dpw\\_siting.htm](http://www.co.delaware.ny.us/departments/dcan/dpw_siting.htm)

Question #37. What about Meredith on Rt. 28 before the intersection w. Turnpike – perfectly flat and on 28?

A. We are only looking at property that is currently for sale.

Question #38. DC always saying no money to fix bridges, etc. but has plenty of money to build a new one why?

Questions from cards.docx

A. DPW's bridges are ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> in New York State. We take pride in that fact. We have never said we didn't have money to build bridges. If this is in reference to the foot bridge being built in Fleischmanns that is a completely separate issue that had nothing to do with available funding.

Question #39. Who's idea was this?

A. The Public Works Committee working with the staff of the Public Works Department has identified the need to construct a new facility for the safety of the Department's employees, the protection of County assets and to improve the efficiencies of the Department. And to better serve the community during storm and flood events.

Question #40 What types of feasibility studies were conducted to assess pros and cons of possibilities county wide?

A. The results of the site evaluations were presented at the meeting. After the meeting, the County's consultant engineer has continued to study alternative sites. Those evaluations have been presented to the Board of Supervisors and the presentation is on the County website.

Question #41. Environmental Impact Studies?

A. Will be done on the final site or sites selected. Environmental studies require access to the property to evaluate fully. The studies include archeological investigations, environmental contamination evaluations, presence of endangered species or habitats, presence of wetlands, etc. It is extremely time consuming and expensive to advance properly prepared impact studies. For cost reasons, it is the county's goal to only perform them on selected site or sites. That does not mean that a fatal flaw may be found during the environmental analysis that will render the site unusable for the intended purpose. If that is the case the County would have to proceed to the next site. However, if no significant impacts are found, that would be the site developed.

Question #42. Where did construction cost come from?

A. The Consultant provided the opinions of probable cost based on experience with similar structures.

Question #43. What does Watershed/DEC/NYC think?

A. The NYS DEC is strongly encouraging the County to get out of the floodplain. DEC, Watershed nor the NYC DEP will render comments or opinions until a site is selected and the SEQRA process is started.

Question #44. Why not ask NY?

A. The City of New York is not responsible for the maintenance of the County's roads bridges or infrastructure. It is up to the County Government to figure out what is in the best interest of the County taxpayer and to precede with the environmental studies and development plans necessary to achieve the goals of the County.

Question #45. How do you justify using road funds for the building of a facility...the discussions/presentation showed a breakdown. You are using CHIPS for building? I have always assumed that CHIPS funding was for the maintenance of specified roads. In Delhi alone numerous County roads are in dire need of repair and maintenance!

A. It is the Department's position that the County Roads in the Delhi area are in good condition. It is important to note that the County is only responsible for the County Roads in the Delhi area not all

Questions from cards.docx

roads. There may be some State roads or other roads that are in rough condition but they do not fall under the jurisdiction of the County.

As for CHIPS funding, the use of CHIPS money for new highway related facilities is an eligible use of the funds. All information concerning CHIPS can be found here:

<https://www.dot.ny.gov/programs/chips> Due to the dire need for a new facility for the Department, the Department and the Committee are in agreement that it is an appropriate use of the funds. The Department cannot adequately run an operation that provides good maintenance of the County roads and bridges if it does not have a good building to operate out of.

Question #46. Furthermore, the funds shown which I understood to be surplus...why have not these funds be used to offset the County's budget...each year the County has gone over the tax cap! These monies should have been returned and used to offset. I am appalled to think that my County is considering such a tremendous undertaking when those living in Delhi and surrounding communities struggle to survive. As of the census of 2000, "there were 48,055 people, 19,270 households, and 12,737 families residing in the county. The population density was 13/km<sup>2</sup> (33/sq mi), making it the least densely populated in the state outside of the Adirondacks. The median income for a household in the county was \$32,461, and the median income for a family was \$39,695. Males had a median income of \$27,732 versus \$22,262 for females. The per capita income for the county was #17,357. About 9.30% of families and 12.90% of the population were below the poverty line, including 18.60% of those under age 18 and 8.60% of those ages 65 or over." Please justify your thoughts then of quadruplicating even doubling the size of your existing building when our younger population is dwindling, schools are considering consolidation due to reduced enrollment...  
A. The funds being used have been being put aside for just this purpose. We have known for a long time that the construction of a new facility was needed; we have been being fiscally responsible and planning for that. The money set aside cannot go back to the general fund; it is in DPW funds and must be used for DPW purposes.

Without a good infrastructure we have nothing so it is imperative that we continue to provide that service to the public. You state that tourism is our last hope. Without good roads and bridges, people are not going to come here. As for the size of the structure, that was addressed in a previous question.

As a side note, the Department does use a portion of fund balance each year in an effort to ease budget increases.

Question #47. Is there a procedure the County is supposed to follow when considering a capital project?

A. There is no set written procedure. Each capital project is different. The capital projects are either overseen by the oversight committee of the Department needing the Capital Project or by a Special Capital Project Committee appointed by the Chairman of the Board.

Question #48. What is the procedure?

A. The procedure DPW used includes retaining a professional firm having experience in the area of the capital project required, having a project program developed that meets the goals of the project and determines the overall size of the facility required. A siting study is performed to identify the best site for developing the project given the goals and the program. The project undergoes a SEQRA review to identify impacts of the proposed project on the proposed site. The Board of

Supervisors issues a findings statement on the SEQRA review. Final designs are developed for Board of Supervisors approval. The final designs are then used to develop bidding documents for the project and the project is put out for competitive bids.

Question #49. Is it a written procedure?

A. There is not a written procedure for the process.

Question #50. 2017 County budget shows capital projects account balance of \$11,416,208- are those funds dedicated solely to Highway Department relocation or are other capital projects included? If so what are the other projects and how much money dedicated for each project?

A. That is the appropriations balance for 2017. There is \$1,308,415.00 in personal services, \$874,429.00 in equipment rental, \$100,094.00 in fringe benefits and \$7,795,971.00 in contractual services.

There are several projects included in these lines.

NYC Roads – (per contract) \$1,491,802.00

BR 26-1 - \$2,500,000.00

BR 216 - \$1,000,000.00

BR 80 - \$3,700,000.00

Of that money, \$454,690 will come from the General fund. The balance is FEMA funding, NYC funds, CHIPS and FHWA funding

That total also includes \$1,337,299 from the Solid Waste Capital Budget. The money to fund Solid Waste comes from sales tax revenue.

Question #51. What is source of \$11,416,208 balance in the capital projects account shown in the 2017 County budget?

A. The answer to this question is address in Question #50.