

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Supervisors  
Todd Kirstin (BOS as of 1/1/12)

FROM: Susan E. Steele, Manager

DATE: December 12, 2011

RE: Municipal Building

---

Attached hereto is the Halfmoon Township Municipal Building Feasibility Study dated 11/22/11. This will be officially presented to the Board of Supervisors at their January 12, 2012 regular meeting by the consultant.

However, prior to the meeting, I wanted to point out some present challenges for the Board's thoughts and direction as to how you wish to handle in conjunction with the report as to present building issues. To help filter out these problems and solutions, I held a meeting on December 9, 2011, with the following individuals:

1. Mike Siggins, Lead Consultant on the Municipal Building Feasibility Study
2. Walter Schneider, Centre Region Code Agency Director
3. D.J. Liggett, Halfmoon Township Local Planner and CRPA Senior Planner
4. Dave Piper, Township Sewage Enforcement Officer
5. Scott Brown, Roadmaster as well as Municipal Facilities Superintendent
6. Susan Steele, Township Manager

The result and recommendations of this meeting are as follows as well as pointed out by the feasibility study.

**PRESENT MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

PRESENT USAGE

The present building is be used 14 hours a day seven days a week. Little League has been using the building for bathroom and changing room use and runs games seven days of week between March and September. Also during the summer months the Township uses the building for a summer parks program that runs from June through the first week of August. The building is used by Township meetings or rentals almost seven days a week (except Fridays).

Stating the above, I thought present usage numbers would be helpful when analyzing what usage the present building was built for and what usage the Township is presently utilizing.

Sundays-rental-	approximately 50 people
Summer LL	approximately 100 people (bathrooms)
<b>Total Sunday Occupancy Needed:</b>	<b>150 people</b>
Mondays-work day	approximately 4 people

5:00-9:00 pm	approximately 40 people (scouts)	
Summer LL	approximately 100 people (bathrooms)	
Summer program	approximately 40 people (building)	
<b>Total Monday Occupancy Needed:</b>		<b>184 people</b>
Tuesdays-workday	approximately 4 people	
5:00-9:00 pm	approximately 40 people (alternates between PC, Park Board & Daisy Scouts)	
Summer LL	approximately 100 people (bathrooms)	
Summer Program	approximately 135 people (building)	
<b>Total Tuesday Occupancy Needed:</b>		<b>279 people</b>
Wednesday workday	approximately 4 people	
5:00-9:00 pm	approximately 20 people (alternates between OSB & Water Company)	
Summer LL	approximately 100 people	
Summer Program	approximately 135 people	
<b>Total Wednesday Occupancy Need:</b>		<b>259 people</b>
Thursday workday	approximately 4 people	
5:00-9:00 pm	approximately 20 people (BOS meetings)	
Summer LL	approximately 100 people	
Summer Program	approximately 135 people	
<b>Total Thursday Occupancy Needed:</b>		<b>259 people</b>
Friday workday	approximately 4 people	
Summer LL	approximately 100 people	
<b>Total Friday Occupancy Needed:</b>		<b>104 people</b>
Saturday-rentals	approximately 50 people	
Summer LL	approximately 100 people	
<b>Total Saturday Occupancy Needed:</b>		<b>150 people</b>

Therefore, the building's structure and utility facilities need to be able to handle minimally 44 people per day year round and up to around 260 people per day during the summer months.

*ISSUE ONE:*

*CAN THE PRESENT STRUCTURE SUSTAIN ITS PRESENT USAGE*

Most of the meeting room usage entails tables and chairs whether it is used for meetings, parties or rentals. Per P. 17 of the feasibility report, the present capacity limit for the meeting room using tables and chairs is 69 people. There are few exceptions of use outside of 69 people **except for the summer children's program (budgets around 135 people) or parks parties (Christmas and Easter which is usually budgeted around 125 children plus an additional 125 parents).**

Conclusion: The present occupancy limit of 69 for meeting room usage with tables and chair *is being met except for the summer parks children's program or parks' parties.*

Also on P. 17 of the feasibility report, the present capacity limit for the business area is around 14 people. The Township employs four full time and one part time employee as well as 25 seasonable employees during the summer months. The seasonal employees as well as two of the full time employees are seldom in the business office except to use the time clock or meetings. However, at other times and during all seasons, because of meeting room conflicts, Township meetings and

conferences are held in the business office. Therefore, at times, the 14 occupancy limit for the business office is not met.

Conclusion: The present occupancy limit of 14 people in the business office is usually adequate **except for summer seasonal as well as meetings and conferences held within the business office area during all four seasons.**

The feasibility study also supports the above analysis as indicted on P. 23, wherein it indicates and states “the functions of township government and the fixtures, furnishings and equipment necessary to administer those functions has outgrown the size and layout of the existing building.’

*ISSUE TWO:  
MOLD PROBLEM/ABATEMENT*

As noted on P. 6 of the feasibility study, the report notes there is a “new mold and mildew problem which has developed which is particularly concerning . . . leaks in the exterior metal cladding, moisture penetrating under and around exterior doors and compromise(s) to the existing wall insulation and/or vapor barrier as the most likely causes the problem. As a result, a mold and mildew problem has developed that is primarily located in the Multi-purpose room. It is detectable by its odor immediately upon entering the room.”

Meeting attendees as well as staff has noticed the mildew and mold problems. In addition, full time staff has had headaches, asthmatic, and allergy related symptoms, which could be a result of the mold. Therefore, in conjunction with the feasibility report, the Supervisors asked me to have a mold analysis done. I had Peneco conduct the mold study. Attached is a copy of the report.

You will note from the report that the control (which was the outside analysis) showed no Chaetomium and minimal Pennicillium/Aspergillus. However, they were elevated in the meeting room walls and air. There were other molds present as noted on the report but the Chaetomium and Pencillium/Aspergillus are **not normally found, toxic, fast growing, and of health concern.** The levels are not elevated enough, at this time, to close the building but do need to remediated as soon as possible as they are fast multiplying mold spores.

To that end, I asked the committee as well as Peneco to come up with remediation procedures. Peneco would fog the room for a cost of around \$2,000, but that would not cure the insulation and mold problem within the walls and vapor barriers. Peneco felt those needed to be remediated first prior to any fogging. Accordingly, I held the meeting to ascertain from Mike Siggins and Walt Schneider the best avenues. First we addressed present health concerns and possible immediate remediation:

- The mold is most dangerous to the full time occupants. Children running in and out as well as part time meeting attendees are probably fine.
- The purchase of state of the art HEPA filters at approximately \$1,000 a piece should be used. My research indicates the Austin Air systems are the best and we would need to purchase two. One for the meeting room and one for the business area.
- Keep doors, windows and HVAC on as much as possible to circulate the air
- They do not suggest sealing windows or doorways because the more outside fresh air entering, the better
- Hand air dryers in bathrooms (take out paper towel dispensers)

Then we discussed permanent remediation of the mold problem, as it will only continue to grow, and become a greater health issue. I addressed with Walt if we replaced the insulation and placed new paneling or drywall, would we have to bring the entire building up to Code (cost of around \$250,000—P. 22 of feasibility report)? Walt said no we would not, however, the vapor barrier as well as insulation would need to be fixed and installed per current insulation standards. What this means is that there is basically not enough room between the metal siding and present wood paneling to replace at current insulation standards and to replace same would entail losing room space. In addition, the vapor barrier has been compromised. Therefore both Walt and Mike said the only way to permanently eradicate the mold issue was to strip off all the exterior metal siding, insulation, wood paneling and go down to the bare steel frame. The work would be minimally \$50,000; just for remediation. This does not include construction and new material costs. The remediation would occur simultaneously from the outside and inside to create a new exterior, vapor barrier, insulation, and the paneling or drywall.

Conclusion: The Township would basically be building a new exterior structure for permanent mold remediation. The members of the meeting felt this was putting good money after bad because even with mold remediation, the building had still outlived its useful life. It is suggested that immediately the Township purchase the necessary HEPA filtering systems as well as hand air dryers for the bathrooms. In addition, I have asked Township staff to keep the windows and doors open, as weather permits, as well as heating the office and meeting room. This will increase our electric bill, but maintaining heat in the meeting room will possibly assist in deterring the rate of mold growth. The Township could also fog the building, but it will not penetrate into the actual areas the mold is growing. Therefore, I am not recommending this expense at this time.

#### *ISSUE THREE:*

#### *WILL THE PRESENT SEPTIC/DRAIN FIELD SUPPORT THE PRESENT USAGE OF THE BUILDING?*

The Township bathrooms are a constant source of problems. During weekend building rentals, I receive calls the toilets and bathroom drains are backed up. During the summer months the bathrooms are inoperable most Mondays and Fridays due to usage. I had originally asked Mike if we could install commercial toilets. The answer is no due to our present septic system.

Dave Piper reviewed the present system. It has a capacity of 1,000 gallons per day, the current perc rate of the soil in which the current septic system is located is not adequate due to the proximity to low lying wet areas. Pg. 8 of the feasibility study indicates current code requires a minimum 750 gallon septic tank capacity plus 2 gallons per person for an assembly hall. One thousand gallons allows for approximately 100 people per day.

Conclusion: You will note that during the summer months when Little League as well as the summer program are using the building the Township has around 259 people per day. This explains the current toilet/sewer issues and backups were are presently experiencing. The peak loads are too great for our current system.

We discussed what the Township could do to increase its capacity to be more in line with present usage. Here were some of the suggestions:

- More port-a-potties—lock bathrooms except for rental use. However, this would not assist during peak flows with the summer children's program as well as building rentals

- Replace present toilets with prison issue commercial toilets as well as install an outside holding tank: Cost: Around \$10,000
- Holding tank would need to be dumped (similar to port-a-potties), on a monthly basis. The cost would be around \$250 per pump.

The group felt for its present usage the Township needed to install the holding tank, commercial toilets and pump: Total cost would be around \$13,000 (\$10,000 for holding tank and toilets, \$3,000 for monthly dump cost).

### **QUESTIONS FOR SUPERVISORS**

The Township needs a new municipal building. The present building is not sufficient in structure and septic issues. In addition, the mold has caused a health concern.

**Question 1:** What does the Township want to do with present building regarding its present usage in the short term?

- Keep capacities in meeting room to 69?
- Cease rentals?
- Purchase HEPA filters for mold?
- Purchase air hand dryers?
- Lock bathrooms when building is not in use (eliminates Halfmoon Little League usage)?
- Inadequate facilities in present building for summer parks' program?
- Spend \$2,000 for HEPA filters, \$5,000 for hand dryers, and another \$13,000 for bathroom improvements?

**Question 2:** Walt and Mike state the present multi-purpose room will need to be stripped down to the steel frame to permanently remediate the mold problem. They are suggesting that once the new building is done, to strip the old building down (at least the multi-purpose room) to the steel frame and use the building only seasonally as a pavilion, bathroom and changing area. This would enable the bathroom and changing rooms to still be utilized for Little League and the Parks Program.

- Does Township agree with this opinion?
- Would still need to expend the \$13,000 for septic/sewer issues unless all porta potties are used. Would Township transfer any of these costs on to the users or renters?
- O&M of public bathrooms would run around \$20,000 a year since no one would be here to supervise their use. Public unsupervised bathrooms are VERY high maintenance.
- And if so, what about the summer parks' children program. Even if it is moved over to the other building, there are no outdoor activities at Autumn Meadow. The land nor the budget supports many playground improvements at Autumn Meadow. In addition, the Township liability insurance only allows the children to be transported by public transportation or by Township vehicle outside of the Township properties. Hiring CATA each day would be expensive. The Township only has trucks that are utilized for business during summer months and holds three persons at a time. There is no Township vehicle large enough that we own presently that could transport the children. The insurance does not allow for leaders to travel with their own vehicles to transport children. Therefore, the summer parks' children program would need to be reassessed? Would the Township want to purchase a new bus, to be driven by Township

employees, for the children to and from and parks? Expensive (\$40,000+) but could be done. Would this cost be transferred to the parents' using the program?

- Or alternatively, should the children's summer parks program remain at the pavilion (old building) with bathrooms and changing areas with the idea when it rains they can come under the pavilion?
- Just tear down the old municipal building and not replace, and if so, do you want to expend monies on a new septic system here, or just rent more port a potties until new building is built?

**Questions 3:** The feasibility conceptual design envisioned only Township meetings be located at the new building. Building rentals, parties and summer programs as well as scouts would remain at the old building. However, making the old building seasonal eliminates that alternative at least for the four season use. Therefore, the building will need more meeting space since many times scouts run at the same time as meetings. The concept only has two meeting rooms, I would suggest a third one. If the children come over, I would also suggest another meeting room with a separate entrance for that meeting room since the children disturb the business and its citizens during the business hours. Also the concept had only one kitchenette. We might want to include some sort of art room with the children's program with utility sinks and another full service kitchen for staff in the office part. Does the summer parks' program interest and attendance warrant the expense?

#### Conclusion

The feasibility study is much more detailed on options such as bringing the building up to code, present building with addition, new building with LEED concepts and new LEED building. With the mold issue, I believe the first two options (bringing up to Code and enlarging the old building) are problematic. Will the Township be saving any money if it must strip to steel frame anyway to eliminate the mold?

If the Supervisors agree, then staff and the Supervisors can concentrate on the following options:

1. New Building with LEED concepts
2. New LEED Building
3. What to do with present building

Staging of the project would consist of:

- Stage One: HEPA Filters and bathroom issues for present building (\$20,000)  
Develop and investigate financing options for new building

Stage Two: Construct and move into new building

Stage Three: Come back to old building and gut and take down to steel frame to make pavilion or tear down.

Mike and DJ will be at the 1/12/12 meeting. Walt said he would come if you so desire. Just let me know. Also let me know if you need any more information or research done prior to the 1/12/12 presentation.

cc: Scott Brown  
DJ Liggett

Walt Schneider  
Mike Siggins  
Dave Piper  
Township Clerk