




Augusta County Courthouse



Feasibility Study
Vol. I

October, 2012



Augusta County Courthouse



Staunton, Va., Augusta County Court House.

For:
AUGUSTA COUNTY, VIRGINIA

October 2012

Prepared By:

FRAZIER ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTURE ■ URBAN PLANNING ■ WAYFINDING

Acknowledgements

AUGUSTA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Tracy C. Pyles, Jr. , Chairman
Pastures Magisterial District

Jeffrey A. Moore, Vice-Chairman
Wayne Magisterial District

David A. Karaffa
Beverley Manor Magisterial District

Larry J. Wills
Middle River Magisterial District

Marshall W. Pattie
North River Magisterial District

Michael L. Shull
Riverheads Magisterial District

David R. Beyeler
South River Magisterial District

AUGUSTA COUNTY STAFF

Patrick J. Coffield,
County Administrator,

John C. McGehee,
Assistant County Administrator

Hon. John B. Davis,
Clerk, Augusta County Circuit Court

JUDGES, 25TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF VIRGINIA

Hon. Victor V. Ludwig, Presiding Judge

Hon. Malfourd W. Trumbo, Chief Judge

Hon. Humes J. Franklin Jr.

Hon. Michael S. Irvine



FRAZIER ASSOCIATES

ARCHITECTURE ■ COMMUNITY DESIGN ■ WAYFINDING

213 NORTH AUGUSTA STREET, STAUNTON, VA 24401

PHONE 540.886.6230

FAX 540.886.8629

www.frazierassociates.com

SUB-CONSULTANTS

Fentress Inc.
Court Planning Needs Assessment

Linton Engineering LLC
Structural Engineering

MEI Engineering, Inc.
Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Assessment

Froehling and Robertson, Inc.
Hazardous Materials Survey

Downey & Scott LLC
Cost Estimators

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Ownership, Scope and Purpose of Project	1-1
B. Building Documentation and Evaluation	1-2

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

A. Context and Development of Staunton	2-1
B. Previous Courthouses	2-1
C. Current Courthouse	2-3

III. SITE DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT

A. General Setting and Orientation	3-1
B. Retaining Walls, Plazas, and Walkways	3-2
C. Parking	3-3
D. Plantings	3-3
E. Accessibility	3-4
F. Drainage	3-4

IV. BUILDING DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT

A. Summary Description	4-1
B. Chronology of Development	4-3
C. Building Exterior	4-5
1. Elevation Illustrations	4-5
2. General	4-7
3. Foundation	4-8
4. Portico	4-8
5. Exterior Doorways	4-9
6. Windows and Openings	4-10
7. Cornice, Pediments and Exterior Trim Details	4-11
8. Roof, Chimneys, and Cupola	4-12
9. Roof Drainage	4-12

Contents

D. Building Interior	4-13
1. Floor Plans	4-13
2. Stairways	4-21
3. Flooring	4-22
4. Wall and Ceiling Finishes	4-23
5. Doorways and Doors	4-24
6. Decorative Features and Trim	4-25
7. Lighting	4-26
8. Courtroom	4-27
9. Structural System	4-28
10. Building Systems (Electrical and Mechanical)	4-28
11. Hazardous Materials	4-28

V. PRESERVATION ANALYSIS

A. Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties	5-1
B. Character-Defining Spaces/Elements/Features of the Augusta County Courthouse	5-2
C. Treatment Zones Used in Project Planning	5-3

VI. PROGRAMMING SUMMARY

A. Program	6-1
-------------------------	------------

VII. CODE ANALYSIS

A. Building Code Analysis	7-1
1. Governing Codes	7-1
2. Classification of Work	7-1
3. Use Groups	7-1
4. Construction Type	7-1
5. Area (IBC Table 503)	7-1
6. Height (IBC Table 503)	7-2
7. Occupancy (IBC Table 1004.1)	7-2
8. Egress	7-2
9. Building Elements and Materials	7-3
10. Fire Protection	7-3
11. Minimum Plumbing Fixtures (IBC Table 2902.1)	7-3
12. Accessibility	7-4

Contents


B. Zoning Code Analysis	7-4
-------------------------------	-----

VIII. SCHEMATIC CONCEPTS, SCOPE, AND COSTS

A. Description of Schematic Design Options	8-1
B. Exterior Design	8-7
C. Summary Scope of Work	8-15
1. Site (Refer also to Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Evaluation for more information)	8-15
2. Exterior (Refer also to Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Evaluation for more information)	8-15
3. Interior (Refer also to Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Evaluation for more information)	8-16
D. Notes on Cost Estimates	8-18
E. Preliminary Cost Estimate	8-19

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Structural Evaluation
Appendix B – Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Evaluation and Energy Analysis
Appendix C – Hazardous Materials Report
Appendix D – Timeline
Appendix E – Bibliography



Executive Summary

Executive Summary

The Augusta County Circuit Courthouse was constructed in 1901 as the fifth county courthouse in the same location dating back to the original log structure built in 1745. Prominent local architect, T.J. Collins prepared the plans for the 1901 building, which replaced an 1835 building designed by another prominent local architect, Thomas Blackburn. An architecturally sympathetic addition designed by the Waynesboro, Virginia architectural firm of Daley Craig and Fleming Hurt was added to the rear of the current courthouse in 1939 and the main courtroom was remodeled in 1949 according to plans by Sam Collins, T.J.'s son.

The courthouse is individually listed on both the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. It is also listed as a building contributing to the significance of the Beverley Historic District as listed on both above-named registers.

With two stories above-grade and a full basement, the building's area is 20,298 square feet. The downtown Staunton site at the corner of East Johnson and South Augusta streets, has limited room for expansion with neighboring buildings located close by. The neoclassical design retains many of its original character-defining features. The original masonry, cornice, windows, and cupola with its bronze statue remain as important exterior features. Inside, much of the original fabric remains including doors, woodwork, light fixtures, terrazzo, and tile finishes that have been preserved in serviceable condition.

Given the age of the building, it has acquired substantial maintenance needs and has mechanical and electrical systems that require upgrades or replacement. While the overall building structure as evaluated by the study's engineer is good, limited deficiencies were found. Hazardous materials such as vinyl asbestos tile and pigeon guano have been identified for future abatement.

With a planning horizon of 30 years, this report addresses maintenance issues and also projects the needs and changing technological requirements of the modern courtroom. Frazier Associates along with Fentress Incorporated (court consultants) held interviews with the judge, clerk and staff to assess their work requirements. Fentress compared established court facility standards to the current building's setup and projected future caseloads and document filings.

Using this information, schematic design options for the building were developed which included interior alterations and new additions along the Barristers Row Alley. The chosen design provides for future staff requirements and adds spaces currently missing from the building such as separated waiting areas and attorney witness conference rooms. Circulation routes for the public, staff, and prisoners are separated and elevators provide handicap access between the floors. While the building does not completely address every standard that would be incorporated into a new courthouse, the overall security and functionality of the building would be greatly increased by implementing the recommendations of this report.

Cost Summary

Hard Construction Cost

(\$8,012,256 + \$108,522 Roofing Additive \$8,120,778)	\$8,120,778
--	-------------

Soft Costs

Architecture/Engineering design fees = 7%	568,454
---	---------

Soft Costs - Other = 10% (placeholder budget to be confirmed by owner)	812,078
--	---------

Owner's project administration and representation

Project related insurance

Financing costs

Moving expenses

Rental of swing space


Utility fees

Furniture

Equipment

Hazardous materials abatement monitoring

Total Project Cost	\$9,501,310
---------------------------	--------------------




A. Ownership, Scope, and Purpose of Project

The land upon which the current courthouse stands was a gift from William Beverley to the newly created Augusta County in 1746 and has remained in the ownership of the county since.

The following feasibility study provides a comprehensive assessment of the building. It documents existing conditions, and is intended to serve as a planning tool for maintenance and improvements to the 1901 courthouse.

The scope of the project includes:

- Summary history of site and present courthouse
- Identification of character-defining elements of the building and determination of treatment zones
- Computer generated (CAD) floor plans and elevations
- An assessment of existing building conditions and a scope of work to address any deficiencies found
- Recommendations for addressing future needs after review of current case load and projections for future trends
- Preparation of schematic design options for any proposed changes to the floor plan of the building
- Final report that documents condition of building, scope of work, and cost to implement proposed work



The 1747 plat of Staunton shows the location of the courthouse.

B. Building Documentation and Evaluation

The evaluation of the Augusta County Courthouse began with the collection of necessary background data on the property. This preliminary work included measured drawings, historical research, and an existing conditions assessment with photographic documentation. Once this data was collected and analyzed, conclusions could be made about the building's significance and the potential impact of any new work.

1. Measured Drawings

Measured drawings for the building were prepared through a combination of detailed field measurements and a digital photogrammetric survey. The resulting computer-aided design (CAD) scale plans and elevations serve as an important analytical tool and the base for recommended treatment approaches. They also serve as a documented record of the building's design and current configuration.

2. Development History Summary

Historic documentation on the Augusta County Courthouse and the development of the City and the County, including minutes of the Board of Supervisors' meetings that corresponded to the identified dates of construction and major changes to the building were reviewed. The information gathered from these sources was analyzed in conjunction with the measured drawings, field notes, and existing conditions survey and is presented in Chapter 2 of this report and well as Appendix E which contains a timeline for the property.

3. Existing Conditions Assessment

An existing conditions survey was performed to document the physical spaces and architectural elements and to assess the current condition of materials and systems. Existing condition photographs of the features and elements of the building are included in this report. They are accompanied by annotated plans that locate these features and elements. In conjunction with the historic research, this condition assessment helped to determine the historic integrity of the building and the various changes made since its original construction.



Chapter 2 - Historical Background and Context



A. Context and Development of Staunton

John Lewis is traditionally thought of as the first permanent settler in Augusta County as he established a homestead about two miles east of present-day downtown Staunton in 1732. In the next four years more than sixty families made the trip from Pennsylvania on the Great Philadelphia Wagon Road to settle in what would come to become Augusta County. At the same time, however, William Beverley of Tidewater saw the benefits of speculation in land in the Shenandoah Valley and in 1736 obtained from Lt. Gov. William Gooch a land grant of 118,491 acres.

Near the center of this tract, Beverley established what would be referred to as his Mill Place. He sold portions of his landholdings to those early settlers who had followed John Lewis and had already cleared the land to which he now held title. Beverley marketed his land in Pennsylvania and to new immigrants from Ireland.

As the population grew, Augusta County was created from part of Orange County and was formally organized in 1745. The following year, William Beverley offered to the justices of the newly formed county a log courthouse and 25 acres of land at his Mill Place. While the county commissioners

did not look upon the gift favorably, as they found the land to be “entirely ill convenient and useless” and thought they would be unable to sell one lot, the colonial government in Williamsburg accepted Beverley’s gift and the town was platted in 1747.

B. Previous Courthouses

An account of the first courthouse was recorded in Grand Jury proceedings on May 21, 1748 as described below:

It was thirty-eight feet three inches long, and eighteen feet three inches wide in the clear, built with logs hewed on both sides, not laid close, some of the cracks between the logs quite open, four or five inches wide and four or five feet long, and some stopped with chunks and clay but not quite close, two small holes cut for windows, but no glass or shutters to them; the inside not furnished or fitting for his Majesty’s Judicatory to sit.

Jos. A. Waddell, Annals of Augusta County from 1726-1871

In 1755, therefore, a second courthouse was constructed and the first courthouse converted to a residence. Little is



A detail from Edward Beyers’ bird’s-eye view of Staunton c. 1857 shows the 1835 courthouse behind the American Hotel.



An earlier photographic image of the 1835 courthouse prior to its demolition in 1901.

known about the construction of the second courthouse except that it was furnished with a chimney and fireplace. Staunton continued to grow throughout the later part of the eighteenth century and in 1788 county commissioners sought a new courthouse that would symbolize the county's transition from frontier to a more stable and prosperous community. Completed in 1789, the third courthouse on the site required that the two earlier courthouses "be put out of the way."

Built of stone, this structure was square in plan, two stories high, and placed near the center of the lot. Entrances were located on the north and south sides and the courtroom was on the first floor. Jury rooms were located on the second floor and were supported by wooden columns. One of these columns held iron clamps to which the hands of a felon would be fastened while branded with hot irons as there was no state penitentiary at the time. (Waddell)

By 1833, a traveler described Staunton as "the seat of justice of Augusta County...the site of a lunatic asylum of great reputation... It has several beautiful edifices erected for public worship, and fifteen or twenty retail stores, with four or five taverns kept in good style...and a considerable number of elegant brick dwelling houses..." (Isaac Weld as reprinted in *Staunton, Va.: A Pictorial History*)

In 1835, "the old courthouse of Augusta, and other buildings in the yard, were taken down, and the present courthouse and clerk's offices were erected." This quote speaks to the

fourth courthouse on the site, the structure that preceded the present courthouse. (Waddell)

According to research published in *In Jefferson's Shadow: The Architecture of Thomas R. Blackburn*, the architect for the 1835 courthouse was Thomas R. Blackburn, who had learned the practice of architecture under Thomas Jefferson during construction of the University of Virginia. Drawings and photographs of this courthouse, "unquestionably the finest building of its kind in any county in the state" (Joseph Martin's 1836 *Gazetteer*) as well as its footprint recorded on fire insurance maps (see page 5) serve as valuable documentary evidence of this structure.

Ten years after the Civil War, it was remarked that "the growth of Staunton since the war is one of the wonders of all time... to the astonishment of all, Staunton began to grow in population, business increased, old houses were improved and new ones, dwelling and business houses, were built... the march of progress has been continuous and accelerated. It would seem that Staunton has gotten possession of Aladdin's wonderful lamp, and that she erects buildings through its magic agency."

By the spring of 1900, the County Board of Supervisors established a building committee and sought an architect for the remodeling of the 1835 courthouse. Meeting minutes convey that they wished to see plans for a remodeling with a courtroom on the first floor as well as the traditional location on the second floor. They were also keenly aware

of their responsibility as keeper of records of the county and wanted to make sure that their storage would be addressed.

With plans by noted local architect T. J. Collins, bids were sought and in September of 1900, A. F. Withrow was chosen as the contractor with a low bid of \$29,900. The Board, building committee, architect, and contractor continued to fine tune the project, considering a five-foot extension to the front of the 1835 courthouse using pressed brick on October 8, 1900. At their October 23 meeting, however, the Board acknowledged that public sentiment was in favor of a new courthouse, rather than just remodeling the existing building. With newly drawn plans by Collins, the chosen contractor, A. F. Withrow, advised the Board that the additional expense would be \$4,504 over the already quoted price, which including the pressed brick, and was a total of \$35,704.

C. Current Courthouse

The new courthouse was located on the center of the lot, rather than at the rear location of the 1835 courthouse and

the design called for “porches” on both the north and south sides. The cornerstone was laid on December 27, 1900.

At the January Board of Supervisors meeting, the plans for the new courthouse were revised to make provision for a tower, an additional \$4,200 expense. In February, the building committee reported that The M. Ohmer’s Sons Company had been contracted for furniture and interior work, that the Art Metal Construction Company would provide the metallic work, and the Staunton Heating Company for heating. The Board also chose to change the interior woodwork from pine to oak, with doors of quartered oak, at this meeting.



The ceremonies “attending the acceptance and opening of the new Court House” were held on November 9, 1901 in front of “a large audience assembled in the spacious courtroom of the handsome new courthouse of Augusta County” according to a November 15 article in the *Staunton Spectator and Vindicator*.

The newspaper article described the courtroom as “large and fitted with opera chairs; the clerks’ offices are provided



The foundation for the new 1901 courthouse under construction is shown here with the old jail (demolished) across Johnson Street in the background. *Hamrick Collection*

Chapter 2- Historical Background and Context



The 1901 (present) courthouse as it appeared in the Rotogravure Section of the 1904 Silver Anniversary Edition of *The Evening Leader-The Staunton News-Leader* (left) and the publication *Staunton* in 1906 (above).

with fireproof vaults for the safekeeping of papers, records, etc. The halls and stairways are broad, the floors being of artificial veined marble. The most modern appliance for heating are used and the building has both electric and gas lights. The final cost of the building was \$55,257.32.

In 1902, the Board sent the contractor a bill for the repair of the courthouse roof and by the spring of 1903 it was brought to the attention of the Board that the roof was in "a very bad condition" and would have to be replaced with one of "the best tin." A committee was appointed to advertise and sell the slate taken from the roof.

In 1904, the Commissioner of Public Buildings reported "the plastering on the ceiling of the Court House is in a very bad condition and is constantly falling off" and would have to be repaired. A contract for "repairing, frescoing and beautifying the walls and ceiling of the courtroom" and for "frescoing the offices and halls of the courthouse" was awarded to J. G. Valiant of Baltimore.



That year, the building committee was also authorized to "do what is necessary to put the courthouse in thorough repair." Among the projects noted were the addition of guttering over the main entrance and the installation of a new heating system. A search of the T.J. Collins and Son archive housed at the Historic Staunton Foundation

offices failed to yield drawings of the rear addition to the courthouse, only the 1949 remodeling of the courtroom. Period newspaper accounts as well as the minute book for 1938 confirmed that the addition was not the work of the T.J. Collins and Son firm but of Daley Craig and Fleming Hurt, Architects of Waynesboro.

In January of 1938 the supervisors were actively seeking proposals for the remodeling of the courthouse when Sam Collins (T.J. Collins' son) addressed the board and stated that if the other architects were released he "would be glad to enter into the picture."

By the end of January the contract for the job was awarded to Mr. S. Daley Craig for tentative plans with a construction cost estimate of \$34,400. Having heard that a rear addition to the courthouse was being planned, the lawyers occupying the Barristers Row building north of the courthouse (Messrs. Timberlake, Peyton, Carter, Cochran, Curry) asked that if a addition were to be built to consider placement on the front rather than the rear and that instead of an addition maybe an entirely new courthouse could be built.

After a public meeting, the Board decided that due to cost considerations, the addition would be constructed on the rear as proposed and "would adequately meet the needs for many years to come."



Details from the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for the City of Staunton show the footprint of the courthouse before (1904) and after (1949) the 1939 addition. Note the existence of the rear portico in the before image at left.

On June 6, the Board received bids for general construction, plumbing and heating, electrical work, and equipment totaling \$54,071. As the cost was considerably more than estimated, the Board decided to seek funds through the "Emergency Administration of Public Works for a grant to aid in financing the additions and alterations" and rejected the submitted bids.

By August a wage-scale and cost-sharing agreement had been worked out between the Public Works Administration (PWA) and the County. The County was responsible for

55% of the total cost and a warrant was drawn for \$35,491 from the General Fund to establish the Augusta County Courthouse Building Fund.

Bids were opened on September 7 and the next day, *The Staunton News-Leader* published the winning bids. The general construction contract was awarded to H. S. Brooks of Waynesboro, the electrical to Eskay Electric of Staunton, the plumbing and heating to W. S. Moffett of Staunton and the equipment to Wilkinson Equipment Company of Philadelphia.



The rear addition (left) to the courthouse and its facade as it appeared in the 1940s.

Chapter 2- Historical Background and Context

Work on the addition started on September 26 and there is little of note in the minutes until the following year. In February of 1939 the PWA asked that the Board erect a suitable bronze plaque regarding the project and the Board asked the architect to draw a sketch and submit it to the PWA for approval.

In June, a number of change orders were presented to the Board, which are enumerated in the minutes and in the timeline in the Appendix of this report. By the end of July, the addition was completed.

During the next ten years, few entries appear regarding maintenance of the courthouse other than construction of shelves in the basement and lettering on office doors in 1941 and interior and exterior painting in 1947.

Bids for redecorating the courtroom based on an examination of the same by S. J. Collins were authorized in June of 1949 and the contract awarded to J. S. Mathers in July for \$8,518. Robert Johnson was hired by the building committee to clean the portraits and touch up the frames before the portraits could be re-hung in the courtroom.

On August 1, 1949, a special meeting of the committee was called as only a week into the project "all the plaster fell from the ceiling of the Courtroom" and "walls have cracked" and that the removal of the fan from the ceiling would be necessary. The existing plans on file in the T. J. Collins and Son archives at Historic Staunton Foundation and reproduced in this report record much of the work done at this time.

A few days later Sam Collins wrote to the Board and explained his plan for the arrangement of portraits in the courtroom and the criteria for which portraits should be placed there versus other locations in the building.

Later in August, the bid of Drumheller Electric for air-conditioning the courtroom for \$5,422 is accepted as is the recommendation for the arrangement of portraits as suggested by Collins. The Supervisors also chose the electric lights for the courtroom from a number of choices presented by Collins.


In September, the Board authorized Collins to secure prices on chairs for the courtroom and to purchase radiators "in accordance with the new architectural design." The deadline for the new windows being made by Miller Lumber Company was set as the installation date of October 15, 1949.

On November 3, 1949, supervisors authorized the purchase

of 128 chairs from the Flowers School Equipment Company at \$9.85 each (installed) and six additional chairs for the counsel table in the courtroom. Twelve more chairs would be ordered prior to the delivery, two of them with a swivel mechanism for the Clerk and Sheriff.

The purchase of the clock with bronze numerals and hands was authorized and the placement over Judge Holt's portrait (where Justice Cochran's portrait is now) was approved.

Since the courtroom remodeling in 1949, there have been few major changes to the courthouse. The coal boiler has been replaced with a gas furnace and a chair lift has been installed on the east stair to facilitate handicap accessibility to the courtroom. Additional later twentieth century changes include a staff restroom and breakroom added on the first floor and restrooms added next to the jury room of the second floor. The spiral stair communicating between the current Clerk's office on the second floor and the room below was also removed during this time.



A drawing of the proposed light fixtures for the 1949 renovation of the courtroom, which are still in place.



The image above shows a painter working on the dome in 1967.
Hamrick Collection

In 2004, Joe Johnson the great nephew of the original architect T. J. Collins and the principal of the T. J. Collins and Son firm was hired to remodel a series of three small offices in the rear addition on the second floor to become a secondary courtroom. A wall had already been removed, creating two rooms where there were originally three. Johnson's work removed the remaining wall to a height of 2'9" creating a gallery behind this knee wall and adding a judge's bench and clerk's desk at the opposite end of the room.

Site changes in the latter part of the twentieth century included parging masonry walls, installing brick pavers over the concrete plaza, planting two large elm trees in the front lawn, adding a granite map of Augusta County in the plaza area, and adding new black metal railings to the entrances and steps.


The Augusta County Courthouse was individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1982 with a period of significance dating to the construction of the first courthouse on the site in 1745 and continuing to the present day. The areas of significance for the courthouse as defined by the National Park Service, include architecture, exploration/settlement, law, and politics/government.

C. Current Courthouse




The T.J. Collins’ drawing of the south elevation of the 1901 courthouse.

C. Current Courthouse



This alley front (rear or north) elevation also includes details for the pilasters, windows, and other exterior decorative elements.


C. Current Courthouse



In addition to the virtually identical east and west elevation drawing, this sheet includes details for the roof, Clerks offices gallery railing, interior cornices, exterior terra cotta capitals, and column bases.


It also notes the reuse of the old foundation wall at the front of the building.

C. Current Courthouse




The original basement plan mimicked the first floor plan with the exception of the restrooms located at the north end of each wing. Details for bars over openings, cold air ducts, coal chute and hatchway and other openings are also included.

C. Current Courthouse




T.J. Collins’ original plan for the second floor included galleries above the clerks offices for the storage of records. Also of note are the light wells adjacent to the restrooms in each hyphen. A label “old vault door” may indicate the reuse of a vault door from the previous courthouse.

C. Current Courthouse




Window, door, and trim detail for the interior of the courthouse.

C. Current Courthouse




Plan for the 1949 remodeling showing the proposed removal of the courtroom fire-places, plan for air-conditioning the courtroom, and removal of light wells.

C. Current Courthouse




This plan for the 1949 courtroom remodeling shows how air-flow was to be handled with a louvered opening in the ceiling and louvers in the courtroom doors. Ductwork details are also furnished.

C. Current Courthouse




This drawing from Sam Collins' 1949 plan for the courtroom renovation shows the design for embellishment behind the judges' bench and over the doors, the schematic for removal of some wainscot detail, and one wall of the proposed arrangement of portraits.

C. Current Courthouse




The plan above shows the arrangement for an additional wall of portraits as well as the decorative new ceiling tile schematic design.

C. Current Courthouse




The demolition plan (above) indicates that the partition wall between two of the former offices in the addition had been removed prior to this proposed work in 2004. The remaining partition wall was removed to a height of 2' 9" as part of this project.



The furnishing plan shows details for the floor plan illustrated on Sheet 1.

C. Current Courthouse




Central air-conditioning was installed for this secondary courtroom during the 2004 renovation.



Chapter 3 – Site Description and Assessment






A. General Setting and Orientation

The Augusta County Courthouse is centrally located in Staunton's downtown area south of the main commercial corridor (Beverley Street) and the Wharf (former warehouse) district. Johnson Street to the south and Augusta Street to the west are two of the major thoroughfares in the central business district and provide ready access to the building.

The "Lawyers Row" buildings to the east are separated from the courthouse by a concrete sidewalk which helps to frame the court square plaza on the front side. The one-story "Barristers Row" buildings, directly to the north (rear) of the courthouse, are separated from it by an alley bearing the same name.

Originally constructed with virtually identical front and rear porticos, due to a 1939 addition, the rear portico was removed. The courthouse has subsequently been clearly oriented to Johnson Street rather than to Barristers Row.

The courthouse site plan shows the brick plaza and plantings.



This aerial view shows the courthouse within the context of Staunton's historic downtown.

B. Retaining Walls, Plaza, and Walkways

At the Johnson Street boundary of the courthouse property, poured concrete retaining walls flank steps centered on the courthouse facade. Each side of the retaining wall terminates in a limestone pier with a poured concrete cap. Similar stone piers are found near the front and rear of the courthouse. It does not appear that these piers have served anything other than a decorative purpose. Pipes visible on the top of each cap may indicate that an allowance was made for future lighting to be installed on these piers.

Additional low, poured concrete walls border the sidewalk on the Augusta Street elevation and appear to provide a deterrent to pedestrian approach to the basement windows and coal chute cover.

The plaza area in front of the building is raised up several feet above the Johnson Street retaining walls. These retaining walls curve around the corners at Augusta Street and the Lawyers Row sidewalk and feature a cap with a rounded edge. The parged surface of these walls has seen numerous repairs and has incidental cracks and spalling that will need further repair. One section of this wall near the stair on the Lawyers Row sidewalk is showing more severe damage apparently due to water that is not being removed by the topside drain.

The main approach to the building is from the Johnson Street sidewalk. While historic images show that the stairs and walkway were originally poured concrete, they were later clad in brick. The walkway forms a “T” as it approaches the building and borders the steps to the building. It also extends to the Augusta Street sidewalk on the west and to a passageway between buildings on the east.

The mortared brick paving of the plaza is laid in a basket-weave pattern. Its condition varies with one section heaving up near the steps leading to the sidewalk. Flood lights located at the top of the steps illuminate the front facade.

There are poured concrete pads on either side of the 1939 addition at the rear of the building. These pads are currently used as a location for HVAC equipment. Unsightly exposed refrigerant piping serving this equipment is mounted on the exterior walls of the building. Given the limited space available on site, the location of the HVAC equipment is understandable, but future plans to upgrade the HVAC systems should include efforts to find



View of courthouse from E. Johnson Street showing sidewalk and retaining wall.



Brick plaza in front of building.



Concrete sidewalk and retaining walls between courthouse and Lawyers Row.



Mechanical units and transformer located on the east side of the building.



Limestone piers and concrete plaza at the northeast corner of the building.



Low site walls along Augusta Street.

a better location that does not detract from the pedestrian experience around the building. The concrete sidewalks on this side of the building are severely deteriorated.

A stone monument is inscribed with a map and information related to the origin of Augusta County. A brick planter is located behind the monument along with flag poles for the national, state, and county flags.

C. Parking

Given the location of the building in the midst of the densely built commercial business district, there is limited parking directly adjacent and available to it. Three spaces are reserved at the rear of the building and parallel parking is available along the Barristers Row alley. Other public parking options are available nearby on the street, in the Wharf Parking Lot and in the municipal New Street parking garage approximately one block east down Barristers Row alley.

D. Plantings

A lawn, bordered by the retaining wall at the front of the building and the brick walkways on the site, is planted with deciduous trees and low shrubs. Elm trees are located at the center of the two grassy areas on either side of the brick plaza. The grass on the west side of the plaza is not in good condition, having trouble competing for resources with the larger tree on that side.



View to the west along Barristers Row alley to the rear of the building.

E. Accessibility

The handicap accessibility of the site is extremely limited. The entrance on the northwest corner functions as the handicap entrance due to its ramped approach. This ramp may be steeper than allowable by the accessibility guidelines and lacks compliant handrails. There is no handicap compliant parking space with an accessible route connected to this ramp.

F. Drainage

Refer to the Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing report in the appendix for information related to site drainage.



The existing concrete handicap ramp leads from Barristers Row Alley to the northwestern entrance to the courthouse.



This side view of handicap ramp above shows the incline of the ramp.



Chapter A - Building Description and Assessment



A. Summary Description

The design of the fifth and present courthouse, completed in 1901, “represents local architect T. J. Collins’ interpretation of the great changes in tastes and styles that occurred at the turn of the century” (National Register Nomination).

As noted in *T. J. Collins: A Local Virginia Architect and His Practice at the Turn of the Century* (Master’s Thesis, William T. Frazier, University of Virginia, 1976), Collins’ design for the Augusta County Courthouse displayed the growing influence of the Beaux Art movement and a break from his earlier work influenced by H. H. Richardson. Not quite comfortable in this new idiom, Collins repeats the overall temple form massing of the 1835 courthouse, and shows a certain provincialism by placing the entrances outside of the portico. The two-story arched panels, within which the windows are

placed, also show that he retained some of the vocabulary of Richardsonian and Sullivanesque commercial structures, not frequently applied to a courthouse of this period.

The current structure is a five-part, two-story, red pressed-brick building with a two-story pedimented central portico flanked by wings on either side. The original drawings and building footprint on the Sanborn Insurance Maps prior to the 1939 rear addition show that, as recorded in the minute books of the Board of Supervisors, there was a matching portico on the rear of the building.



The facade (south) elevation of the 1901 Augusta County Courthouse faces Johnson Street.



The west elevation of the courthouse faces South Augusta Street.



A change in brick at the intersection of the original building (left) and the 1939 addition (right). Also note the deteriorated concrete sidewalk.

C. Building Exterior

The building description is based on on-site visits to the property as well as the architectural description recorded as part of the National Register Nomination for the courthouse.

2. General

The symmetrical two-story facade consists of a central four-bay pavilion flanked by single-bay wings connected to the pavilion by single-bay hyphens.

On the original section of the building, the red pressed-brick laid in running bond is accented by yellow brick composite pilasters that define the corners of the wings and hyphens. Both the columns and pilasters rest on square pedestals of yellow brick. A dressed Indiana limestone belt course surrounds the entire building just above the rusticated native limestone foundation.

The bricks measure 2 1/2" in height and 7 5/8" in length. The mortar joints in the brick are narrow, measuring approximately 3/16" in height. The masonry is generally in good to fair condition with mortar joints fairly firm but are eroding in some areas. Soiling and accumulated dirt is noticeable especially on the light colored brick.

Care was taken on the rear addition to match or compliment many of the original design features of the building such as the cornice, pilasters, roof, and windows. Some variations between the rear addition and the original structure are noticeable. The bricks are a different shade of red and have a more porous surface texture. The bricks and mortar are a slightly different size, which results in misaligned mortar joints where the building sections intersect.

3. Foundation

Below grade level (as taken from the rear of the building), the foundation of the building is coursed ashlar limestone with a rusticated surface where visible to the exterior and more random/rubble coursing as viewed from the boiler room in the basement of the building. This may indicate the reuse of stone and or walls from the 1835 courthouse formerly on the site. The exposed limestone foundation is capped by a cast stone sill upon which the red pressed-brick raised foundation rests. This portion of the foundation is in turn capped by a smaller cast stone belt course that bisects and forms a cap for the yellow brick piers upon which the pilasters rest. The foundation is generally in good condition.



View of rusticated native limestone foundation and dressed Indiana limestone water table.

4. Portico

Dominating the facade is the pavilion's two-story pedimented portico, which is supported by yellow pressed brick columns with terra-cotta Composite capitals. The ceiling under the portico is clad in pressed-metal panels. A set of steps leads to the entrances and portico. According to documentation, the steps are constructed of granolite, a type of cast-in-place concrete with granite aggregate to simulate stone. These stairs are degrading and several sections have been patched with traditional concrete. Other minor repairs to the metal ceiling and brick columns may be necessary when the overall maintenance of the building is addressed.



The granolithic steps at the front of the courthouse show signs of deterioration.



Side view of front portico and steps.



Original entrance into hyphen directly adjacent to front portico.



View at northwest corner of building featuring the entrance structure added as part of the 1939 addition.

5. Exterior Doorways

The building's two main entrances are not located in the central pavilion but rather in the two hyphens. This is due to the circulation pattern in the main block on the first floor (see Interior - Floor Plans). The paired single-leaf partially glazed and paneled doors have a single-light transom above and period hardware. These doors appear to have been reworked/replaced when the addition was constructed to add the half panels of glass. Early images of the courthouse show a pair of single-leaf six-paneled doors in each opening. The arrangement of the lower three panels is quite similar to what is seen in the historic images. .

Located in the rear (north) addition on the west side is a single-bay two-story entrance porch. A very low-pitched roof gives it essentially a flat roof appearance. It has arched openings on the lower level and is enclosed above. This porch covers the original west door opening on the north elevation. The doors at this entrance appear to be identical to those on the front of the building.

A basement entrance is located at the south end of the east elevation of the building. The partially glazed (frosted) door in this opening has six small panes of glass over four recessed panels in a typical Colonial Revival style arrangement consistent with the 1939 remodeling. At that time, this opening was apparently converted from a window to a door. This door and adjacent window have been boarded over on the interior, apparently for security purposes. Similar basement entrances on the north elevation traditionally provided access to public toilets. The stairs are in good condition but will need to have their drains periodically maintained to prevent flooding of the building.



Detail view of exterior stair to basement on the east side of the building.

6. Windows and Openings

The building design features balanced, symmetrical window openings throughout. The typical windows are single pane, double-hung wood sash with one-over-one light pattern. They are set into the recessed two-story panels capped with arched stone hood molds. All windows have cast stone sills; the first floor windows have cast stone lintels.


While the windows are typically in good to fair condition, they will need periodic maintenance. The single pane construction of the windows makes them candidates for improved weatherization including storm windows. Current courthouse guidelines recommend security windows and bulletproof glass in several areas and this should be considered as part of any future renovations.



Detail of original first floor window.



Detail of window on 1939 addition.



Detail of original second floor window.



Photo of pediment above front portico showing decorative sheet metal cornices.



Detail of sheet metal cornice with circled areas showing typical deterioration and missing elements.

7. Cornice, Pediments, and Exterior Trim Details

The brick columns and pilasters described previously support an enriched three-part entablature that surrounds the building and portico. It is composed of a molded architrave, Rinceau-pattern (foliate) frieze, and a dentilated cornice. The entablature is fabricated from galvanized iron sheet metal and was ordered from either W. H. Mullins and Co., of Salem, OH or the Art Metal Construction Company of Jamestown, NY. Under the eaves, modillion blocks alternate with rosettes.

There are eight triangular pediments on the building - one on the portico, three on each wing, and two on the east and west sides of the rear addition. Each is decorated with a terra-cotta relief. The terra cotta relief appears to be in good condition with no visible signs of deterioration.

This decorative sheet metal entablature is showing signs of deterioration with rust at gaps that are opening up. Missing floral details were observed between the modillion blocks in some locations. There is what appears to be a wood cornice, in fair condition, on the flat roof sections of the rear addition.

8. Roof, Chimneys, and Cupola

The complex standing-seam metal gable roof replaced the original slate roof early in the building's history. The roof is showing its age with paint peeling and visible rust in many areas. Valleys have been patched with rubber roofing in some locations.

There are two corbelled chimneys with inset plaques, one in each wing. Due to exposure, the masonry on these chimneys is showing some serious deterioration (refer also to structural report).

In the center of the roof, a domed cupola rises from a base of Composite pilasters that alternate with rectangular molded panels to support a Rinceau frieze and a cornice with modillion blocks and dentils. The base of the dome is sheathed with sheet metal embossed with a brick pattern. The sheet metal is in serviceable condition but should receive maintenance as part of an overall rehabilitation.

The cupola's lower dome has a ribbed metal shingle roof, which, like the main roof, is painted gray/silver. No leaks are reported from this roof, but given its age, it should be a candidate for replacement as part of any major rehabilitation. Atop the main dome is a secondary dome with copper shingles that rests on Ionic columns and is capped by a bronze statue of Justice, draped and holding scales and a sword. Almost the entire surface of the statue is covered with the typical pale green products of corrosion. Deterioration of this important feature will continue without conservation efforts.

Currently, the dome does not let light into the building as appears to have been the original design intent. Based on the lack of paint on the backside of the rectangular panels, they were filled in after the initial construction of the building.

9. Roof Drainage

Roof drainage on the original section of the building consists of hidden internal gutters with overflow scuppers connected to internal rain leaders. The internal rain leaders are undersized. Water damage, seen on the interior wall at the southwest corner of the second floor, is likely a result of failure of the roof drainage system in this area. Refer to the Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing report in the Appendix for more information related to this drainage system.

There are external gutters and downspouts on the rear addition. The upper sections have painted galvanized

half-round gutters and round downspouts. The flat roof areas have what appears to be aluminum ogee gutters with large rectangular downspouts. Some of these gutters are in poor condition. The rectangular downspouts do not appear appropriate to the building and have been rerouted in an awkward fashion in some areas in an attempt to discharge the water away from the building.



View of roof of the addition showing rusted roof areas. Also, note half-round gutter.



View of cupola showing decorative sheet metal work, ribbed metal shingle roof and bronze statue.



First floor west corridor looking north. Note historic finishes throughout.



East corridor looking south through vestibule.



First-floor space used for record storage. Note metal storage cabinets.

D. Building Interior

1. Floor Plans

a. First Floor

(Refer to Code Analysis for egress evaluation of the existing circulation).

The original floor plan was essentially symmetrical with the main north-south cross axial stair hallways located in the hyphens. This basic layout remains but has been changed on the north side of the building by the subsequent addition.

Each hallway contains a stair that extends from the basement to second floor. At the front of the building, each hallway terminates at a vestibule with paired doors, surrounded by sidelights and a transom. This arrangement was repeated on the rear of the building until the rear addition was constructed. The rear vestibule on the west side of the building remains in its original configuration, while on the east side of the building the exterior door was removed, the hallway lengthened and a window placed at the end.

The main connecting corridor between these hallways was altered on the first floor but still exists in a fashion in the open floor plan of the records room area. This area was originally four separate rooms accessed by the corridor. Changes were made to this original layout in 1939, however, the central hallway was retained. This area achieved its present configuration in, most likely, the late 1960s. The room's open layout features fixed reference tables that also serve as storage units for court records.

Within this open area, there are two non-original stairs that provide basement access. The stair at the midpoint on the west wall allows public access to additional record storage and one within the office area provides staff access to the larger non-public portion of the basement. The door opening from the records room into the west hallway was shifted south when the public stairway to the basement was added. Two fireplaces located in the north side of the space have been closed. Two vaults have also been added in this area.

The arrangement of rooms in each wing of the building was originally symmetrical in plan. A smaller room was located at the front of the building with access from the main hallway and,

Chapter 4 - Building Description and Assessment

through which, a larger room extending to the rear of the building was accessible. It is likely that the smaller rooms served as offices and the larger rooms were records storage. Each of the larger rooms contained a spiral stair that provided access to additional record storage on the second floor. The last spiral stair removed was removed in 2007. The original plans show these spiral stairs accessing balcony catwalks on the second floor. It is not clear whether these catwalks were actually built as no record has been found of them being removed. The east wing retains its original large room configuration but has been outfitted with a high-density storage unit that occupies most of the space. The north wall of the smaller east wing room contains the only remaining original fireplace, hearth, and mantel in the building. In the west wing, the larger room has been partitioned and a handicap restroom added this area.



Service counter in first floor Deed Room.



Work area for Clerk's staff behind service counter on the first floor.



The larger records room in the east wing of the first floor retains early court record storage furnishing along the walls.



Storage cabinets in first-floor employee break area.



Current waiting area outside main courtroom on the second floor.



Current Clerk's office on the second floor.



View of east-west corridor between the two courtrooms on the second floor.

b. Second Floor

On the second floor, the central pavilion contains the courtroom. Like the first floor, the hyphens contain cross-axial stair halls, which provide access to the courtroom. At the south end of each hall, there are doors separating off small restrooms and narrow corridors leading to secured spaces beyond. While the restroom locations are original, the current corridors replaced light wells in the same location.

Prior to this alteration, the main stairs provided access to only the courtroom. The original records rooms and offices in the wings, which mirrored the first floor plan, were only accessible from the circular stair in the records rooms or by going through the courtroom. These larger record rooms have been subdivided into offices for the presiding judge on the west side and jury room suite and an office for the Clerk on the east side. There were two fireplaces in the courtroom and one in each of the offices on the second floor. All have been removed and closed up during the 1949 remodeling. The 1939 addition extended the hallway on each side to the north and created an axial hallway north of the courtroom. This helped provide access to the office wings without going through the records rooms or the courtroom.

Opening onto this new hallway were three small offices located in the addition at the rear of the building. While three separate doorways remain, this area was converted into an accessory courtroom in 2004. The east interior partition wall between the former offices has been completely removed and the west partition wall reduced to 2'9" height.

Glass block between the office doors help to light this interior passage. The original exterior windows of the north end of the courtroom are visible in the new hallway and are shuttered from inside the courtroom.

The Clerk's office contains several pieces of antique furniture that came from the previous courthouse on the site.

c. Basement

The original basement layout repeated the original floor plan of the first floor, with four rooms in the central pavilion, cross-axial hallways in the hyphens, and rooms in the wings. The rooms directly below the records room were slightly smaller as each was partitioned for a public restroom.

While the central pavilion retains its two southern rooms and the axial hallway of the original design, the north rooms were combined and extended north with construction of the 1939 addition.

In the wings, additional restrooms were added adjacent to the retained original locations. These facilities, used by African-Americans before desegregation, were accessible only from outside stairwells, but are now accessible from the interior of the building as well.



The old records room in the basement has storage furnishings similar to those seen in the records room on the first floor.



Electrical service and panels in the basement are outdated and would be upgraded in any future renovation..



Evidence vault and server equipment located in the basement. The door of the vault was reused from the previous courthouse.



Original stairway in the east corridor of the first floor.

2. Stairways

The identical staircases in each cross-axial hall feature turned balusters and elaborately carved newel posts. The treads and risers are clad in the same terrazzo as the hall floors. Earlier damage to the terrazzo treads have been patched with a material that doesn't match but which appears to be holding up.

The stairways that provide access to the basement from the large records room are typical mid-twentieth-century metal fire stairs with non-slip coated treads, and square balusters capped by a molded handrail.

The condition of the stairway materials is good to fair with some damage and wear and tear evident. These conditions should be addressed as part of any comprehensive rehabilitation of the building.



Handicap stair lift used to bring wheelchairs to the second floor.



Detail of original second floor decorative guardrail at the top of the stair.



Stair from first floor to basement.

3. Flooring

The floors of the hallways located in the hyphens retain their original 12" gray, beige, and black terrazzo bordered with a black Greek key design. The same floor is found in the office portion of the large records room. The area containing deed books has been covered in carpet, as have the rooms in each wing. This flooring is typically holding up well and appears to be in serviceable condition.

Exposed floor surfaces on the second floor are brown and black 9" by 9" vinyl asbestos tile (refer to the hazardous materials section of the report for asbestos content of these tiles). In general, the vinyl tile and carpeting are both worn and dated.

Based on limited investigations and information in the original plans, there appears to be a hardwood floor beneath these more modern floor finishes. The condition of this floor is unknown. The damage done to these wood floors may be limited if an underlayment was installed beneath the carpeting and tile layered on top of it.



Detail of terrazzo tile finish in first floor corridors.



Typical vinyl asbestos tile used in second floor corridor.



Carpet has been installed over the original floors in several locations.



Historic door surround and tile wainscot in the first floor corridor.



Detail of plaster crown molding in first floor corridor.



Acoustical ceiling tiles installed during 1949 courtroom renovation.

4. Wall and Ceiling Finishes

The original hallway walls on both floors are clad in white 3" by 6" subway tile to a height of approximately 4'0", above which the walls are painted plaster. This tile wainscot is capped with a molded bullnose cap and has a molded base. While tiles show some crazing and minor chipping, they are in serviceable condition.

A significant painted plaster crown molding is found in the halls and in the former corridor that now bisects the large records room.

Given that many of the original partitions remain in their original locations, it may be assumed that they retain much of their original plaster finish which remains in serviceable condition. Many of the later partitions are assumed to be gypsum board. In general, the plaster is in good condition with only minor damage evident.




Detail of plaster, ceramic tile wainscot and wood trim in first floor corridor.

5. Doorways and Doors

Original oak doors throughout the building are of a six-panel design, many with a three-light transom above. While showing dents and scratches accumulated over time, these character-defining features are in serviceable condition. The doors into the large records room are fully glazed double-doors.

On the second floor, the paired doors to the main courtroom are partially glazed as are those for smaller courtroom. There are some instances of replaced transoms and modified door designs, typically at areas that have been altered from the original design.

Some of the original hardware still remains. This includes locksets with separate knobs and deadbolts with brass back plates. The knobs do not meet ADA requirements for lever type trim.



Original door showing typical 6-panel configuration of raised panels.



Typical door with transom and header cap on second floor.



Original pair of doors leading to courtroom.



Original fireplace and hearth in first-floor office space.



Door surround at opening leading to first floor employee break room.



Window surrounds in first floor conference room - part of 1939 addition.

6. Decorative Features and Trim

The wood trim varies but typically consists of stained trim boards with eased edges and a molded back band topped with a header cap of crown molding. A plinth block makes the transition of the door casing to the molded baseboard. Due to the depth of the interior walls, many door openings have paneled sides that repeat the rhythm of the door paneling. On doors capped by transoms, the trim extends to the full height of the openings.

The window trim typically is of similar description to the door trim. Below the sash and sill on the first floor, windows have paneled wainscoting. Solid interior shutters varnished to match the existing trim have been added to windows in several locations in an apparent attempt to provide privacy for these areas.

Original oak door and window trim throughout the building typically retains its dark varnished appearance. In several instances a lighter varnish has been used for new construction and for refinished areas. While most of the original trim remains in remarkably good condition, it has begun to take on a disjointed appearance due to varying finish treatments.

The only surviving original fireplace is located in the front office on the east side of the first floor. The firebox contains a cast iron insert. The surround is clad in a mottled narrow rectangular tile in shades of brick red, brown, and white. This tile also clads the hearth. The mantelpiece is constructed of dark-stained oak to match other trim in the building. The mantel shelf is supported by Ionic ribbed columnettes which rest on simple boxed bases. The frieze under the shelf is simply adorned with a rope motif border.

The civil office and records room on the east side of the first floor retain early and original metal record drawers lining the walls. Similar storage equipment is also located in the basement records room.

Contrasting to the retention of a large proportion of the original finishes, some of the newer work is of a more functional quality typical of incremental changes in this type of building. In particular, the restrooms added on the first and second floor fit this description. The employee break room on the first floor has plastic laminate countertops and lower quality wood cabinets.

7. Lighting

Very little early lighting remains on the first floor with the exception of the white glass schoolhouse globe pendants in the hallways.

Several areas of the second floor have Art Deco-styled fixture which may date to the 1939 addition. While these fixtures have a historic value they do not exist in a quantity of context that makes them character-defining for the building.

Designed by architect Sam Collins, the courtroom chandeliers were added during the 1949 courtroom rehabilitation and should be considered historically significant.

Much of the first floor is lighted with suspended fluorescent fixtures with exposed tubes that probably dates to the mid- to late-twentieth century. Various other fixtures are seen in the building, including more contemporary surface-mounted fluorescent fixtures.

Given their age, any historic fixtures that are retained, would need to be refurbished as part of a building rehabilitation.



One of two custom-designed courtroom chandeliers installed during the 1949 courtroom renovation.



Non-original Art-Deco style fixtures seen in several spaces throughout the building.



View of schoolhouse style pendant light fixture as seen in many of the building's corridors.



Suspended fluorescent fixtures in the Deed Room.



Courtroom interior view from the rear with detail of fixed seating.



Detail of railing separating the seating area from the front of the courtroom.



View of the original judges bench with portrait of John Marshall behind.

8. Courtroom

The main courtroom, located on the second floor, retains its basic original size and configuration. Original wainscoting and trim remain but with alterations from the remodeling in 1949. The uppermost trim on the wainscoting was removed and pediments resting on consoles were added to the door surrounds. A broken pediment with a pineapple finial supported by consoles was added behind the judge's bench. The plaster cornice, acoustic finish on the cove ceiling, and decorative acoustic tile ceiling also date to 1949. The custom-made chandeliers in the courtroom were also part of these alterations. Fireplaces and window casings were removed at this time. The 1901 judge's bench was retained as was the witness chair.

Based on information on the original plans and evidence seen in the attic above the courtroom, the building's dome appears to have let light into the courtroom through a large circular light well located in the ceiling. It was removed as part of the 1949 alterations.

County records show that chairs were ordered for the courtroom at the time of remodeling in 1949. It appears that the swivel jury chairs and some of the freestanding chairs with spindle backs date to 1949 and are the remains of 128 chairs that were purchased at the time of the remodeling. The current auditorium chairs have been in place for at least 30 years. The railing that separates the public gallery from the jury/bar/judge's area was moved to its current location in 1988 when carpet was installed.

The original woodwork in the courtroom was stripped of its original dark varnish prior to 1982. The 1949 additions are painted.



View of transformer and mechanical units on the east side of the building.

9. Structural System

Much of the structure of the building was not visible or available for inspection for this report. In general, it appears to be in good condition with few cracks or signs of settlement evident. Some remedial work to the attic framing is recommended. Refer to the structural report in the appendix for more information.

10. Building Systems (electrical and mechanical)

In general, the mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems for the building are antiquated, inadequate, and do not meet current standards for efficiency. Only the courtrooms have central air-conditioning with windows units used for the rest of the building. Any rehabilitation of the building would require replacement and upgrading of most or all of the building's mechanical, electrical and plumbing infrastructure.

Refer to the Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing report in the Appendix for more information.



View of first floor brick vault floor structure as seen in the basement.


11. Hazardous Materials

The building contains hazardous materials including pigeon excrement in the attic and vinyl asbestos tile. Refer to the Hazardous Materials Report in the Appendix for more information.

B. Chronology of Development


The Augusta County Courthouse was originally constructed in 1901. A rear addition was constructed on the north side of the building in 1939. In 1949, the courtroom was remodeled and, in 2004, an additional courtroom was created by removing several partition walls in the 1939 addition on the second floor.

The graphic on this page shows the integrity of the interior spaces by depicting those spaces that have been altered over time.



C. Building Exterior


1. Elevation Illustrations



1 EXIST FRONT ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




2 EXIST REAR ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



1 EXIST SIDE ELEVATION - TYPICAL
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"


D. Building Interior

- 1. Floor Plans
 - a. Basement Existing Conditions




D. Building Interior

- 1. Floor Plans
 - b. First Floor Existing Conditions



D. Building Interior

- 1. Floor Plans
 - c. Second Floor Existing Conditions





Chapter 5 – Preservation Analysis



A. Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties

The Augusta County Courthouse is a contributing structure to the Beverley Historic District (132-0024) as listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. It is also individually listed on both registers. Due to its location within the local Historic Preservation Overlay zoning district, any rehabilitation or new construction work will need to be reviewed by the City of Staunton Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).

The basis used for review by the HPC are *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* as published by the National Park Service. They express a basic rehabilitation credo of “retain, repair, replace.” In other words, do not remove a historic element unless there is no other option; do not replace an element if it can be repaired, and so on. First developed in 1979, these general guidelines have been expanded and refined, most recently in 1995.

The scope of the work proposed in this report meets *The Standards* as listed below:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

A. Applying The Standards to the Augusta County Courthouse

Although several major modifications have been made to the Augusta County Courthouse since its construction in 1901, the building and its setting still retain a high degree of integrity. Most modifications are a result of modernization to ensure the continued use of the courthouse and changes to accommodate the need for increased record-keeping storage.

B. Character-Defining Spaces/Elements/Features of the Augusta County Courthouse

The assignment of Treatment Zones for the exterior and interior spaces, elements, and features was guided by the identification of character-defining attributes during the assessment phase of the project. Below are listed the features of the courthouse found to be character-defining:

Exterior

- Pressed brick, variation in brick colors
- Stone foundation and site features
- Roof shape and covering
- Chimneys
- Metal decoration, patina of unpainted metal
- Cast stone decoration
- Cupola/tower – shape, openings, texture of roof covering, overall design and Statue of Justice
- Window openings, sash, hoods, bars
- Entrances – steps, doors, trim, transoms
- Plaque on front

Basement

- Safe/vault door
- Original and 1930s doors and trim

First Floor

- Arrival sequence – vestibule at each opening
- Terrazzo floors with Greek key design
- Tile walls
- Dark trim/doors/transoms/other interior openings
- Crown molding
- Stair/newel/balustrade
- Architectural remnants that speak to former division of spaces
- Hearth/mantel
- Original furnishings and built-ins

Second Floor

- Openings/corridors
- Trim/transoms/hardware
- Floors – terrazzo
- Doors/period lettering on glass
- Stairs/newel/balustrade
- Tile walls
- Several light fixtures
- Original furnishings and built-in cabinets

Courtroom

- Decorative acoustic ceiling tile
- Chandeliers
- Wainscoting
- Original furnishings and built-ins including the jury box, witness stand, and judge's bench
- Trim – original/1938/1949
- Doors/lettering/hardware
- Brass rail
- Clock
- Portraits

C. Treatment Zones Used in Project Planning

In order to summarize and better visualize the character-defining materials, finishes, spaces and spacial relationships, three general levels of rehabilitation approaches with accompanying plans were created. They are as follows:

Preservation Approach

This level places a high premium on the retention of all historic fabric through retention, maintenance and repair and identifies significant original elements, materials or spaces. This level also includes early changes that are considered character-defining and allows for reconstruction of missing historic elements that are documented either through drawings or photographs.

Rehabilitation Approach

This level acknowledges that there are character-defining materials, features, or spaces that are to be retained but allows for more latitude in alterations and additions.

Renovation Approach

This level means that a space, feature or elevation contains little or no character-defining features, materials or special qualities that warrants a formal preservation approach. This level identifies areas where new services or uses can be introduced without concern for impacting or disturbing historic materials or spaces.

While, in general, the entire courthouse project can be thought of as a rehabilitation, the plans and text on the following pages provide additional guidance to help prioritize the approach to the treatment of various materials, elements, and spaces within the courthouse. The plans should be used in conjunction with the list of character-defining spaces/elements/features found in the previous section.

C. Treatment Zones Used in Project Planning

1. Basement

a. Preservation


There are no Preservation Treatment Zones in the basement.

b. Rehabilitation

There are no Rehabilitation Treatment Zones in the basement.

c. Renovation

Due to its utilitarian nature and low level of interior finishes, the entire lowest level of the courthouse has been designated a renovation zone.



BASEMENT TREATMENT ZONE

KEY	
	PRESERVATION
	REHABILITATION
	RENOVATION
	FIREPLACE (Closed)
	LEVEL 1 EXTERIOR
	LEVEL 2 EXTERIOR

2. First Floor

The designation of treatment zones on the first floor, in general, reflect the level of integrity/modifications to this level over time.

a. Preservation

The exterior of the 1901 portion of the building, the central corridors in each hyphen, and the small offices in the wings at the front (south) of the building have been designated as Preservation Zones due to their high level of integrity.


b. Rehabilitation

The exterior of the 1939 addition has been designated a Rehabilitation Zone as it is not an original feature of the design and is located on a secondary elevation. The Civil Records Room located in the northeast corner of the 1901 building retains its original volume, unlike the originally identical room in the west wing which has been partitioned. In addition, this room retains an early records storage system.

c. Rehabilitation/Renovation

The treatment approach for the remaining rooms on the main level of the courthouse have been designated as a hybrid of rehabilitation and renovation. This spaces, both in the original 1901 courthouse and in the 1939 addition, have been modified over time to meet the changing needs of the court system and staff. Each space so designated retains a moderate to high level of original finishes although modifications such as contemporary lighting, carpeting, exposed electrical conduit, and in some cases the additional or removal of walls, effects the historic character of these spaces.





3. Second Floor

a. Preservation

Those rooms on the second floor that retain their original proportions, including the rooms in the front (south) of each wing and the small room at the front of the west hyphen, are designated as Preservation Zones. Like the lower floor, the exterior of the 1901 building on this level is also considered a Preservation Zone.

b. Rehabilitation

The courtroom renovated in 1949, the cross-axial hallways affected by the rear addition in 1939 and courtroom remodeling, the partitioned small office (holding cells) at the front of the east hyphen, and the current clerk's office in the northeast corner of the east wing, while modified over time still retain a level of character-defining elements and features. Rehabilitation efforts should proceed cautiously, therefore, to avoid further impact to the character of these spaces. The exterior of the 1939 addition is, like the lower level of the addition, designated in this category.

c. Renovation

The north corridor and smaller courtroom located in the 1939 addition as well as the restrooms located in the central portion of the east wing have been designated as Renovation Zones due to their lack of originality and character-defining features from previous renovations.



Chapter 6 - Programming Summary



A. Program

Frazier Associates teamed with Fentress Incorporated, a firm specializing in court planning, to document the specific needs of the Augusta County Circuit Court. This process included interviews with the judge, clerk, and staff followed by questionnaires, surveys, and additional conversations. The existing facility was compared to established *Virginia Courthouse Facilities Guidelines* according to five criteria: 1) Space Functionality, 2) Space Standards, 3) Security, 4) Building Condition, and 5) Court Technology. The following deficiencies were brought to light.

- Lack of three separate circulation patterns for public, staff, and prisoners
- Undersized entry lobby
- Absence of an elevator and other handicap accommodations
- Undersized second courtroom without a jury box (based on feedback from the judge, while desirable this was not considered to be a necessity)
- No jury assembly room (based on feedback from the judge, this function takes place in the existing courtroom which was deemed adequate).
- No attorney/witness conference rooms
- Non-contiguous offices for Clerk's staff
- Lack of office space for projected second judge
- Inadequate number of public bathrooms
- Deficiencies in security standards

Specific technology needs to bring the Circuit Court up to current standards were identified including:


- Audio/video systems including recording and video-conferencing capability
- Security systems
- Evidence presentation systems
- Document storage and retrieval systems
- Public information systems

Augusta County's demographic and economic trends were analyzed to help determine the caseload, personnel, and document-processing and storage requirements for the next 30 years. The detailed results of the programming process are included in a separate document prepared by Fentress, Inc. and included as Appendix D.

Projected case loads of a personnel forecast are reproduced on the following pages and come from Appendix D.

AUGUSTA COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT COURTHOUSE NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND SPACE PROGRAM | JULY 2012 DEMOGRAPHICS, CASELOAD, AND PERSONNEL

Figure 3.4 Total Instruments Forecast



The following table lists the filing rate for the Augusta County population with additional columns for the forecasted years of 2020 and 2030. As noted, population is not an accurate predictor of workload but, should significant changes occur in filing levels, it would imply a change in some element of the workload or in the county demographic/economic composition.

Table 3.5 2010, 2020, and 2030 Filings per 1,000 People

Filing Type	2010 Filings per 1,000 People	2020 Filings per 1,000 People	2030 Filings per 1,000 People
Civil	11.2	8.7	8.4
Criminal	15.5	19.2	19.6
Total Instruments	229.4	213.5	203.5

The data in table 3.5 illustrate the conservative nature of both the civil forecast and the total instruments forecast. Both forecasts indicate that there will be fewer filings per 1,000 people in Augusta County in the future than there are currently. The civil filings are projected to drop from 11.2 filings per 1,000 people to 8.4 filings per 1,000 people over the next 20 years. Similarly, the total instruments are projected to drop from 229.4 instruments per 1,000 people in 2010 to 203.5 instruments per 1,000 people in 2030. When historic data decline, as seen in both civil filings and total instruments, it is very difficult to statistically predict an increasing trend in the future. For that reason, both the civil forecast and the total instruments forecast should be monitored, especially as the economy in Virginia and Augusta County improves.

AUGUSTA COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT
COURTHOUSE NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND SPACE PROGRAM | JULY 2012
DEMOGRAPHICS, CASELOAD, AND PERSONNEL

The criminal caseload is projected to increase from 15.5 filings per 1,000 people in 2010 to 19.6 filings per 1,000 people in 2030. This criminal workload drives the demand for additional personnel for the court. Additional criminal cases requires an increase in courthouse security services, including prisoner management and circulation.

PERSONNEL PROJECTIONS

The final element in this section is predicting future judge and staffing needs based on the forecasted caseload filings. Because of the conservative nature of the forecasts for civil filings and total instruments, and the lack of any increase in judge or court personnel over the past 30 years, the prediction for future personnel is based on both logic and statistics.

Table 3.6 lists the personnel forecast for the Augusta County Circuit Court. The table contains forecasts for Circuit Judges and staff, and the Clerk’s Office. For each personnel type, a rationale is provided to support the forecast.

Table 3.6 Personnel Forecast

Personnel Type	2012	2022	2032	2042	Rationale
Circuit Judge	1	1.25	1.33	1.50	A part-time judge is projected over the next 10 years to assist with the increasing workload.
Secretary	1	1	1	2	One secretary is projected until the part-time judge works the majority of his/her time in Augusta County.
Research Assistant	0.5	0.5	0.75	1	A research position will continue to be shared with the City of Staunton Circuit Court until the part-time judge works the majority of his/her hours in Augusta County.
Clerk of Court	1	1	1	1	One Clerk of Court
Clerk’s Office Staff	9	11	12	13	Based on the current workload measurement formula that would support two additional staff positions, one deputy clerk is needed immediately to scan files and help with staging and organizing file storage. One additional staff position is projected every 10 years to accommodate workload growth. Give the transition to electronic filing, an information technology position should be considered within the projected totals.
Total Clerk’s Office	10	12	13	14	

As presented in table 3.6, personnel for the Augusta County Circuit Court are projected to increase at a modest rate over the planning period. This increase is in alignment with the caseload forecast presented earlier. For example, currently one Circuit Judge handles over 1,100 criminal filings and over 750 civil filings. In the year 2042, there is predicted to be an average of 1,094 criminal filings and 515 civil filings per judge. In the Clerk’s Office, there is currently one staff position per 114 criminal filings,



A. Building Code Analysis

1. Governing Codes

This code analysis was performed using the Virginia Uniform State Building Code (VUSBC 2009 Edition). Part II of the VUSBC, the 2009 Virginia Rehabilitation Code, is used as an alternative to compliance with Part I (the Virginia Construction Code). These codes reference the 2009 International Existing Building Code (IEBC) and the 2009 International Building Code (IBC) respectively. The IEBC frequently references the IBC and applicable provisions of both are noted below.

As the building is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places and Virginia Landmarks Register and is a contributing building to a National Register and Virginia Landmarks Register historic district, the provisions of IEBC Chapter 11 Historic Buildings will apply.

Accessibility standards are per the 2010 ADA (Americans with Disabilities) *Standards for Accessible Design*.

All interpretations of the code included in this report are subject to the approval of the local code official.

2. Classification of Work

The existing building code (IEBC) classifies work to existing buildings by levels based on the amount of work involved. Level 3, the highest level, applies when the work area of alterations exceeds 50% of the building. Lowering the classification level reduces the amount of code improvements required. Except where noted, for the purposes of this study, Level 3 is assumed.

3. Use Groups

Existing uses: A-3 (Assembly - Courtrooms), B (Business)

Proposed use: A-3 (Assembly - Courtrooms), B (Business)

Given the lack of fire separations between uses, the building must be considered as non-separated, mixed-use with the provisions of the most restrictive use (A-3) in effect. The building will not need to comply with "Change of Occupancy" requirements of IEBC Chapter 9 due to its continued use as a courthouse.

4. Construction Type

Despite the noncombustible exterior walls and floor system, since the roof is wood-framed, the building will be considered construction Type IIIB (masonry exterior walls, interior wood framing).

5. Area (IBC Table 503)

Basement	6,868 SF
First Floor	6,657 SF
Second Floor	6,773 SF
Total	20,298 SF

Allowable (per floor): 9,500 SF

The existing floor areas will be within the allowable area without the need for a sprinkler or open perimeter increase. (See the section on Fire Suppression later in this chapter)

6. Height (IBC Table 503)

Based on most restrictive use A-3.

Existing: 2 stories, 45 feet +/-

Allowable: 2 story, 55 feet

The basement is not considered a story since the first floor is not more than 6 feet above-grade.

7. Occupancy (Table 1004.1 IBC)

All square foot (SF) areas are gross unless noted otherwise. The area of the proposed additions is included.

Basement		
(accessory storage and mechanical)	7810 SF/300 SF per occ	26 occ
First Floor Library Reading Room		
(Deed Room)	1475 SF/50 net SF	30 occ
First Floor Business	5150 SF/100 SF	52 occ
Second Floor Courtroom A		
(Fixed Seats)		112 occ
Second Floor Courtroom A (Other)	1078 SF/40 net SF	27 occ
Second Floor Courtroom B	567 SF/40 net SF	14 occ
Second Floor Business	5230 SF/100 SF per occ	52 occ
Total		313 occupants

8. Egress

- Two exits are required from each level (IBC Table 1021.2).
- The main entrance is required to accommodate half of the total occupancy of the building (IEBC 705.3.3)
- Guardrails at the edge of the second floor do not meet requirements of IBC 1013. There are not wall-mounted handrails at any of the stairs and the interior side handrails lack code extension and are not continuous. For existing buildings, IEBC Section 705.9 allows a handrail on one side only provided it meets code. For historic buildings, IEBC Section 1103.9 allows existing handrails and guardrails to remain at stairs provided they are structurally sound.
- Panic hardware is not required on doors serving the courtrooms since the occupancy using the doors is less than 100 (IEBC 705.4.4.).
- Exit signs and egress lighting are required as part of the overall electrical upgrade (IEBC 805).
- The existing doors with half glass panels on the second floor are allowed to remain per IEBC 705.5.1. In order to retain the windows into the corridors on the second floor, a sprinkler system must be installed to bring the required corridor rating down to 0 hours (IEBC 705.5.3).

9. Building Elements and Materials

The existing stairs to the second floor are not enclosed in fire-rated construction to prevent the spread of fire between floors. This is one of the primary code deficiencies in the building, and enclosing the stairs would have a detrimental effect on the historic character of the building. A number of code sections, particularly IEBC 703.2.1, address less than full code compliance for stair enclosure in existing buildings. For historic buildings, IEBC Section 1103.6 permits the enclosure not to be fire-rated in buildings three stories or less.

Based on Table 601 in the IBC, Type IIIB buildings elements are required to have the following fire protection:

Structural Frame	0 hours
Bearing Walls	
Exterior	0 hours
Interior	0 hours
Non-bearing Walls and Partitions	0 hours
Floor Construction	0 hours
Roof Construction	0 hours

Corridors with an occupant load of more than 30 require a fire rating (IBC Table 1018.1) or protection by a sprinkler system.

10. Fire Protection

A sprinkler system is required due to the size and occupancy of the building (IEBC 704.2 and IBC 903.1.3)

A manual fire alarm system is required since the occupancy building exceeds 300 (per IBC 907.2.1).

11. Minimum Plumbing Fixtures (IBC Table 2902.1)

Assembly	1 per 75 (male and female) = 153 occ/75 = 1 WC male/1WC female
Business	1 per 25 for the first 50 and 1 per 50 for the remainder exceeding 50 = 134 occ = 2 WC male/2WC female
Storage	1 per 75 (male and female) 26 occ = no fixture required (included above)

Total **3 WC male/3 WC female required by code**

Note: additional water closets are required by court standards. Refer to programming information.

12. Accessibility

Currently, the building has an accessible parking and loading zone in the alley behind the building. Once inside, there is no elevator. Handicap access between the first and second floors is accomplished with a chair lift at the east stair. Bathrooms and drinking fountains typically do not meet ADA standards.

As part of an overall renovation of the building, there are numerous other areas that would be addressed as part of the work. In order of priority, the following improvements to the accessibility of the building should be made:

- a. At least one accessible building entrance
- b. At least one accessible route from an accessible building entrance to the primary function area
- c. Accessibility signage
- d. Accessible route from the parking to the accessible entrance
- e. One accessible public toilet is required for each gender

An accessible route is required in the buildings to all floors since it is more than 3,000 SF per floor (per ADAAG 206.2.3). This would require elevator access to all floors. Alterations made to provide an accessible path of travel to the altered area will be deemed disproportionate to the overall alteration when the cost exceeds 20% of the cost of the alteration to the primary function area (ADAAG 202.4).

Other accessibility improvements to be included in a total renovation of the building include:

- Lever-handle door hardware
- Accessible drinking fountain
- Courtroom accessibility requirements such as accessible jury and witness accommodations
- Provisions related to fire alarm such as visual alarms
- Mounting heights for controls
- Accessible public service counters

B. Zoning Code Analysis

The building is located in a B-2 (General Business) zoning district. The B-2 district permits 100% lot coverage and has no side or rear yard setback requirements. Permitted uses include “public buildings.”

The building is also located in the H-1 Historic Preservation District, an overlay district which requires review of exterior alterations and additions.

Since the building is located in the core business district, it is exempt from off-street parking requirements (per zoning code section 018.125.011).



A. Description of Schematic Design Options

Based on the identified program, two schematic design options were developed and presented for consideration. The option that included a single elevator and a single addition on the northwest side of the building, while less expensive, was not accepted because it did not solve enough of the deficiencies brought to light during the programming effort.

The selected option provides two elevators in two additions on the rear (north) side of the building. The additions add 2,820 total square feet of space. This scheme provides better circulation separation between the public, prisoners, and staff. Additional restrooms provide better convenience, accommodate handicap users, and separate public and staff.

As part of this design, a new entrance to the building is created within the proposed addition on the Augusta Street side. This location creates more space for the entrance lobby and is a better location for handicap access than the steps at the front of the building. The security checkpoint relocates to this entrance alleviating the challenges associated with its inadequate current setup at the buildings rear (northwest) entrance.

Some of the record storage on the first floor will be moved to basement areas in the addition to allow for better organization of the Clerk's offices. A separate genealogy research room, will be provided in one of the more historic spaces in the building (small office in front of west wing on first floor). It will accommodate the frequent visitors that access the wide-ranging documents covering areas far beyond the current Augusta County boundaries.

The existing courtrooms on the second floor are retained in their existing locations and have the capacity to handle the projected caseloads. Upgrades to finishes, fixtures, and technology in these spaces will be necessary. They will be made better accessible through the addition of the elevators. The elevators also allow prisoners to be held in the basement in more adequate holding cells and then brought to the smaller cells next to the courtroom as the time of their proceeding nears.

The additions create the space needed to provide separate waiting for two parties in areas adjacent to the courtrooms. These spaces also include conference rooms for the parties to meet and restrooms for their use. The additions also provide space for a projected second judge's office suite.

Due to the site limitations, no parking is available on site including secure parking for the judge. Currently, visitors to the building must find parking on the street or in one of the nearby municipal parking lots and decks. An enclosed sally port is included on the ground level of the east addition to provide a secure entrance for prisoners into the building. Some of the current parking along the Barristers Row Alley may need to be eliminated to help accommodate the clearances needed for vans pulling into this sally port. In some instances, this sally port could be used as secure parking for the judge.

B. Exterior Design

Care was taken to blend the new additions appropriately with the historic context of the courthouse and the strong character of its neoclassical design. Adding to the front of the building was not feasible given the character-defining double-story portico that would have to be retained. In contrast, the corner niches on the rear provide an excellent opportunity to add to the building without seriously detracting from its appearance.

The brick masonry and cast stone detailing of the proposed design, relate to the existing building. The flat roofs serve to make the additions subordinate to the existing massing of the building. High parapets at the perimeter of the flat roofs serve to screen mechanical equipment and elevator overrun shafts from view.

The projecting entrance arcade allows the new entrance location to be easily identified by the visitors. The arches borrow their detailing from the second story windows on the original building to unite the old and new designs.

A new handicapped access ramp is located on the west side elevation of the Courthouse and ties into the new side entrance of the building.

C. Summary Scope of Work

1. Site

(Refer also to Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Evaluation for more information)

- a. Provide minor repairs and paint parged retaining walls.
- b. Repair lawn areas in front of the building and prune trees. Provide new plantings along perimeter of landscaped areas.
- c. Remove existing mortared brick paving in front of the building and provide new unmortared brick paving in its place. Retain flagpoles and the stone historical monument in the front plaza, rebuild as required to coordinate with site work.
- d. Remove damaged concrete sidewalks along east side of the building and replace with new unmortared brick paving. Provide new site drainage along this side and relocate HVAC equipment to flat roof of proposed addition (refer also to MEP report in Appendix).
- e. Repair circular limestone bases that will be retained on-site as needed; salvage stone and caps for those pillars to be removed for new addition.
- f. Provide new multi-globe historically themed site lighting on the existing circular limestone bases in front of and on the east side of the building.
- g. Provide new handicap accessible ramp and handrails at the entrance into the proposed addition.
- h. Replace asphalt with new concrete pavers in adjacent Barristers Row Alley. Match pavers in section of alley to the east. Tie drainage into new storm drain on east side of building.
- i. Screen Virginia Power transformer box with architectural grille.

2. Exterior

(Refer also to Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Evaluation for more information)

- a. Repoint the exterior brick in limited areas (assume 20%). Use lime-based mortar that matches in color, texture and appearance. Make very limited brick repairs using matching materials. Clean the exterior masonry with an approved cleaner.
- b. For the main roof, provide new standing-seam-metal roof pre-finished with fluoropolymer paint. Use 26-gauge material to allow traditional rolled details at hips and ridges.

- c. Provide new pre-finished sheet-metal in internal gutter areas on the original section of the building. Provide new copper half-round gutters and round downspouts on the existing addition. Provide new interior roof drains on the new flat roof additions.
- d. Replace the metal shingle roofs on the cupola. Provide minor repairs as necessary and repaint the lower dome roof. Provide new flat copper roofing at cupola platform including flashing and cap for roof hatch.
- e. Provide conservation for the bronze statue according to established standards by carefully removing the discoloration and applying a corrosion inhibitor and protective wax coating.
- f. Provide minor repairs and repaint the sheet-metal details on the cupola including the columns and brick patterned sheathing. Provide bird exclusion spikes as needed in areas that provide nesting sites for birds.
- g. Remove, strip, and refurbish windows. Provide exterior pre-finished aluminum storm windows to match paint color of window trim.
- h. Make improvements to courtroom and judges' chambers windows to make them ballistic resistant.
- i. Repair damaged areas and replace missing decorative sheet metal cornice and pediment elements. Prime as needed and repaint all sheet-metal decorative elements.
- j. Repair damaged areas on front steps with matching stone or stone repair system. Remove concrete patches.
- k. Replace existing concrete surface under portico.
- l. Remove any unnecessary power lines or conduit on building.
- m. Retain, repair, upgrade security, and repaint exterior basement door, window, and stair on east wall. (Window currently boarded up.)
- n. Demolish existing entrance structure and mirror image addition that occupy the same space as the new additions proposed in this report. Salvage cast arches from these structures for possible reuse.
- o. Retain existing historic and honorific plaques on building, clean as needed.
- p. Conduct paint color analysis on the exterior trim.

3. Interior

(Refer also to Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Evaluation for more information)

Provide new work including building additions as shown on plans and elevations.

a. Restrooms and Water Fountains

(Refer also to Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing Report)

- i. Rehabilitate existing restrooms with new fixtures and plumbing.
- ii. Provide new restrooms as shown on the plans.
- iii. Provide handicap accessible water fountains.

b. Flooring

- i. Retain existing terrazzo tile flooring on first floor and terrazzo treads on stairs. Clean and provide minor repairs as necessary (5%).
- ii. Remove carpet. Provide new carpet with historic pattern (15%).
- iii. Remove carpet and repair/refinish wood floors (25%).
- iv. Remove vinyl asbestos tile and replace wood flooring (20%).
- v. Provide ceramic tile in bathrooms (5%).
- vi. Remove vinyl asbestos tile and paint concrete (30%).

b. Wall and Ceiling Finishes

Provide interior finishes that coordinate with the historic materials as follows:

- i. New Partitions: gypsum board with level 5 finish.
- ii. Maintain courtroom ceiling in place.
- iii. Repaint previously painted existing interior. Provide minor repairs to plaster and repair locations where partitions are removed; prime and repaint.

- iv. Eliminate any surface-mounted conduit and channel new wiring into existing plaster and repair as required.
- v. Remove acoustical tile ceiling in small courtroom and provide new acoustical plaster ceiling.
- vi. Provide minor repairs to first floor tile wainscot.
- vii. Provide new ceramic tile (in period-appropriate style) in new bathrooms on floors and on walls 42" high.

c. Doorways and Doors

- i. Maintain/rehabilitate existing/original 6-panel oak stile-and-rail doors (with transoms in main corridors only). Retain any unused doors for use in new locations.
- ii. Provide new mortise locks with levers to replace knobs in all doors with public access. Retain and reuse existing bronze plates with new level handles; clean and refinish as needed.

c. Decorative Features and Trim

- i. Provide interior finishes that coordinate with the historic materials.
- ii. Baseboard: 8" molded oak base and cap
- iii. Door casing: flat oak with plinth blocks and header cap
- iv. Rehabilitate existing woodwork including trim, stair railings, and courtroom wainscoting. Refinish mismatched woodwork with new finish to match predominant original finish or as determined by stain/varnish color from color analysis.
- v. Retain existing mantel and tile hearth and surround at one location on first floor. Restore fire box and provide matching tile surround and hearth and mantel at one location on first floor and two locations on second floor to match existing example.
- vi. Provide clear finished interior wood blind window treatments.
- vii. Provide built-in oak service counter for Deed Room and public intake counter with break-resistant glazing.

- viii. Provide casework for records in Deed Room.
- ix. Provide casework, proper archival mounting, and exhibit lighting for display of historic artifacts in genealogy room.
- b. Lighting
 - i. Retain existing “schoolhouse” pendant fixtures. Rewire with new wiring as required, refinish/polish as needed.
 - ii. Consolidate existing Art Deco fixtures in small courtroom.
 - iii. Retain existing period pendant/chandeliers in Courtroom A; rewire as required; refinish/polish.
 - iv. Provide necessary task lighting.
 - v. Provide new historically themed light fixtures in new spaces.
 - vi. Refurbish historic brass chandeliers (2) in main courtroom.
- c. Hazardous Materials

Remove hazardous materials in the building including vinyl asbestos tile, asbestos-containing mastic, mercury-containing thermostats, and pigeon guano in the attic.
- d. Courtroom
 - i. Replace existing fixed seating in courtroom with new seating. Match existing wood and finish on any new furnishings.
 - ii. Retain and refurbish fixed courtroom elements such as judge’s bench, jury seating, and witness stand.
 - iii. Upgrade associated finish elements and incorporate new technology.
 - iv. New technology for the courtroom will need to be carefully integrated into the historic fabric of the main courtroom. New technology will include: speakers and recording devices, video screens and cameras, large LCD screens (plus smaller LCD screens for the Jury Box), video conferencing capability, infrared emitters used for hearing impaired and a evidence presentation system including a “smart” lectern. Provide a white noise generator to conceal conversation at bench when necessary.
- e. Stairways and Accessibility

Remove handicap stair lift and provide new elevators as shown on plans.
- f. Technology, Security, and Storage
 - i. An AV feed should be provided in the judges chambers and holding cell to monitor court activities.
 - ii. Provide new court record storage equipment and technology such as high-speed scanning and retrieval equipment.
 - iii. Retain historic record storage bins in some areas when possible to continue being used or as part of the historic interpretation of the building in featured areas. Clean and refurbish as necessary to make presentable.
 - iv. Provide security cameras throughout the building. Provide X-ray equipment and magnetometer at entrance and to scan mail.
 - v. Provide new data system throughout the building including new servers.
 - vi. Provide an interactive information kiosk at the entrance to the building.
- g. Wayfinding/Signage

A fully coordinated interior and exterior signage system should be developed for the Courthouse, as well as the Augusta County court system in the immediate vicinity.

 - Exterior- sign to courthouse, jail & courtrooms across the street, and courthouse entrance(s)
 - Interior- directional signage and room signs.

D. Notes on Cost Estimates

It is recognized that neither the Architect nor the Owner has control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment, over the Contractor's methods of determining bid prices, or over competitive bidding, market or negotiating conditions. Accordingly, the Architect cannot and does not warrant or represent that bids or negotiated prices will not vary from any estimate of Construction Cost or evaluation prepared or agreed to by the Architect.

Unit prices, provided by suppliers, subcontractors, and past experience, reflect standard construction methods and materials. Prices include overhead and profit.

This estimate is based on report and drawings dated October 2013.

These costs are based on a construction start of the fourth quarter of 2013. Escalation estimates due to inflation and market conditions are speculative and unpredictable and should be re-evaluated on a quarterly basis, or more frequently in an unstable market.

A design contingency of 10% and a construction contingency of 10% have been included in this estimate. A design contingency in the Schematic Design phase of a project allows for variations in the costs of details and design changes or scope increases. A construction contingency allows a reserve to cover the cost of unforeseen circumstances particular to the site. The cost estimate includes escalation to the fourth quarter of 2013.

Exclusions to this cost estimate include:

Hazardous materials abatement (estimate included at end of cost estimate)

Architecture/engineering fees

Other owner soft costs including:

- Owner's project administration and representation

- Project related insurance

- Financing costs

- Moving expenses

- Rental of swing space

- Utility fees

- Furniture

- Equipment

- Hazardous materials abatement monitoring

E. Preliminary Cost Estimate



Main Office: 6799 Kennedy Road Unit F Warrenton, Virginia 20187 Phone: 540.347.5001 Fax: 540.347.5021
1388 NW 2nd Ave., Unit 4B, Boca Raton, FL. 33432 Phone: 561.416.1240 Fax: 561.416.1248 www.downeyscott.com

Schematic Concept Cost Estimate Report

Report Date October 8, 2012

Prepared for:

***Frazier Associates
& Augusta County***



FRAZIER ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTURE • COMMUNITY DESIGN • WAYFINDING

**Augusta County Courthouse
1 East Johnson Street
Staunton, VA**





COST ESTIMATE CLARIFYING NOTES & EXCLUSIONS

We have incorporated construction costs for a single Contractor procurement via lump sum General Contract for single phase construction. It is assumed that the building will be vacant prior to renovation.

Without exception, **we have included hard construction costs only** and all soft construction costs are excluded. Please refer to list of Owner Budget Items.

The Limits of Construction are those indicated on the documents provided.

We **include HAZMAT abatement costs as identified in F&R Report dated 10/04/2012.** (Copy included with this report)

Design Contingency accounts for the costs of yet unidentified scope requirements. **A 10% Design Contingency has been included.**

Construction Contingency accounts for the costs of change orders. **A 10% Construction Contingency has been included. A Construction Contingency has been included for unforeseen conditions.**

Escalation accounts for the inflationary effects of elapsed time. **Escalation costs have been included to the project midpoint in the amount indicated in the project summary.**

Our costs do not include any Owner Furniture storage or moving costs or any Commonwealth of Virginia Courts IT equipment and related costs.

All cost data is based on Open shop wage and burden rates.



OWNER COSTS NOT INCLUDED IN OUR COSTS ANALYSIS

We have found during the budgeting phase, Owners sometimes do not fully consider all the costs they will incur when implementing capital improvements. For convenience, we provide below a list of common non-construction Owner costs.

FURNITURE, FIXTURE & EQUIPMENT [FF&E]

- Loose, unattached system furniture, traditional furniture, etc.
- Special fixtures relevant to subject facility operations and uses
- Communications equipment, such as servers, telephone sets, communications cables, instruments, & accessories
- Vending equipment purchases and/or leases, etc.
- Exterior equipment, such as exercise equipment, pay telephones.

MOVING & STORAGE COSTS

- Contract and/or internal staff implemented moving costs.
- Temporary storage and insurance.
- Removal and disposal of furnishings of no salvage value.

TEMPORARY FACILITIES

- Non-contractor temporary storage trailers.
- Non-contractor temporary utilities.

REAL ESTATE

- Land acquisitions, leases, easements and rights of way.
- Real estate taxes.
- Transfer taxes.
- Recordation fees & taxes.
- Brokerage commissions.
- Settlement charges.
- Legal fees.

MANAGEMENT *Indirect* Owner Mgt Expenses

- Real estate necessary to house management & staff.
- Utilities.
- Insurance.
- Furniture, fixture & equipment.
- Project management salaries.
- Communications, telephone, facsimile expenses, e-mail, etc.
- Travel, parking, courier services, etc.
- Security.
- Office equipment & supplies.



COMMON OWNER COSTS (continued)

PROMOTION / RESPONDING TO PUBLIC & MEDIA INQUIRIES

- Artwork and reproduction of advertising, brochures, hand-outs.
- Advertising fees.
- Postage.
- Signage.
- Photography.
- Renderings.
- Public and/or promotional events, such as hearings, fund raisers, etc.

FINANCIAL

- Accounting [in-house].
- Accounting [CPA].
- Interim financing [loan, bond, other] origination fees, expenses & interest.
- Permanent financing [loan, bond, other] origination fees, expenses & interest.
- Appraisal fees.
- Working capital / start-up.
- Performance [Owner, not to be confused with contractor] bonds

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

- Builder's risk
- Liability
- Title
- Other

LEGAL FEES

- Real estate, land, zoning, proffers
- Partnerships
- Financing
- Contracts
- Leasing

JURISDICTIONAL FEES

- Zoning, site and general building permit fees & expenses. Note: jurisdictional trade permit fees are included in our computations.
- Primary water utility availability and connection fees
- Primary sewer utility availability and connection fees
- Gas Company fees
- Power company fees
- Telephone company fees



• **COMMON OWNER COSTS (continued)**

- Cable TV company fees
- State & local highway fees
- Mandatory completion bonds
- Adjoining owner demands
- Mandated off-site storm water management contributions

DESIGN FEES

- Architect / Engineer / Cost Management / Construction Management Consultant Fees
- Surveys, Civil Engineering, Testing and Third Party Inspection Fees
- Traffic Consultant Fees

RECOMMENDED COST CONTROL PROCESS

Controlling construction costs is a continuous process that spans from the initial programmatic level through to final completion.

MARKET CONDITIONS & OPINIONS OF PROBABLE COST

Downey and Scott, LLC has no control over market conditions or acts of God that can create rapid fluctuations in material prices. We have extensive experience in similar projects and have employed our best judgment in analyzing the subject project. We cannot, however, guarantee that actual construction costs will not vary from the opinions of probable construction costs herein provided.

Please contact William G. (Bill) Downey, AACE, CSI – Managing Principal or William E. (Bill) Lehmer, PE – Vice President of Preconstruction Services regarding this project should you have any questions or concerns.

Chapter 8 - Schematic Concepts, Scope, and Design

Report:	PROGRAMMATIC COST MODELS	<i>Prepared by: Downey & Scott, LLC 6799 Kennedy Road, Suite F Warrenton, VA 20187 ph 540.347.5001</i>	Status:	Conceptual Design	PM: bt / bd		
Project:	Augusta County Courthouse		Client:	<i>Frazier Associates</i>	Chckd by: fs/sm		
City:	Stanton, VA		Submissn:	Oct. 8, 2012	Job no: 12076		
Documents & date:	05/03/2012, 06/20/2012, 09/10/2012		Run Date:	See footer	Copyright Downey & Scott, LLC 2012		
LOCATION REFERENCE	SYSTEM NUMBER	UNIFORMAT SYSTEM HEADING	SPECIFICATION DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT MEASURE	UNIT COST	EXTENSION

SUMMARY COST DATA

HARD CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

				Cost per SF	
SITE	SITWORK				\$733,596
RENOVATIONS	EXISTING BUILDING RENOVATIONS	20,105.00	GSF	\$207.83	\$4,178,491
ADDITIONS	ADDITIONS	3,886.00	GSF	\$365.85	\$1,421,711
SUBTOTAL	SUBTOTAL				\$6,333,799
ESCALATION	TO MID POINT BIDS 4th quarter 2013	6.50%			\$411,697
DESIGN CONTINGENCY	DESIGN CONTINGENCY = 10.00%	10.00%			\$633,380
CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY	CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY = 10.00%	10.00%			\$633,380

PROJECT BASE BID - TOTAL

BASE BID TOTAL

23,991.00 GSF

\$333.97

\$8,012,256

Alternate-1 Note this is a premium upcharge to base bid	Replacing Existing roof with Copper Standing Seam roof in lieu of Kynar finish standing seam roof	9,158.00	GSF	\$9.60	\$87,917
					Add to Base Bid
Alternate-2 Note this is a premium upcharge to base bid	Replacing Existing roof with Zinc Standing Seam roof in lieu of Kynar finish standing seam roof	9,158.00	GSF	\$11.85	\$108,522
					Add to Base Bid
PROJECT BASE BID - TOTAL with Alternate-1	Note that Add Alternate # 1 and # 2 are mutually exclusive of each other				\$8,100,173
PROJECT BASE BID - TOTAL with Alternate-2	Note that Add Alternate # 1 and # 2 are mutually exclusive of each other				\$8,120,778

Chapter 8 - Schematic Concepts, Scope, and Costs

Report:	PROGRAMMATIC COST MODELS		Prepared by: Downey & Scott, LLC 6799 Kennedy Road, Suite F Warrenton, VA 20187 ph 540.347.5001	Status:	Conceptual Design	PM: bt / bd	
Project:	Augusta County Courthouse			Client:	Frazier Associates	Chckd by: fs/sm	
City:	Stanton, VA			Submissn:	Oct. 8, 2012	Job no: 12076	
Documents & date:	05/03/2012, 06/20/2012, 09/10/2012			Run Date:	See footer	Copyright Downey & Scott, LLC 2012	
LOCATION REFERENCE	SYSTEM NUMBER	UNIFORMAT SYSTEM HEADING	SPECIFICATION DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT MEASURE	UNIT COST	EXTENSION

SITWORK ALLOWANCES							
SINGLE PHASE CONSTRUCTION							
SITWORK	12.00	TRAFFIC CONTROLS	Temporary traffic control measures	1.00	LS	5,500.00	5,500.00
SITWORK	12.05	SITE DEMO	Misc site demo	0.17	AC	10,250.00	1,788.81
SITWORK			Remove existing sidewalk & brick mortared paving	7,602.00	SF	2.55	19,385.10
SITWORK			Remove existing asphalt	1,934.00	SF	2.00	3,868.00
SITWORK			Misc utility removal	500.00	LF	48.00	24,000.00
SITWORK	12.10	ENVIRONMENTAL	Siltation fences, constr entrns, temp seed	450.00	LF	5.00	2,250.00
SITWORK			Tree protection allowance	10.00	EA	200.00	2,000.00
SITWORK			Inst & rem gravel construction entrances	1.00	EA	3,500.00	3,500.00
SITWORK			Inlet protection	4.00	EA	250.00	1,000.00
SITWORK	12.20	EARTHWORK	Overlot grading and shaping	844.67	SY	2.25	1,900.50
SITWORK			Excavation and backfill	449.04	CY	38.00	17,063.41
SITWORK			Sheeting & Shoring LF depth assume to be 14'	132.00	LF	225.00	29,700.00
SITWORK	12.25	PRIMARY WATER	Water Main for Fire and domestic allowance	200.00	LF	68	13,600.00
SITWORK			Fire Hydrant allowance	1.00	EA	5000	5,000.00
SITWORK			Building Domestic Water line allowance	50.00	LF	40	2,000.00
SITWORK			Conn to main, excav, restoration allowance	2.00	LOC	5000	10,000.00
SITWORK			Tap fees allowance	1.00	LS	4000	4,000.00
SITWORK	12.30	SANITARY SEWER	Lateral Tie into existing Allowance	1.00	LS	7,000.00	7,000.00
SITWORK			Structures Allowance	2.00	EA	3,500.00	7,000.00
SITWORK			Tap fees			No new tap fee anticipated	
SITWORK	12.35	STORM WATER MGT	Storm Water Management Allowances	1.00	LS	45,000.00	45,000.00
SITWORK			Conn to existing, excav, restoration	2.00	LOC	5,000.00	10,000.00
SITWORK			Found & roof drainage, incl gravel & filtercloth allowance	200.00	LF	25.00	5,000.00
SITWORK	12.40	SITE ELECTRIC	Primary Transformer fee & set by Elec. Co.	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000.00
SITWORK			Site power and circuits	500.00	LF	15.00	7,500.00
SITWORK			Site pole lighting allowance quantity	8.00	EA	3,000.00	24,000.00
SITWORK			Ductbank and service cable into building	1.00	LS	12,800.00	12,800.00
SITWORK			Security system CCTV Cameras allowance	12.00	EA	4,800.00	57,600.00

Downey & Scott, LLC Construction Management Services 2 of 8 10/09/2012

Chapter 8 - Schematic Concepts, Scope, and Design

Report:		PROGRAMMATIC COST MODELS		Prepared by: Downey & Scott, LLC		Status: Conceptual Design		PM: bt / bd	
Project:		Augusta County Courthouse		6799 Kennedy Road, Suite F		Client: Frazier Associates		Chckd by: fs/sm	
City:		Stanton, VA		Warrenton, VA 20187		Submissn: Oct. 8, 2012		Job no: 12076	
Documents & date:		05/03/2012, 06/20/2012, 09/10/2012		ph 540.347.5001		Run Date: See footer		Copyright Downey & Scott, LLC 2012	
LOCATION REFERENCE	SYSTEM NUMBER	UNIFORMAT SYSTEM HEADING	SPECIFICATION DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT MEASURE	UNIT COST	EXTENSION		
SITEWORK	12.45	PRIMARY DATA / PHONE	Assume brought to meter by utility company		Excluded				
SITEWORK	12.50	PRIMARY GAS	Assume brought to meter by utility company		Excluded				
SITEWORK	12.55	CABLE TV	Assume brought to meter by utility company		Excluded				
SITEWORK	12.60	PAVING	Concrete Unit pavers at Barristers Row Alley	2,127.40	SF	18.00	38,293.20		
SITEWORK			City Street patching to VDOT standards allowance	1.00	EA	12,000.00	12,000.00		
SITEWORK		SITE CONCRETE	Brick paver sidewalks	5,868.00	SF	22.00	129,096.00		
SITEWORK			New concrete stairs	70.00	LF	14.85	1,039.50		
SITEWORK			New security bollards allowance	10.00	EA	1,500.00	15,000.00		
SITEWORK			Patch existing sidewalks allowance	1.00	LS	2,400.00	2,400.00		
SITEWORK			Curb & gutter replacement allowance	120.00	LF	12.30	1,476.00		
SITEWORK			C6-12 HC ramp(ADA)	1.00	EA	1,100.00	1,100.00		
SITEWORK			Planter retaining walls		Assumes Existing to Remain				
SITEWORK			Transformer slab	192.00	SF	8.00	1,536.00		
SITEWORK	12.65	LANDSCAPING	Sod for yard restoration	382.89	SY	4.00	1,531.56		
SITEWORK			Trees, shrubs and ornamental plantings allowance	1.00	LS	10,000.00	10,000.00		
SITEWORK	12.75	SPECIALTIES	Repairs to planter and step cheek walls	170.00	LF	65.00	11,050.00		
SITEWORK			Main entrance signage allowance	1.00	LS	2,500.00	2,500.00		
SITEWORK			Signs - directional	16.00	EA	110.00	1,760.00		
SITEWORK			Hand rail replacement at areaway steps	65.20	LF	60.00	3,912.00		
SITEWORK			Handrail replacement at Plaza	120	LF	60.00	7,200.00		
SITEWORK			Transformer screen foundation and wall assembly	448	SF	38.00	17,024.00		
SITEWORK			Transformer enclosure louver gates allowance	1	PR	4,200.00	4,200.00		
SITEWORK	12.80	MARK-UPS	Subtotal				608,574.07		
SITEWORK			General conditions	8.50%			51,728.80		
SITEWORK			Subtotal				660,302.87		
SITEWORK			Overhead & profit	10.00%			66,030.29		
SITEWORK			Subtotal				726,333.15		
SITEWORK			Bonds & insurance	1.00%			7,263.33		
SITEWORK			Subtotal				733,596.49		

Downey & Scott, LLC Construction Management Services 3 of 8 10/09/2012

Chapter 8 - Schematic Concepts, Scope, and Costs

Report:	PROGRAMMATIC COST MODELS		Prepared by: Downey & Scott, LLC 6799 Kennedy Road, Suite F Warrenton, VA 20187 ph 540.347.5001	Status:	Conceptual Design	PM: bt / bd	
Project:	Augusta County Courthouse			Client:	Frazier Associates	Chckd by: fs/sm	
City:	Stanton, VA			Submissn:	Oct. 8, 2012	Job no: 12076	
Documents & date:	05/03/2012, 06/20/2012, 09/10/2012			Run Date:	See footer	Copyright Downey & Scott, LLC 2012	
LOCATION REFERENCE	SYSTEM NUMBER	UNIFORMAT SYSTEM HEADING	SPECIFICATION DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT MEASURE	UNIT COST	EXTENSION

			RENOVATIONS	20,105.00	GSF		
			SINGLE PHASE CONSTRUCTION				
RENOVATION	01.00	FOUNDATIONS		Section not used			
RENOVATION	02.00	DEMOLITION	Interior selective demolition of walls & finishes	20,105.00	GSF	2.35	47,246.75
RENOVATION			Testing and Environmental monitoring			Included in all HAZMAT abatement unit costs	
RENOVATION			Asbestos abatement per report Oct 4, 2012	1.00	LS	54,800.00	54,800.00
RENOVATION			PCB abatement per report Oct 4, 2012	1.00	LS	1,000.00	1,000.00
RENOVATION			Mercury HAZMAT per report Oct 4, 2012	1.00	LS	1,000.00	1,000.00
RENOVATION			Pigeon Guano Abatement per report Oct 4, 2012	1.00	LS	15,000.00	15,000.00
RENOVATION			Remove existing entrance structures (2 locations)	151.54	GSF	25.00	3,788.50
RENOVATION	03.00	SUPERSTRUCTURE	Lateral wood bracing members and attic framing	9,158.00	SF	1.80	16,484.40
RENOVATION			Interior floor and stairs structural repairs - Allowance	13,247.00	GSF	2.10	27,818.70
RENOVATION	04.00	EXTERIOR CLOSURE	Misc repairs to existing exterior	1.00	LS	15,000.00	15,000.00
RENOVATION			Repairs to existing exterior steps	1.00	LS	6,375.00	6,375.00
RENOVATION			Exterior doors, frames and hardware refinish existing	2	PR	1,500.00	3,000.00
RENOVATION			Bullet-resistant panels (existing windows to remain)	400.00	SF	172.00	68,800.00
RENOVATION			Storm panels - prefinished aluminum storm windows	33.00	EA	190.00	6,270.00
RENOVATION			Repointing existing chimneys	368.00	SF	35.00	12,880.00
RENOVATION			Repointing 20% of existing exterior face brick	1,485.64	SF	35.00	51,997.40
RENOVATION			Restore Bronze statue at Cupola	1.00	EA	20,000.00	20,000.00
RENOVATION			Repair and repaint sheet metal detailing at Cupola	1,735.00	SF	34.00	58,990.00
RENOVATION			New Bird exclusions spikes allowance	2,000.00	LF	15.00	30,000.00
RENOVATION			Remove, strip and refurbish windows	33.00	EA	2,500.00	82,500.00
RENOVATION			Repair sheet metal cornice and pediments	1,053.60	SF	34.00	35,822.40
RENOVATION			Repair front steps and match existing stone 50% area	136.55	SF	40.00	5,462.00
RENOVATION			Replace concrete under portico	997.40	SF	12.00	11,968.80
RENOVATION			Remove exterior bldg mounted conduits	1.00	LS	1,000.00	1,000.00
RENOVATION			Repair basement exterior basement door	1.00	EA	1,200.00	1,200.00
RENOVATION			Repair basement exterior basement windows allowance	20.00	EA	360.00	7,200.00
RENOVATION			Repair basement exterior basement stair	1.00	EA	4,500.00	4,500.00
RENOVATION			Restore exterior historic plaques	1.00	LS	120.00	120.00
RENOVATION			Mocks ups and submittals	1.00	LS	2,000.00	2,000.00
RENOVATION							
RENOVATION							

Downey & Scott, LLC Construction Management Services 4 of 8 10/09/2012

Chapter 8 - Schematic Concepts, Scope, and Design

Report:		PROGRAMMATIC COST MODELS		Prepared by: Downey & Scott, LLC		Status: Conceptual Design		PM: bt / bd	
Project:		Augusta County Courthouse		6799 Kennedy Road, Suite F		Client: Frazier Associates		Chckd by: fs/sm	
City:		Stanton, VA		Warrenton, VA 20187		Submissn: Oct. 8, 2012		Job no: 12076	
Documents & date:		05/03/2012, 06/20/2012, 09/10/2012		ph 540.347.5001		Run Date: See footer		Copyright Downey & Scott, LLC 2012	
LOCATION REFERENCE	SYSTEM NUMBER	UNIFORMAT SYSTEM HEADING	SPECIFICATION DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT MEASURE	UNIT COST	EXTENSION		
RENOVATION	05.00	ROOFING	Roof replacement - Standing seam Kynar finish	9,158.00	SF	18.80	172,170.40		
RENOVATION			Replace integral Gutters with new copper assembly	433.00	LF	40.00	17,320.00		
RENOVATION			Roof substrate repair allowance 20% of existing	2,656.12	SF	5.00	13,280.60		
RENOVATION			Replace downspouts	600.00	LF	22.00	13,200.00		
RENOVATION			New flat copper roof at Cupola and flashings etc	85.00	SF	32.00	2,720.00		
RENOVATION			Restore ornamental metal surfaces at cupola		Refer to Exterior				
RENOVATION			Replace Cupola Roof with prefinished metal shingles	4,122.60	SF	36.80	151,711.68		
RENOVATION	06.00	INTERIOR CONSTR	Interior finishes, walls ceilings floors	20,105.00	GSF	19.00	381,995.00		
RENOVATION			Interior standing and running trims oak	13,247.00	SF	3.25	43,052.75		
RENOVATION			Interior doors single - new frame/door/hardware	16.00	EA	1,500.00	24,000.00		
RENOVATION			Interior doors single - existing with hardware upgrades	54.00	EA	550.00	29,700.00		
RENOVATION			Interior doors dbl - existing with hardware upgrades	7.00	PR	1,000.00	7,000.00		
RENOVATION			Interior Gypsum wall with level 5 finish	2,140.00	SF	9.20	19,688.00		
RENOVATION			Holding Cell Walls reinforced masonry	28.20	LF	300.00	8,460.00		
RENOVATION			Rehabilitating existing wood work	20,105.00	SF	2.00	40,210.00		
RENOVATION			Restore fireboxes and matching surrounds	3.00	LOC	3,850.00	11,550.00		
RENOVATION			Window treatments - wood blinds	1,428.80	SF	16.00	22,860.80		
RENOVATION			Built in casework		Refer to special equipment				
RENOVATION			Prisoner holding cells & detention hardware	147.00	FPSF	148.50	21,829.50		
RENOVATION	07.00	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT	Judges Bench and Clerks Desk with Kevlar underlayment	1.00	EA	32,160.00	32,160.00		
RENOVATION			Courtroom benches fixed incl handicap accessible	1.00	LS	15,000.00	15,000.00		
RENOVATION			Wall treatments / Paneling and rails fixed at courtroom	2,860.00	SF	12.00	34,320.00		
RENOVATION			Misc casework items	20,105.00	GSF	3.50	70,367.50		
RENOVATION			Signage, toilet partitions, misc specialties	20,105.00	GSF	5.50	110,577.50		
RENOVATION	08.00	CONVEYING	Restore stairs and rails	1.00	LS	7,500.00	7,500.00		
RENOVATION	09.00	MECHANICAL	Plumbing	20,105.00	GSF	7.20	144,756.00		
RENOVATION			HVAC	20,105.00	SF	38.00	763,990.00		
RENOVATION			Sprinkler	20,105.00	GSF	3.25	65,341.25		
RENOVATION			New fire pump		Not included				

Downey & Scott, LLC Construction Management Services 5 of 8 10/09/2012

Report:	PROGRAMMATIC COST MODELS		Prepared by: Downey & Scott, LLC 6799 Kennedy Road, Suite F Warrenton, VA 20187 ph 540.347.5001	Status:	Conceptual Design	PM: bt / bd	
Project:	Augusta County Courthouse			Client:	Frazier Associates	Chckd by: fs/sm	
City:	Stanton, VA			Submissn:	Oct. 8, 2012	Job no: 12076	
Documents & date:	05/03/2012, 06/20/2012, 09/10/2012			Run Date:	See footer	Copyright Downey & Scott, LLC 2012	
LOCATION REFERENCE	SYSTEM NUMBER	UNIFORMAT SYSTEM HEADING	SPECIFICATION DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT MEASURE	UNIT COST	EXTENSION

RENOVATION	10.00	ELECTRICAL	Electrical system	20,105.00	GSF	24.00	482,520.00
RENOVATION			IT systems drops and cabling - No equipment	20,105.00	GSF	2.80	56,294.00
RENOVATION			Security system allowance	20,105.00	GSF	5.50	110,577.50
RENOVATION	11.00	MARK-UPS	Subtotal				3,466,376.43
RENOVATION			General conditions	8.50%			294,642.00
RENOVATION			Subtotal				3,761,018.43
RENOVATION			Overhead & profit	10.00%			376,101.84
RENOVATION			Subtotal				4,137,120.27
RENOVATION			Bonds & insurance	1.00%			41,371.20
RENOVATION			Subtotal	20,105.00	GSF	\$207.83	\$4,178,491.47

Downey & Scott, LLC Construction Management Services 6 of 8 10/09/2012

Chapter 8 - Schematic Concepts, Scope, and Design

Report:	PROGRAMMATIC COST MODELS		Prepared by: Downey & Scott, LLC	Status:	Conceptual Design		PM: bt / bd
Project:	Augusta County Courthouse		6799 Kennedy Road, Suite F	Client:	Frazier Associates		Chckd by: fs/sm
City:	Stanton, VA		Warrenton, VA 20187	Submissn:	Oct. 8, 2012		Job no: 12076
Documents & date:	05/03/2012, 06/20/2012, 09/10/2012		ph 540.347.5001	Run Date:	See footer	Copyright Downey & Scott, LLC 2012	
LOCATION REFERENCE	SYSTEM NUMBER	UNIFORMAT SYSTEM HEADING	SPECIFICATION DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT MEASURE	UNIT COST	EXTENSION
ADDITIONS			ADDITION	3,886.00	GSF		
ADDITIONS			SINGLE PHASE CONSTRUCTION				
ADDITIONS	01.00	FOUNDATIONS	Concrete foundations	3,886.00	FPSF	4.25	16,515.50
ADDITIONS			Foundation dewatering	270.90	WSF	11.00	2,979.90
ADDITIONS			Elevator pit and mat	2.00	EA	7,500.00	15,000.00
ADDITIONS							
ADDITIONS	02.00	SUBSTRUCTURE	Concrete slabs on grade at basements	866.00	SF	8.00	6,928.00
ADDITIONS			Concrete slab on grade at porch	161.00	SF	10.00	1,610.00
ADDITIONS			Concrete slabs on deck	2,859.00	SF	5.00	14,295.00
ADDITIONS			Underpin existing building	40.00	CY	750.00	30,000.00
ADDITIONS			Concrete basement walls	40.13	CY	490.00	19,665.33
ADDITIONS			Foundation wall waterproofing	1,264.20	WSF	9.80	12,389.16
ADDITIONS							
ADDITIONS	03.00	SUPERSTRUCTURE	Floor framing system	2,859.00	GSF	20.60	58,895.40
ADDITIONS			Roof framing system	1,444.86	GSF	22.45	32,437.11
ADDITIONS			Steps risers and tread	10.00	STEPS	1,016.67	10,166.67
ADDITIONS			Rated Elevator shafts	1,920.00	SF	30.00	57,600.00
ADDITIONS							
ADDITIONS	04.00	EXTERIOR CLOSURE	Brick Masonry over CMU wall assembly	2,902.50	WSF	36.00	104,490.00
ADDITIONS			Cast Stone Watertable over CMU wall assembly	109.30	WSF	42.00	4,590.43
ADDITIONS			Cast Stone bands and parapet over CMU	87.18	WSF	40.00	3,487.36
ADDITIONS			Standing and running trim GRFC assembly over CMU	232.40	WSF	30.00	6,972.00
ADDITIONS			Exterior windows / trims	247.20	WSF	72.00	17,798.40
ADDITIONS			Ext doors single incl frame/door/hardware	1.00	EA	2,000.00	2,000.00
ADDITIONS			Ext doors double incl frame/door/hardware	1.00	PR	4,000.00	4,000.00
ADDITIONS			Sallyport Overhead Door custom sectional door	1.00	EA	8,085.00	8,085.00
ADDITIONS			Brick Masonry over CMU wall assembly at porch	468.00	SF	36.00	16,848.00
ADDITIONS			Porch arches 6.4' dia	4.00	EA	850.00	3,400.00
ADDITIONS			Porch ceiling	161.00	SF	6.00	966.00
ADDITIONS							
ADDITIONS	05.00	ROOFING	Low slope membrane roofing w/ insulation	1,444.86	SF	10.25	14,809.82
ADDITIONS			Gutters & downspouts	Not used - internal drains Refer to Plumbing			
ADDITIONS			Low slope roof at porch	167.75	SF	10.25	1,719.39
ADDITIONS			Sloped Roof at Sallyport and vestibule	60.14	SF	18.80	1,130.54
ADDITIONS							
ADDITIONS	06.00	INTERIOR CONSTR	Interior finishes ceilings walls floors	3,886.00	GSF	20.00	77,720.00
ADDITIONS			Interior doors single	17.00	EA	1,500.00	25,500.00
ADDITIONS			Interior door double	1.00	EA	3,000.00	3,000.00
ADDITIONS			Close off window openings	4	EA	300	1,200.00

Downey & Scott, LLC Construction Management Services 7 of 8 10/09/2012

Chapter 8 - Schematic Concepts, Scope, and Costs

Report:	PROGRAMMATIC COST MODELS		Prepared by: Downey & Scott, LLC 6799 Kennedy Road, Suite F Warrenton, VA 20187 ph 540.347.5001	Status:	Conceptual Design	PM: bt / bd	
Project:	Augusta County Courthouse			Client:	Frazier Associates	Chckd by: fs/sm	
City:	Stanton, VA			Submissn:	Oct. 8, 2012	Job no: 12076	
Documents & date:	05/03/2012, 06/20/2012, 09/10/2012			Run Date:	See footer	Copyright Downey & Scott, LLC 2012	
LOCATION REFERENCE	SYSTEM NUMBER	UNIFORMAT SYSTEM HEADING	SPECIFICATION DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT MEASURE	UNIT COST	EXTENSION

ADDITIONS	07.00	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT	Signage, fire ext, misc	3,886.00	GSF	2.25	8,743.50
ADDITIONS			Casework - Judge chambers, deliberation, etc	3,886.00	GSF	6.80	26,424.80
ADDITIONS			Metal detection equipment allowance	1.00	LS	35,000.00	35,000.00
ADDITIONS	08.00	CONVEYING	Elevators 3 stop hydraulic	2.00	EA	63,000.00	126,000.00
ADDITIONS			Stairwell railings - code compliant modifications		Refer to renovations		
ADDITIONS	09.00	MECHANICAL	Plumbing	3,886.00	GSF	8.00	31,088.00
ADDITIONS			HVAC	3,886.00	GSF	38.00	147,668.00
ADDITIONS			Sprinkler	3,886.00	GSF	3.25	12,629.50
ADDITIONS	10.00	ELECTRICAL	Electrical system	3,886.00	GSF	26.00	101,036.00
ADDITIONS			New emergency generator	1.00	EA	67,375.00	67,375.00
ADDITIONS			New fuel tank for emergency generator "Day tank"	1.00	EA	15,000.00	15,000.00
ADDITIONS			IT systems drops and cabling - No equipment	3,886.00	GSF	2.80	10,880.80
ADDITIONS			Security system allowance	3,886.00	GSF	5.50	21,373.00
ADDITIONS	11.00	MARK-UPS	Subtotal				1,179,417.60
ADDITIONS			General conditions	8.50%			100,250.50
ADDITIONS			Subtotal				1,279,668.09
ADDITIONS			Overhead & profit	10.00%			127,966.81
ADDITIONS			Subtotal				1,407,634.90
ADDITIONS			Bonds & insurance	1.00%			14,076.35
ADDITIONS			Subtotal	3,886.00	GSF	\$365.85	\$1,421,711.25

Downey & Scott, LLC Construction Management Services 8 of 8 10/09/2012



FROEHLING & ROBERTSON, INC.
Engineering Stability Since 1881

1734 Seibel Drive, NE
Roanoke, Virginia 24012-5624
T 540.344.7939 | F 540.344.3657

Record No: 62P-0132

October 4, 2012

Frazier Associates
213 North Augusta Street
Staunton, Virginia 24401
Phone: 540.886.6230
Fax: 540.886.8629

Attention: Tom Clayton; (tclayton@frazierassociates.com)

Subject: Abatement Cost Estimate
Augusta County Courthouse
Staunton, Virginia

Mr. Clayton:

F&R has prepared an abatement cost estimate based upon our present understanding of the project and the results of our field investigations. The asbestos containing materials (ACM) quantities used herein are estimates only and are provided for preliminary budgetary purposes. Our calculations are based upon material quantities presently known to F&R and our understanding of general industry rates for abatement of specific materials using established acceptable abatement practices.

Materials that are not readily observable are frequently uncovered during renovation activities. This is due to them being hidden above ceilings, within wall cavities, or materials that are obscured during previous renovation activities. As such, F&R may not have been able to account for all possible ACM and it should be recognized that concealed materials may be exposed during demolition which will increase the cost of abatement. Therefore, F&R suggests that unit rates for abatement of all types of ACM (TSI, spray applied insulation, floor tile, mastics, roofing materials, etc.) be secured during the bidding process and that a contingency be added to budgetary allowances.

We note that competitive bidding can reduce overall costs based on awarding the various abatement tasks in bulk, which should provide for lower unit rates and overall lowered cost. In addition, by removing various materials types within a singular containment, a contractor can also reduce their costs. Our estimate does not include fees for third-party asbestos abatement project monitoring services.

Corporate HQ: 3015 Dumbarton Road Richmond, Virginia 23228 T 804.264.2701 F 804.264.1202 www.fandr.com

VIRGINIA • NORTH CAROLINA • SOUTH CAROLINA • MARYLAND • DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A Minority-Owned Business



Asbestos Containing Materials Abatement:

1. Removal of 9,800 square feet of floor tile and mastics at \$3.50/sq. ft. = **\$34,300**
2. Remove asbestos containing glazing from 20 windows in the basement level = **\$2,500**
3. Removal of approximately 3,000 square feet of plaster skim coat (limited to 1939 addition)
at \$6.00/linear ft. = **\$18,000**

Note: One sample of the plaster skim coat in the 1939 addition test trace (<1%) for asbestos in the basement women's restroom of the building. Although this level is below the regulatory threshold under EPA regulations, F&R recommends that the owner conduct follow-up sampling of the plaster base coat using a more sensitive method (TEM analysis) to evaluate if there is asbestos present in this material above a regulatory threshold. F&R notes however that this is not a regulatory requirement and our recommendation is based on the fact that OSHA has regulations regarding potential employee exposure from disturbance of any material containing asbestos, including trace levels. If TEM testing is not performed, F&R recommends that the plaster be abated as asbestos containing in order to preclude violating OSHA regulations.

Lead Contingency: **\$1,500**

Based on our understanding of the scope of work, abatement of lead paint from building components is not a specified part of the scope of work; and that the contractor's disturbance of lead based paint coatings will be incidental to the general renovation work. Therefore, for painted surfaces which the Contractor will impact, at this time F&R does not anticipate any specific LBP abatement costs, unless required by the owner. However, since surfaces which the Contractor may impact during general demolition/renovation may contain LBP, F&R estimates a contingency for Contractor exposure monitoring and TCLP testing for waste stream characterization.

PCB Light Ballast Contingency: **\$1,000**

Based on the age of the buildings and our observations, we recommend a budgetary allowance to address ballasts.

Fluorescent Lamps Contingency: **\$1,000**

Based on the age of the buildings and our observations, we recommend a budgetary allowance to address mercury containing lamps.

Bird Guano Abatement Cost: **\$12,000 to \$15,000**



Extensive contamination from bird droppings was observed throughout all levels of the cupola. Due to difficulty in obtaining access and containing the space, the cost of the abatement could not be estimated accurately. The price range provided above was extrapolated from our experience with projects of a similar scope.

LIMITATIONS

This Abatement Cost Estimate (ACE) has been prepared for the exclusive use of Frazier Associates and their authorized agents for use on this specific project. The purpose of this ACE is to provide preliminary budgetary estimates of potential abatement cost estimate. Quantities are estimated based upon materials that are readily accessible during this survey. It is recognized that concealed materials are present and will need to be exposed during abatement which will increase the cost of this estimate. Therefore, F&R does not assume liability for the use of this ACE for purposes other than which it is intended, as stated above.


If you should have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact the undersigned. Froehling & Robertson, Inc. appreciates the opportunity to work with you as your Environmental Consultant, and looks forward to a continued cordial working relationship with you.

Respectfully Submitted,
FROEHLING & ROBERTSON, INC.

Gregory L. Whitt
Environmental Group Manager

A. Description of Schematic Design

1. Basement Plan



The proposed main function of the basement will be the storage of old records. A scanning room will allow the continued digitization of these important historical documents.

A. Description of Schematic Design

2. First Floor Plan



New additions at the northeast and northwest corners of the building will allow the separation of circulation between staff, public, and inmates. The proposed floor plan also provides expanded space for the Clerk's staff.



AUGUSTA COUNTY COURTHOUSE ■ FEASIBILITY STUDY 8-5



The new additions as viewed from across Augusta Street looking southeast.

B. Exterior Design



A birds-eye view of the addition on the northwest corner of the courthouse shows how rooftop equipment for the new elevator is screened from view by a parapet wall.

B. Exterior Design



Looking north at the Augusta Street elevation, the new handicap ramp provides access from the sidewalk at the side of the building to the new main entrance.

B. Exterior Design



The new addition and entrance repeat the detailing found on the original 1901 structure and the 1939 addition which this addition will replace.

B. Exterior Design



A staff entrance to the building is located adjacent to the Sally Port. Both are accessible from Barristers Row Alley.

B. Exterior Design



A sally port located in the northeast addition at the rear of the building allows safe transfer of inmates into the building. The addition also contains a secure elevator.




Augusta County Courthouse



Feasibility Study
Vol. II

October, 2012







Augusta County Courthouse
1 East Johnson Street
Stanton, VA

STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT



LINTON ENGINEERING, LLC

46090 Lake Center Plaza
Suite 309
Potomac Falls, VA 20165
(T) 571-323-0320
May 3, 2012

Introduction:

A visual structural survey was performed on April 26, 2012 of the existing three level historic courthouse building located at 1 Johnson Street in Stanton, VA. The purpose of the survey was to identify and assess possible structural damage that is present in the building. The building maintenance engineer, the mechanical engineers and the project architect were present during the survey.

Procedure:

All of the items identified in this report were obtained through a visual survey. Visually accessible areas of the building structure were surveyed in detail. Areas of the structure covered by existing architectural finishes were not observed since the structure could not be seen without causing damage to the existing finishes.

Description:

The existing building has three floor levels including a below grade basement level. The footprint of the original building is approximately 5,500 GSF per floor level. A three level addition totaling approximately 2,000 GSF per floor level was added to one of the longitudinal sides of the building providing an overall GSF area of 22,500 GSF.

According to the existing structural drawings dated February, 1901, the primary floor structure of the building consists of 6-inch and 10-inch deep steel beams spaced at 4-foot 4-inches and 4-foot 9-inches on center which support a series of brick masonry arches. Two steel tie rods are used at 1/3 points along the length of the beams to provide lateral support to resist the thrust of the arches. Each beam line is supported by the interior and/or exterior loading bearing transverse masonry walls. Our building survey confirmed the information contained in the drawings at the visually accessible portions of the existing ceiling structure in the basement level of the building. See Photo #1.

The roof structure is built with a series of heavy timber trusses, and beams spanning to the transverse interior load bearing masonry walls. An intricate curved wood framed dome structure was observed at the center of the building.

Observations:

The following items were noted during our survey of the building.

- A previous repair over a 1st floor window opening was completed last year. We understand that a severe sag in the 2nd floor occurred above the window. All the repair work appeared to be performing satisfactorily at the time of the site visit. See Photo #2.
- A shoring post was observed at one of the steel beam locations in the basement ceiling. A deflection of approximately about ¼ -inch was measured at the mid-span of the beam which is not excessive for the span length of the beam. There does not appear to be any structural distress in the floor structure at this location. See Photo #3.
- Several of the existing floor beams where strengthening by the addition of new adjustable steel column shoring posts. It was observed at the floor above that the high density files were added on to the floor requiring the addition of the posts. See Photo #4. The additional support structure appears to be performing adequately.

- During the inspection of the attic area, it was observed that several of the wood purlin beams have twisted to the extent that the bearing length of the rafters has been reduced. The location of the rafter notch is no longer located where the rafters meet the top of the beam. See Photo #5. Diagonal braces have been added at other purlin beam locations to mitigate the twisting and warping that is occurring at these beam locations.
- Repointing is needed at the top of both of the chimneys. See Photo #6. At one location on the face of one of the chimneys loose bricks have partially displaced slightly from the face of the chimney. See Photo #7.
- A small vertical brick crack was observed on the exterior face of the building below one of the 2nd floor windows. See Photo #8.
- The hardscape around the perimeter of the building is a very poor existing condition. The following items were noted;
 1. Severe cracks and slab settlement occur at the cast-in-place concrete stair treads and risers. See Photo #9.
 2. A significant amount of rust was observed at the base of several of the steel guard rails. See Photo #10.
 3. Spalls and cracks occur at the base of the stone portico columns and curb stones. See Photo #11.
 4. A series of severe spalls has occurred on the face of the walls that wrap the perimeter of the stairs and ramps. See Photo #12.

Recommendations:

The following remedial actions are recommended to retain the overall stability and durability of the building. This list should be considered as an initial starting point for the repairs rather than as an all inclusive restoration list for the building since some portions of the existing structure are not visually accessible due the presence of architectural finishes.

- The two existing chimneys above the roof level of the building need to be repointed with a lime based repair mortar. All loose bricks need be reset securely within the face of the chimney.
- The existing hardscape surrounding the perimeter of the building should be removed and replaced in its entirety. The existing sub-soil should be re-compacted to prevent future additional settlement.
- The existing exterior wall crack below the 2nd floor window should be filled with an appropriate lime-base repair mortar.
- Lateral wood bracing members should be added in the attic structure to securely brace all of the existing purlin beams. The existing rotated purlin beams should be reset to provide full bearing support to the existing roof rafters.



Photo #1: Existing beam and brick vault floor structure.




Photo #2: Repaired exterior brick above 1st floor window



Photo #3: Shoring post located beneath existing beam in basement ceiling



Photo #4: Adjustable steel column shoring post under steel beam supporting HD files above



Photo #5: Twisted attic beam rotated away from ends of rafters



Photo #6: Open mortar joints at top of chimney



Photo #7: Open brick joints and loose brick at top of chimney



Photo#8: Small vertical crack below 2nd floor window sill




Photo #9: Multiple stair cracks




Photo #10: Corrosion at base of steel guard rail



Photo #11: Severe spall at base of exterior masonry column



Photo #12: Severe spall at base of landing wall



Appendix B - Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Evaluation and Energy Analysis



MEI engineering, inc.

 **MEMO**

September 10, 2012

12046MEPupgrades.wpd

To: Frazier Associates

From: Michael S. Good, P.E.
Wesley F. Siever, P.E.

Attn: Carter Green

Total # pages: 4

Re: Augusta County Courthouse
MEP Upgrades

Job No.: 12046

Please note the following regarding the MEP Upgrades for the referenced project:

HVAC System:

- Replace the boiler with a high efficiency (92%) gas fired 700 MBH input type boiler. Replace the two large boiler pumps. The piping system with radiators is to remain. Provide twelve low voltage control valves with thermostats located around the building to improve the supplemental heating control.
- Remove the existing air conditioning systems and exhaust systems.
- provide new toilet exhaust systems
- provide new outside air ventilation system for the Basement, consisting of two 500 cfm wheel type energy recovery ventilators and associated ductwork.
- provide new 3 pipe variable refrigerant (VRF) heat pump system for the building, including the new addition, with combination of ductless and ducted units, as follows:
 1. Basement zone - 156,000 btuhs of ductless split units, generally one unit in each room or corridor [two units in the Old Records Room, and a dedicated system (indoor and outdoor unit) for the computer server room].
 2. First Floor - 282,000 btuhs of ducted units located in basement or attic mechanical spaces with duct shafts to the first floor, (approx. 11 individual ducted units) and ducted fresh air.
 3. Second Floor - 440,000 btuhs of ducted units located in attic mechanical spaces, with ducted fresh air. (approx. 10 ducted zones, with 216,000 btuhs of equipment for Courtroom A)
 4. The indoor units can be interconnected to minimum of three outdoor units, of various capacities, with a minimum SEER of 16, and a minimum IEER of 18. The outdoor units to be located on the flat roof areas of the new addition.
 5. For the VRF system provide a web based thermostat control system with building KW demand limiting capabilities. The units' thermostats will stand alone and be connected to the central control system.

Plumbing System:

- provide a new sanitary sewer and vent piping system - use cast iron pipe for sewer piping above grade, Sch. 40 PVC piping for sewer piping below grade and for the vent piping.
- replace the inside rain leaders with cast iron piping above grade and PVC piping below grade.
- replace the interior water piping with Type L copper piping, insulated with ½" thick fiberglass.
- replace the east side exterior underground storm piping, and add three plaza drains.
- replace the water closets with 1.28 gpf flush valve fixtures.
- replace the urinals with 0.5 gpf types
- use 'hands free' devices for the water closets, urinals and lavatories.
- replace the water cooler with a dual height type
- provide floor drains with trap primers, in the public toilets.
- provide tankless water heaters at each lavatory and sink.

Sprinkler System:

- provide a complete automatic sprinkler system in accordance with code requirements.
- Provide a dry pipe system in areas subject to freezing.
- Sprinkler heads in finished areas to be semi-recessed type with white finish/escutcheon.

Electrical System:

- Remove electrical circuitry related to the removed HVAC systems detailed in that section above.
- Install circuitry & gear for new HVAC and Plumbing equipment detailed in the associated sections above.
- Replace exit light fixtures with new emergency backup type. Match existing housing colors.
- Interior Lighting:
 1. 2nd Floor level historic fixtures - replace incandescent lamps in fixtures to be retained with equivalent wattage LED replacement bulbs (Philips or equal). In areas with dimming controls, LED replacement lamps shall be dimmable. Where an equivalent LED bulb is not available, replace lamps with equivalent wattage compact fluorescent bulbs. Lamp color temperatures shall be 3000K.
 - A. Retain existing schoolhouse pendant light fixtures. Refinish/polish as needed. Rewire as required.
 - a. In corridors - provide similar style historically themed lights. Lamping shall be LED as available otherwise lamping shall be equivalent wattage compact fluorescent. Lamp color shall be 3000K. Rewire as required.
 - B. In small courtroom - Retain and consolidate existing art deco style fixtures. Rewire as required.
 - C. In large courtroom - Retain existing period pendant/chandeliers. Refinish/polish as needed. Rewire fixtures as required. Provide necessary task lighting in areas as needed.

2. 2nd Floor level linear fluorescent fixtures. Replace with new fixtures that utilize T8 technology and electronic ballasts. Use vandal resistant fixtures in areas that could be subject to abuse. Fixtures in office areas shall be changed to Direct/Indirect style fixtures. Fixtures in corridors/restrooms/etc. shall have prismatic lenses. Lamp color temperature shall be 3500K. Rewire fixtures as required.
3. 2nd Floor level down light fixtures - replace recessed down light fixtures with LED fixtures. Lamp color temperature shall be 3000K. Rewire fixtures as required.
4. 1st Floor historic corridor fixtures - provide similar style historically themed lights. Lamping shall be LED as available otherwise lamping shall be equivalent wattage compact fluorescent. Lamp color shall be 3000K. Rewire as required.
5. 1st Floor level linear fluorescent fixtures. Replace with new fixtures that utilize T8 technology and electronic ballasts. Use vandal resistant fixtures in areas that could be subject to abuse. Fixtures in administrative/office/records areas shall be changed to Direct/Indirect style fixtures. Fixtures in corridors/restrooms/etc. shall have prismatic lenses. Lamp color shall be 3500K. Rewire fixtures as required.
6. Basement level linear fluorescent fixtures. Replace with new fixtures that utilize T8 technology and electronic ballasts. Fixtures shall have prismatic lenses. Lamp color temperature shall be 3500K. Rewire fixtures as required.
7. Basement level incandescent fixtures. Replace incandescent light fixtures with linear fluorescent fixtures with prismatic lenses. Fixtures shall utilize T8 technology and electronic ballasts. Lamp color temperature shall be 3500K. Rewire fixtures as required.
8. Wall sconces throughout - replace with new fluorescent fixtures with electronic ballasts. Lamp color shall be 3000K. Rewire fixtures as required.


- replace wall switches in offices and storage rooms with occupancy sensor switches [*Sensor Switch* or equal with Dual Technology PIR/Microphonics].
- install ceiling or high wall mounted occupancy sensors in large rooms such as records rooms restrooms, etc. to provide extended range coverage [*Sensor Switch* or equal with extended range option and Dual Technology PIR/Microphonics]. Rewire fixtures thru motion sensor for auto off functionality, and maintain wall switch control.
- Maintain dimming control in spaces where currently present. Replace dimming switches with *Lutron* or equal 1%-100% dimming devices that are compatible with lighting systems in those rooms.
- provide daylight utilization sensors/controls for the interior lights near windows. Rework wiring for those fixtures as required.
- replace the exterior light fixtures with full cut-off fixtures utilizing LED lamping. For fixtures at required egress exits, provide remote emergency battery backup using local AC output mini-inverters that are compatible with the LED fixtures served where necessary.
- add HID lighting on roof to illuminate cupola.
- add "period" site lighting at front plaza area, and along the east side. Coordinate with existing stone bases.
- exterior lighting shall be controlled by photocells and timeclock.

- See Architectural section for additional lighting requirements.
- Install conduits, junction boxes, power feeds, etc. as required for new security system throughout. Coordinate with historic finishes in Courtroom A and corridors. See architectural section and court programming report for additional details and requirements.
- Install conduits, junction boxes, power feeds, backboards, etc. as required for new phone/data system throughout. Coordinate with new document retrieval system. See architectural section and court programming report for additional details and requirements.
- Replace existing fire alarm system with new to handle existing&added devices with capacity for future expansion. Replace existing fire alarm devices & wiring and add new fire alarm devices in all public areas where not present. Provide & install new sprinkler system flow and tamper switches and tie devices into fire alarm system. Install new duct smoke detectors.
- Upgrade electric service to a new 3P-1000A service.
 - install new 3P-1000A main breaker panel, service entrance rated.
 - install new 3P-600A main breaker panel that is wired thru automatic transfer switch for emergency loads.
 - Replace existing original building panels: (7) 2P-100A panels and (2) 2P-200A panels and wire with new feeders from the new 3P-600A panel.
 - Rework existing panels & other existing circuits remaining to new 3P-600A panel.
 - Install new 3P-200A panel at addition for non-emergency power circuits.
 - Install new 3P-100A panel at addition for emergency power circuits.
 - Install new 3P-100A panel for server room equipment.
- provide an emergency generator sized at 150kw. Generator shall be located on the roof (subject to approval). Generator shall be 120/208V 3phase 4 wire, 0.8pf. Fuel source for generator to be diesel. Generator shall back up the following:
 - a. Existing & added lights & receptacles
 - b. 2 new elevators
 - c. existing boiler system

If you have any questions or comments please advise.

Thank you.

AUGUSTA COUNTY COURTHOUSE ELECTRICAL & MECHANICAL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS REPORT



October 17, 2012

MEI ENGINEERING, INC.

276 S. LIBERTY STREET
HARRISONBURG, VA 22801
(540) 432-6272

Existing Electrical Conditions Analysis

Item #	Description	Figure Reference
<i>Upper Level</i>		
E1	The majority of the lights on the Upper Level are utilizing incandescent bulbs which are inefficient and produce extra heat. Some incandescent light bulbs are being phased out due to the congressionally mandated efficiency standards policies.	1A 1B
E2	The existing upper level fixtures utilizing fluorescent lamps are using outdated T12 technology which is inefficient compared to current standards. T12 lamps are being phased out along with fixtures that use T12 technology which will make replacing those lamps more difficult and expensive as the phase out progresses.	2A
E3	Some fluorescent fixtures do not have reflectors or lenses. The exposed lamps create a glare and make for a more uncomfortable environment.	3A
E4	The Upper Level does not have any form of emergency egress lighting. In the event of power failure, there would be no illumination of the path of egress which is unsafe and could potentially cause confusion for the occupants.	
<i>Main Level</i>		
E5	The majority of the lights on the Main Level are utilizing fluorescent lamps are using outdated T12 technology which is inefficient compared to current standards. T12 lamps are being phased out along with fixtures that use T12 technology which will make replacing those lamps more difficult and expensive as the phase out progresses.	4A
E6	Most of the fluorescent fixtures on the Main Level do not have reflectors or lenses. The exposed lamps create a glare and make for a more uncomfortable environment.	5A
E7	Some of the lights on the Main Level are utilizing incandescent bulbs which are inefficient and produce extra heat. Some incandescent light bulbs are being phased out due to the congressionally mandated efficiency standards policies.	6A
E8	The Upper Level does not have any form of emergency egress lighting. In the event of power failure, there would be no illumination of the path of egress which is unsafe and could potentially cause confusion for the occupants.	

Bsmt Level		
E9	A mixture of the lights on the Basement Level are utilizing incandescent bulbs which are inefficient and produce extra heat. Some incandescent light bulbs are being phased out due to the congressionally mandated efficiency standards policies.	7A 7B
E10	A mixture of the lights on the Basement Level are utilizing fluorescent lamps are using outdated T12 technology which is inefficient compared to current standards. T12 lamps are being phased out along with fixtures that use T12 technology which will make replacing those lamps more difficult and expensive as the phase out progresses.	8A
E11	Most of the light fixtures on the Basement Level do not have reflectors or lenses. The exposed lamps create a glare and make for a more uncomfortable environment.	7A 7B
E12	The Basement Level does not have any form of emergency egress lighting. In the event of power failure, there would be no illumination of the path of egress which is unsafe and could potentially cause confusion for the occupants.	
General		
E13	The exit light fixtures have inefficient incandescent bulbs that are prone to short life leaving the sign without proper illumination.	9A

Existing Mechanical Conditions Analysis

Item #	Description	Figure Reference
M1	No air conditioning is installed in the Basement - in the summer the humidity level rises and the IT area gets warm. There is a lack of fresh air ventilation into the basement.	10A, 10B, 10C
M2	Water leaks into the basement during periods of high rates of rain through steel covers in the sidewalk outside.	11A, 11B, 11C, 11D
M3	The heating water boiler is aged and is a low efficiency type. The heating water controls at the radiators are not efficient.	12A
M4	In the Old Records Room in the basement the window mounted exhaust fan's blades are not protected, resulting in a possible hazardous situation.	
M5	Bathrooms in the basement do not have exhaust fans to remove the odors.	13A, 13B
M6	Water closets and urinals have a high flush rate and should be replaced. The lavatories do not have flow restrictors and should be replaced.	14A, 14B, 14C
M7	There are too few handicapped accessible toilets.	15A
M8	At the West Corridor water cooler and the Civil Office sink water gushes out of the drains during periods of heavy rains.	16A, 16B
M9	The underground storm piping by the first floor Conference Room is blocked. The downspout has been rerouted to an open storm pipe.	17A
M10	The air conditioning in most areas is accomplished by window type AC units. These units are not very efficient, have excessive noise when they operate and allow for air leakage around the units. They also allow a path for insects to enter the building.	18A, 18B
M11	In the Court Reporters office the wall thermostat controls the hot water radiator in an office on the floor above.	19A
M12	For Courtroom A, the two 10 ton air handling units are in an attic mechanical room which also serves as a return air plenum. The mechanical room is open to the attic, and will draw in contaminated and hot/cold air depending on the season. The units are aged and near the end of their useful life. The outside air ductwork connects to a shutter louver in the cupola, and does not draw in clean outside air properly. The lined return air ducts are dirty and should be replaced.	20A, 20B, 20C, 20D, 20E
M13	For Courtroom B the AC unit is 17 SEER, a good high efficient unit and has recently been installed. The heat is provided by the heating water radiators, which will be abandoned when the boiler is removed.	21A, 21B

Annual Utility Costs Report

Utility	Recent Year (2012)	Previous Year (2011)
Electricity	\$14,520	\$12,312
Natural Gas	\$6,282	\$8,390
Water and Sewer (excluding trash and storm water charges)	\$675	\$730
Total	\$21,476	\$21,382

Potential Energy Savings and Occupant Comfort Upgrade Recommendations

Item #	Description	Cost
ELECTRICAL		
ES1	1 ST & 2 ND Floor historic fixtures - replace incandescent lamps with equivalent wattage LED or spiral compact fluorescent bulbs (based on availability). Recondition fixtures and clean globes/lenses for maximum light transmittance.	\$3,000
ES2	1 ST , 2 ND & Basement Floor linear fluorescent fixtures in halls/restrooms/holding/storage/etc. - replace with new fixtures that utilize T8 technology and electronic ballasts with prismatic lenses. Use vandal resistant fixtures in areas that could be subject to abuse.	\$4,000
ES3	1 ST Floor fixtures in administrative/office/records areas – replace out dated T12 fixtures with new Direct/Indirect style linear suspended fixtures that utilize T8 technology and high power factor electronic ballasts.	\$10,000
ES4	Basement Floor incandescent fixtures - Replace with linear fluorescent fixtures with prismatic lenses that utilize T8 Technology and electronic ballasts.	\$2,000
ES5	2 ND Floor level down light fixtures - replace recessed down light fixtures with compact fluorescent fixtures with electronic ballasts.	\$1,400
ES6	Wall sconces throughout - replace with new compact fluorescent sconce fixtures with electronic ballasts.	\$1,800
ES7	Replace incandescent exit lights with new LED fixtures with battery backup and emergency egress heads.	\$1,100
ES8	Replace wall switches in offices/storage rooms/restrooms/utility rooms with occupancy sensor type to turn off lights when the space is unoccupied.	\$3,800
ES9	Install new emergency egress fixtures to provide coverage along paths of egress in the event of power failure.	\$2,100
MECHANICAL		
MS1	Replace the plumbing fixture with low water usage types. Rework the toilets to be more handicapped accessible.	\$60,000
MS2	Remove the wall mounted exhaust fan in the window of the Old Records Room. Conditions in the room will improve when new AC is added to the space.	\$400
MS3	Provide new exhaust fans in the toilet rooms.	\$8,000

MS4	Remove the window AC units and the boiler system/radiators. Provide a new variable refrigerant flow (VRF) heat pump system with numerous indoor units connected to two or three outdoor units. The efficiency of the VRF system at times will be 25 SEER. The indoor units will be ductless or ducted types. The ducted types will be used in noise sensitive areas. The outdoor units can be located on the flat roof area of a new rear addition. All indoor unit locations will be closely coordinated with architectural features. The building insulation envelope will have to be improved to minimize any auxiliary electric heat.	\$242,000
MS5	Peppermint test plumbing fixtures at the West Corridor water cooler and the Civil Office sink. Upgrade the drain lines as required.	\$2,000
MS6	Provide new underground storm piping system on the east side of the building	\$18,000
MS7	Upgrade the mechanical room for Court Room A and replace the dirty return air duct, and provide a new outside air duct termination, replace the HVAC equipment with the VRF type equipment.	\$128,000 (mech. \$ only)
MS8	Replace the HVAC equipment in Court Room B with the VRF system, as the heating radiators will be abandoned. Reuse the existing ductwork.	\$20,000
MS9	Provide a HVAC thermostatic control demand limiting system to reduce peak energy charges.	\$30,000
MS10	Provide a ducted and conditioned fresh air duct system for distribution into the first floor and basement areas.	\$18,000

Payback Analysis of Recommendations

Item #	Description	PAYBACK	Cost
PB1	The plumbing fixtures will be replaced with low water usage types as required by the code when the remodel work is done.	N/A	\$60,000
PB2	New exhaust fans to provide in the renovated toilet rooms as required by the code.	N/A	\$8,000
PB3	New variable refrigerant flow heat pump system. The payback will be in comparison with a conventional 13 SEER heat pump system with electric back-up heat.	8.3 years	\$242,000
PB4	Upgrade the mechanical room for Court Room A with the VRF type equipment. The payback will be in comparison with a conventional 13 SEER heat pump system with electric back-up heat, and not including the ductwork upgrades.	8.3 years	\$128,000
PB4	Replace the HVAC equipment in Court Room B with the VRF system. The payback will be in comparison with a conventional 13 SEER heat pump system with electric back-up heat.	13 years	\$20,000
PB5	Provide the HVAC control demand limiting system. The payback will be in comparison with a conventional 7 day programmable thermostat system with an electric heat source.	9.7 years	\$30,000
PB6	Replace old incandescent & fluorescent lights/ bulbs/exit signs with new current technology fixtures & lamps.	8 years	\$23,100
PB7	Install occupancy sensors in offices/storage rooms/ restrooms/ utility rooms.	7.5 years	\$3800
PB8	Install new emergency egress fixtures along paths of egress	N/A	\$2,100
PB9	Upgrade electric service to 600A and install new panels/gear & HVAC Units	N/A	\$20,000



Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Report





FROEHLING & ROBERTSON, INC.

Engineering Stability Since 1881

1734 Seibel Drive, NE
Roanoke, Virginia 24012-5624
T 540.344.7939 | F 540.344.3657

Record No: 62P-0132

June 20, 2012

Frazier Associates
213 North Augusta Street
Staunton, Virginia 24401
Phone: 540.886.6230
Fax: 540.886.8629

Attention: Tom Clayton; bfrazier@frazierassociates.com

Subject: Hazardous Materials Survey
Augusta County Courthouse
Staunton, Virginia

Mr. Clayton:

Froehling & Robertson, Inc. (F&R) personnel performed a limited non-invasive hazardous materials survey on June 8, 2012 to identify suspect asbestos-containing materials, lead-containing painted surfaces, PCB containing light ballasts, mercury containing thermostats, and bird guano. This survey was performed at the Augusta County Courthouse located at 1 East Johnson Street in Staunton, Virginia. Sampling was performed in general accordance with U.S. EPA and HUD protocols. The following sections summarize our findings.

1.0 LIMITED ASBESTOS SURVEY FINDINGS AND RESULTS

1.1. Asbestos Findings

Forty-four (44) bulk samples of suspect asbestos containing materials collected at the site were analyzed for a total of seventy three (73) layers. The suspect ACMs were submitted to Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C. an NVLAP accredited (NVLAP Lab Code: 101882-0) and Virginia licensed asbestos laboratory, in Richmond, Virginia, for analysis by Polarized Light Microscopy (PLM) following EPA Method 600/R-93/116. The analytical results are shown in the following table. A copy of the laboratory Asbestos Bulk Analysis Report is included as an attachment to this report. The survey results are presented in Table I.

Corporate HQ: 3015 Dumbarton Road Richmond, Virginia 23228 T 804.264.2701 F 804.264.1202 www.fandr.com

VIRGINIA • NORTH CAROLINA • SOUTH CAROLINA • MARYLAND • DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A Minority-Owned Business



TABLE I: Asbestos Sample Results: June 8, 2012

Sample Number	Sample Location	Sample Type	Lab Description	Analytical Results
6-8DL01	Basement Women's Restroom	Plaster-Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD ¹
6-8DL02A	Basement Women's Restroom	Plaster-Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD
6-8DL02B	Basement Women's Restroom	Plaster-Base Coat	Gray Granular	Trace < 1% Chrysotile
6-8DL03	Basement Women's Restroom	Plaster	White Granular	NAD
6-8DL04A	1 st Floor Conference Room	Tan Mastic	Cream Adhesive	NAD
6-8DL04B	1 st Floor Conference Room	Tan Floor Tile	Tan Vinyl	NAD
6-8DL04C	1 st Floor Conference Room	Brown Mastic	Brown Adhesive; Brittle	NAD
6-8DL05A	1 st Floor Deed's Room	Plaster-Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD
6-8DL05B	1 st Floor Deed's Room	Plaster-Base Coat	Gray Granular	NAD
6-8DL06A	1 st Floor Deed's Room Vault	Brown Cork Floor Tile	Brown Cork	NAD
6-8DL06B	1 st Floor Deed's Room Vault	Dark Brown Mastic	Dark Brown Adhesive; Brittle	NAD
6-8DL07A	1st Floor Civil Record's Room	Brown 9" Floor Tile	Brown Vinyl	12% Chrysotile
6-8DL07B	1 st Floor Civil Record's Room	Black Mastic	Black Tar-Like	NAD
6-8DL07C	1 st Floor Civil Record's Room	Felt	Black Tar-Like; Tan Fibrous	NAD
6-8DL08A	1 st Floor Civil Record's Room	Plaster Ceiling-Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD
6-8DL08B	1 st Floor Civil Record's Room	Plaster Ceiling-Base Coat	Gray Granular	NAD
6-8DL09A	1 st Floor Civil Record's Room	Plaster Wall-Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD
6-8DL09B	1 st Floor Civil Record's Room	Plaster Wall-Base Coat	Gray Granular	NAD
6-8DL10A	1 st Floor Civil Office	White Mastic	Off-White Adhesive	NAD
6-8DL10B	1st Floor Civil Office	Black Floor Tile	Black Vinyl	10% Chrysotile
6-8DL10C	1st Floor Civil Office	Black Mastic	Black Tar-Like; Fibrous	7% Chrysotile
6-8DL11A	1 st Floor Deed's Room	Black Baseboard	Black Vinyl	NAD
6-8DL11B	1 st Floor Deed's Room	Tan Mastic	Tan Adhesive	NAD
6-8DL12	Roof-Vent	Black Tar	Black Tar-Like	7% Chrysotile
6-8DL13	Roof-Chimney	White Caulking	White Adhesive	NAD



Sample Number	Sample Location	Sample Type	Lab Description	Analytical Results
6-8DL14	Roof-Tower	Gray Caulking	Gray/Clear Adhesive; Rubbery	NAD
6-8DL15	Roof-Seam	Gray Caulking	Gray Rubbery	NAD
6-8DL16A	Roof	Black Membrane	Black Rubbery	NAD
6-8DL16B	Roof	Black Sealer	Black Adhesive	NAD
6-8DL17	Attic	Insulation	White Fibrous	NAD
6-8DL18	Attic	Mortar from Bricks	Gray Granular	NAD
6-8DL19A	Basement Chancery	Wall Plaster-Skim Coat	Off-White Granular	NAD
6-8DL19B	Basement Chancery	Wall Plaster-Base Coat	Gray Granular	NAD
6-8DL20	Basement Record's Room	Ceiling Plaster	Tan Granular	NAD
6-8DL21A	Basement Criminal Record's Room	Black Floor Tile	Black Vinyl	7% Chrysotile
6-8DL21B	Basement Criminal Record's Room	Black Mastic	Black Tar-Like	2% Chrysotile
6-8DL22	Basement Criminal Record's Room	Window Glazing	Gray Granular	Trace < 1% Chrysotile
6-8DL23	Peg Board	Ceiling Tile	White Fibrous	NAD
6-8DL24	Basement Boiler Room	Boiler Insulation in Front under Jacket	Yellow Fibrous	NAD
6-8DL25	Basement Old Record/Storage Room	Black Packing around Pipe	Black Brittle	NAD
6-8DL26	Basement Boiler Room	Caulking on Boiler near Water Line	Gray Brittle	NAD
6-8DL27A	Basement Boiler Room	Thermal Systems Insulation Wrap	Tan/Yellow Fibrous; Silver Foil	NAD
6-8DL27B	Basement Boiler Room	Thermal Systems Insulation-Paint	Silver Paint Like	NAD
6-8DL28	Basement West Stairwell	Mudded Elbow	Gray Cementitious	NAD
6-8DL29	Exterior Public Restroom	Window Glazing	Gray Granular	NAD
6-8DL30	Men's Storage	Window Glazing	Gray Granular	NAD
6-8DL31	Women's Storage	Plaster Top Coat	Tan Granular	NAD
6-8DL32A	2 nd Floor Holding Cell	Brown Floor Tile	Brown Vinyl	3% Chrysotile
6-8DL32B	2 nd Floor Holding Cell	Black Mastic	Black Tar-Like	NAD
6-8DL33A	2 nd Floor Jury Room	Red/Black with White Streaks Floor Tile	Black Vinyl	7% Chrysotile
6-8DL33B	2 nd Floor Jury Room	Black Mastic	Black Tar-Like	4% Chrysotile
6-8DL33C	2 nd Floor Jury Room	Underlayment	Brown Fibrous	NAD
6-8DL34A	2 nd Floor Jury Men's Room	Green Floor Tile	Green Vinyl	4% Chrysotile



Sample Number	Sample Location	Sample Type	Lab Description	Analytical Results
6-8DL34B	2nd Floor Jury Men's Room	Black Mastic	Black Tar-Like	3% Chrysotile
6-8DL35A	2 nd Floor Jury Men's Room	Black Cove Base	Black Vinyl	NAD
6-8DL35B	2 nd Floor Jury Men's Room	Tan Mastic	Cream Adhesive	NAD
6-8DL36	2 nd Floor Jury Men's Room	Ceiling Tile	White Fibrous	NAD
6-8DL37A	Basement Old Record's Room Steps	Tan Floor Tile	Tan Vinyl	NAD
6-8DL37B	Basement Old Record's Room Steps	Brown Mastic	Brown Adhesive	NAD
6-8DL38A	Basement Old Record's Room	Maroon Floor Tile	Brown Vinyl	6% Chrysotile
6-8DL38B	Basement Old Record's Room	Black Mastic	Black Tar-Like	NAD
6-8DL39A	Basement Old Record's Room	Black Floor Tile	Brown Vinyl	4% Chrysotile
6-8DL39B	Basement Old Record's Room	Black Mastic	Black Tar-Like	NAD
6-8DL40A	1 st Floor Court Reporter's Office	Black Mastic-Top Layer	Black Tar-Like	NAD
6-8DL40B	1st Floor Court Reporter's Office	Yellow Floor Tile	Yellow Vinyl	2% Chrysotile
6-8DL40C	1st Floor Court Reporter's Office	Black Mastic-Bottom Layer	Black Tar-Like	5% Chrysotile
6-8DL41A	1 st Floor Bathroom in Break Area	Brown Cove Base	Brown Vinyl	NAD
6-8DL41B	1 st Floor Bathroom in Break Area	Gray Mastic	Gray Adhesive	NAD
6-8DL42A	1 st Floor Bathroom in Break Area	Drywall	White Powdery; Tan Fibrous	NAD
6-8DL42B	1 st Floor Bathroom in Break Area	Joint Compound	White Granular	NAD
6-8DL43	Exterior Front	Window Glazing	White Granular	NAD
6-8DL44	Exterior	White Caulking	White Rubbery	NAD

¹NAD: No Asbestos Detected

1.2. Survey Results

1.2.1. Asbestos Containing Materials

1.2.1.1. Friable Asbestos Containing Materials:

Asbestos (Trace <1%) was detected in one (1) representative sample (6-8DL02B) of the plaster base coat located in the basement women's restroom of the building. Although this level is



below the regulatory threshold under EPA regulations, F&R recommends that the owner conduct follow-up sampling of the plaster base coat using a more sensitive method (TEM analysis) to evaluate if there is asbestos present in this material above a regulatory threshold. F&R notes, however, that this is not a regulatory requirement and our recommendation is based on experience and the fact that OSHA has regulations regarding potential employee exposure from disturbance of any material containing asbestos, including trace levels.

1.2.1.2. Non-Friable Asbestos Containing Materials:

Asbestos (12% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL07A) collected of the brown 9" floor tile located in the 1st floor civil record's room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar floor tiles should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (10% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL10B) collected of the black 9" floor tile located in the 1st floor civil office of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar floor tiles should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (7% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL10C) collected of the black mastic associated with the black 9" floor tile located in the 1st floor civil office of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar mastics should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (7% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL12) collected of the black tar located around a vent on the roof of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar mastics should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (7% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL21A) collected of the black floor tile located in the basement criminal record's room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar floor tiles should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (2% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL21B) collected of the black mastic associated with the black floor tile located in the basement criminal record's room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar mastics should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (Trace <1%) was detected in one (1) representative sample (6-8DL22) of the gray window glazing located in the basement criminal record's room of the building. Although this level is below the regulatory threshold under EPA regulations, F&R recommends that the owner



conduct follow-up sampling of the window glazing using a more sensitive method (TEM analysis) to evaluate if there is asbestos present in this material above a regulatory threshold. F&R notes however that this is not a regulatory requirement and our recommendation is based on experience and the fact that OSHA has regulations regarding potential employee exposure from disturbance of any material containing asbestos, including trace levels.

Asbestos (3% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL32A) collected of the brown floor tile located in the 2nd floor holding cell of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar floor tiles should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (7% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL33A) collected of the red/black with white streaks floor tile located in the 2nd floor jury room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar floor tiles should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (4% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL33B) collected of the black mastic associated with the red/black with white streaks floor tile located in the 2nd floor jury room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar mastics should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (3% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL34B) collected of the black mastic associated with the green floor tile located in the 2nd floor jury men's room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar mastics should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (6% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL38A) collected of the maroon floor tile located in the basement old record's room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar floor tiles should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (4% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL39A) collected of the black floor tile located in the basement old record's room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar floor tiles should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

Asbestos (2% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL40B) collected of the yellow floor tile located in the 1st floor court reporter's office room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar floor tiles should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).



Asbestos (5% Chrysotile) was detected in one representative sample (6-8DL40C) collected of the black mastic bottom layer associated with the yellow floor tile located in the 1st floor court reporter's office room of the building. This material is classified as Category I non-friable ACM. All similar mastics should be assumed to be an asbestos containing material (ACM).

The Asbestos Analytical Report and the Chain of Custody Documentation is provided as an attachment to this report.

Note 1: If during repair/renovation activities, work is performed that will impact suspect materials that have not been sampled, it is recommended that these materials be sampled by a Virginia licensed asbestos inspector prior to disturbance.

Note 2: If asbestos abatement activities are performed at the Augusta County Courthouse all work should be performed by a Virginia licensed asbestos abatement contractor.

1.3. EPA/NESHAP Regulations for Asbestos Containing Materials

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency promulgated the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) [40 CFR Part 61], which addresses the application, removal, and disposal of asbestos-containing materials (ACM). Under NESHAP the following categories are defined for asbestos-containing materials:

Friable - When dry, can be crumbled, pulverized, or reduced to powder by hand pressure.

Non-friable - When dry, cannot be crumbled, pulverized, or reduced to powder by hand pressure.

Category I Non-friable ACM - Packings, gaskets, resilient floor coverings, and asphalt roofing products containing more than 1% asbestos.

Category II Non-friable ACM - Any material, excluding Category I Non-friable ACM, which contains more than 1% asbestos.

Regulated Asbestos Containing Material (RACM) - One of the following:

1. Friable ACM
2. Category I Non-friable ACM that has become friable.
3. Category I Non-friable ACM that will be or has been subjected to sanding, grinding, cutting, or abrading.
4. Category II Non-friable ACM that has a high probability of becoming, or has become, friable by the forces expected to act on the material in the course of demolition or renovation operations.



Under NESHAP, the following actions are required:

1. Prior to the commencement of demolition or renovation activities, the building owner must inspect the affected facility or part of the facility where the demolition or renovation activities will occur for the presence of asbestos.
2. Remove all RACM from the facility before any activity begins that would break up, dislodge, or similarly disturb the material or preclude access for subsequent removal.
3. RACM need not be removed if:
 - a) It is Category I non-friable ACM that is not in poor condition.
 - b) It is on a facility component that is encased in concrete or other similar material and is adequately wet whenever exposed.
 - c) It was not accessible for testing and was therefore not discovered until after demolition began and because of the demolition the material cannot be safely removed.
 - d) It is Category II non-friable ACM and the probability is low that the material will become crumbled, pulverized, or reduced to powder during demolition.

1.4. OSHA

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulates employee exposure to asbestos under 29 CFR 1926.1101 and 29 CFR 1926.1001. Work associated with known or suspect ACMs must be conducted according to these regulations in addition to the noted EPA regulations.

2.0 LIMITED LEAD-BASED PAINT SURVEY FINDINGS AND RESULTS

2.1. Introduction

Froehling & Robertson, Inc. (F&R) personnel also performed lead based paint (LBP) testing of painted surfaces of the building.

Based on the nature of this survey, when one component tests positive for the presence of lead paint all similar painted components must be assumed to be positive, unless additional testing is performed.

2.2. Lead-Based Paint (LBP) Survey Methodology

An F&R Industrial Hygienist performed the testing of painted surfaces for lead. The testing was conducted by using a Niton XLp-300 X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) Lead Paint Analyzer. The XRF contains a small radioisotopic source and operates on the principle of x-ray fluorescence,



whereby lead atoms in paint are stimulated to emit characteristic x-rays, which are then detected by the instrument. The XRF can measure surface or non-surface concentrations of lead with 95% accuracy at the HUD action level of 1.0 mg/cm². Levels of lead are reported in units of milligrams per square centimeter (mg/cm²). The XRF is able to accurately detect as little as 0.1 mg/cm² of lead. The XRF classifies painted surfaces as “positive” or “negative” for lead content based on the HUD action level (1.0 mg/cm²) and the performance characteristics of the XRF.

Positive: Lead is present at or above the HUD standard of 1.0 mg/cm² on one or more of the components.
 Negative: Lead is not present at or above the HUD standard of 1.0 mg/cm² on any of the components.

The survey was conducted in general accordance with the methodology recommended by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

2.3. Findings and Conclusions

A total of one hundred one (101) XRF readings were taken on interior and exterior painted surfaces of the building. The samples that tested positive for lead are listed below in Table 2.

Table 2: - Lead Based Paint Positive Sampling Results: June 8, 2012

Reading #	Sample Location	Component	Substrate	Color
8	Basement-East Side	Door	Wood	White
9	Basement-East Side	Door Casing	Wood	White
10	Basement-East Side	Door	Wood	White
11	Basement-East Side	Stair-Newel Post	Metal	Black
13	Basement-East Side	Stair-Riser	Wood	Black
14	Basement-East Women's Restroom	Wall	Ceramic	Beige
16	Basement-East Women's Restroom	Door	Wood	White
17	Basement-East Women's Restroom	Door Casing	Wood	White
26	1 st Floor-Deeds Room Vault	Door Casing	Metal	Off-White

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Report



Reading #	Sample Location	Component	Substrate	Color
33	1 st Floor-Deeds Room	Door Casing	Wood	Tan
35	1 st Floor-Deeds Room	Wall	Ceramic	White
50	1 st Floor-Civil Office	Floor	Ceramic	Purple
54	Exterior	Roof	Metal	Silver
57	Basement-Chancery Records Room	Door Casing	Wood	White
61	Basement-Storage Room	Baseboard	Wood	White
65	Basement-Storage Room	Door	Wood	Beige
66	Basement-Storage Room	Door Casing	Wood	Beige
67	Basement-Storage Room	Window-Casing	Wood	White
69	Basement-Server Room	Stair-Riser	Wood	Black
70	Basement-Server Room	Stair-Stringer	Wood	Brown
71	Basement-Server Room	Vault-Door	Metal	Black
77	Basement-West Stairwell	Door	Wood	White
79	Basement-West Stairwell	Stair-Newel Post	Metal	Black
81	Basement-West Stairwell	Stair-Stringer	Wood	White
84	Basement-West Stairwell Restroom	Wall	Ceramic	Beige
85	Basement-West Stairwell Restroom	Window-Casing	Wood	White
86	Basement-Lab	Door	Wood	Brown
87	Basement-Lab	Door	Wood	Gray
88	Basement-Lab	Door Casing	Wood	Gray
89	Basement-Lab	Window-Sill	Wood	Beige
91	Basement-Storage Room Lab	Window-Casing	Wood	Green
92	Basement-Storage Room Lab	Door	Wood	White
93	Basement-Storage Room Lab	Door Casing	Wood	White



Reading #	Sample Location	Component	Substrate	Color
100	2 nd Floor-Jury Passage	Closet Door	Metal	Gray
103	2 nd Floor-Jury Room	Wall	Plaster	White
116	Basement-Old Records Room	Vault Door	Metal	Green
117	Basement-Old Records Room	Vault Door Casing	Metal	Green
122	Basement-Old Records Room	Stair-Riser	Wood	Black
124	Basement-Old Records Room	Stair-Stringer	Metal	Black
125	Basement-Old Records Room	Stair-Newel Post	Metal	Black
129	Exterior-Front	Window-Casing	Wood	Beige

2.3.1. Locations of Detected Lead Based Paint (LBP) - Exterior

Based on the detection of LBP on specific exterior component types and our observation of an apparent homogenous painting history, the following building components are assumed to be coated with LBP:

- The silver painted metal exterior roof.

F&R recommends that all of these materials and all similar painted surfaces be assumed to be coated with LBP.

2.3.2. Locations of Detected Lead Based Paint (LBP)-Interior

Based on the detection of LBP on specific interior component types and our observation of an apparent homogenous painting history; the following building components are assumed to be coated with LBP.

- The white painted wood doors and door casings in the basement;
- The gray painted wood doors and door casings in the basement;
- The brown painted wood doors in the basement;
- The beige painted wood doors and door casings in the basement;
- The black painted metal vault door in the basement;
- The green painted metal vault door and door casing in the basement;
- The beige painted ceramic wall in the basement;
- The white painted wood baseboards in the basement;
- The white painted wood window casings in the basement;



- The green painted wood window casings in the basement;
- The beige painted wood window sills in the basement;
- The black painted wood stair-risers in the basement;
- The black painted metal stair newel posts in the basement;
- The black painted metal stair stringers in the basement;
- The brown painted wood stair stringers in the basement server room;
- The white painted wood stair stringers in the basement west stairwell;
- The tan painted wood door casings in the 1st floor deeds room;
- The off-white painted metal door casings in the 1st floor deeds room;
- The white painted ceramic wall in the 1st floor deeds room;
- The purple painted ceramic floor in the 1st floor civil office;
- The gray painted metal closet door in the 2nd floor jury passage;
- The white painted plaster walls in the 2nd floor jury room;
- The beige painted wood window casing in the exterior front of the building.

2.4. Applicable Regulations

2.4.1. OSHA Regulations for Lead-Based Paint

It is important to note that any painted surface may contain concentrations of lead in the paint, which when disturbed, may generate lead dust greater than the maximum exposure concentration of 30 micrograms per cubic millimeter established by the OSHA “Lead Exposure in Construction Rule” (29 CFR 1926.62). The OSHA standard gives no guidance on acceptable levels of lead in paint at which no exposure to airborne lead (above the action level) would be expected. Rather, OSHA defines airborne concentrations, and references specific types of work practices and operations from which a lead hazard may be generated (reference 29 CFR 1926.62, section d). Environmental and personnel monitoring should be conducted during any removal or demolition process (as appropriate) to determine actual personal exposure. This monitoring information can be used to determine the levels of personnel protection and environmental controls required for work involving specific removal/demolition processes on specific structures. Under OSHA requirements, the Contractor performing the work will be required to conduct this monitoring. It is important to note that environmental controls will vary dependent upon the content of lead in paint, the process used to remove it, duration of the work, and the amount of paint to be removed.

2.4.2. EPA Regulations for Lead-Based Paint

Under the new Renovation, Repair, and Painting (RRP) Regulation the Contractor shall complete all renovation work that will affect LBP coated surfaces in accordance with the requirements found in 40 CFR 745. At a minimum the contractor shall assume that this facility is classified as a Child Occupied Facility under the US EPA RRP regulations found under 40 CFR 745.



The Contractor should submit documentation of compliance with this standard to the Client prior to start-up of work, including personal training, certification of personal, and a means and methods work plan to comply with the RRP regulations.

For disposal of construction/demolition debris that has LBP, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requires that testing of lead content be performed to determine proper disposal. EPA regulations require that a generator of waste determine if that waste is hazardous by performing testing in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 261.11 or for wastes that may be RCRA hazardous (such as items with high lead content), the generator may assume that the waste is hazardous and comply with the hazardous waste regulation.

3.0 PCB CONTAINING LIGHT BALLASTS

3.1. Methodology

Light ballasts are the electrical components attached to fluorescent light fixtures usually found under a metal over-plate. Prior to 1978, ballasts were commonly manufactured with polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). PCBs were used in fluorescent light ballasts because of their good electrical insulating capabilities. Ballasts made after 1978 are usually marked "Non-PCB."

3.2. Results

F&R personnel located seventy (70) light ballasts which may contain PCB's.

3.3. Conclusions and Recommendations

F&R recommends that each fluorescent light ballast be inspected at the time of demolition/renovation to verify the presence or absence of PCB labeling. If no label is present, then the presence of PCB's should be assumed. If such light ballasts are encountered, the disposal of fluorescent light ballasts should be based upon the presence or lack thereof of PCBs and the condition of the ballasts (leaking, etc.). The best option for non-leaking PCB ballasts is to recycle them at an approved recycling facility. Non-leaking PCB ballasts that aren't recycled must be managed and disposed of as hazardous waste. Leaking PCB ballasts should be handled with extreme caution to avoid exposure, contamination and liability. All applicable local, state, and federal regulations should be followed.



4.0 MERCURY CONTAINING THERMOSTATS

4.1. Methodology

Mercury is used in several building components including fluorescent lamps, mercury vapor lamps, and wall thermostats. F&R conducted a limited visual review of the building interior for mercury containing thermostats and lamps.

4.2. Results

F&R personnel did not observe any thermostats that may contain mercury.

4.3. Conclusions and Recommendations

If during demolition/renovation, items such as mercury thermostats are encountered, they should be removed and disposed of/recycled according to regulatory guidelines by an appropriately licensed/certified contractor. Mercury containing waste components is considered as hazardous waste materials in the State of Virginia.

5.0 BIRD GUANO REVIEW

5.1. Methodology

F&R also reviewed the attic area of the building to look for evidence of accumulated bird droppings.

5.2. Results

It was observed that multiple levels inside the cupola have extremely heavy accumulations of droppings and nesting materials all the way down to the attic area above the courtroom. All wooden members including beams, plaster, and insulation are covered with droppings. We recommend that the contractor be informed of the bird guano contamination and be instructed to look for accumulated droppings within the attic/cupola areas and clean and treat the areas where that are found with a biocide.

5.3. Conclusions and Recommendations

A guano abatement specification should be prepared and followed if renovation or other work will be conducted in those areas where guano was identified.

6.0 LIMITATIONS



This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of Frazier Associates and/or their agents. This service was performed in accordance with generally accepted environmental practices. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made. Our conclusions and recommendations are based, in part, upon information provided to us by others and our site observations. We have not verified the completeness or accuracy of the information provided by others, unless otherwise noted. Our observations and recommendations are based upon conditions readily visible at the site at the time of our site visit, and upon current industry standards. During F&R's non-invasive inspection, accessible areas were visually surveyed for the presence of suspect asbestos materials and suspected LBP. Areas inspected for the above-referenced materials were limited to those designated by the Client and the scope of services.

During this study, suspect asbestos samples were submitted for analysis at an NVLAP-accredited laboratory via polarized light microscopy and suspect hazardous material samples were submitted for laboratory analysis. As with any similar survey of this nature, actual conditions exist only at the precise locations from which suspect asbestos samples were collected. Certain inferences are based on the results of this sampling and related testing to form a professional opinion of conditions in areas beyond those from which the samples were collected. It is also understood that this is a non-invasive survey so that it is possible that concealed materials may be present that were not accessible during the original survey. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

Under this scope of services, F&R assumes no responsibility regarding response actions (e.g. O&M Plans, Encapsulation, Abatement, Removal, Notifications, etc.) initiated as a result of these findings. F&R assumes no liability for the duties and responsibilities of the Client with respect to compliance with these regulations. Compliance with regulations and response actions are the sole responsibility of the Client and should be conducted in accordance with local, state, and/or federal requirements and should be performed by appropriately qualified and licensed-personnel, as warranted.

Froehling & Robertson, Inc. by virtue of providing the services described in this report, does not assume the responsibility of the person(s) in charge of the site, or otherwise undertake responsibility for reporting to any local, state, or federal public agencies any conditions at the site that may present a potential danger to public health, safety, or the environment. The Client agrees to notify the appropriate local, state, or federal public agencies as required by law, or otherwise to disclose, in a timely manner, any information that may be necessary to prevent any danger to public health, safety, or the environment. The contents of the report should not be construed in any way as a recommendation to purchase, sell, or develop the project site.



7.0 SIGNATURES

If you have any questions concerning this report, please feel free to contact the undersigned. Froehling & Robertson, Inc. appreciates the opportunity to work with you as your Environmental Consultant, and looks forward to a continued cordial working relationship with you.

Respectfully Submitted,
FROEHLING & ROBERTSON, INC.

Mary Beth Wriston
Industrial Hygienist
VA Asbestos Inspector #3303 003466

Gregory L. Whitt
Environmental Group Manager
VA Asbestos Inspector # 3303 003582

Attachments: Appendices



APPENDIX A

**Asbestos Analytical Report
and
Chain of Custody Documentation**



Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C.
7469 Whitepine Rd
Richmond, VA 23237
Telephone: 800.347.4010

Asbestos Bulk Analysis Report

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Client: Froehling & Robertson Inc. - Roanoke
1734 Seibel Drive, N.E.
Roanoke, VA 24012

Received Date: 06/12/2012
Analyzed Date: 06/14/2012
Reported Date: 06/15/2012

Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Client Number:
48-4628

Fax Number:
540-344-3657

Laboratory Results

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-001	6-8DL01		White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-002A	6-8DL02 A	Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-002B	6-8DL02 B	Base Coat	Gray Granular	Trace <1% Chrysotile	1% Cellulose 99% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: Trace <1%					
12-06-01602-003	6-8DL03		White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-004A	6-8DL04 A	Mastic	Cream Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
Top layer					
12-06-01602-004B	6-8DL04 B	Tile	Tan Vinyl	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 48-4628

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-004C	6-8DL04 C	Mastic	Brown Adhesive; Brittle	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
Bottom layer					
12-06-01602-005A	6-8DL05 A	Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-005B	6-8DL05 B	Base Coat	Gray Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-006A	6-8DL06 A	Tile	Brown Cork	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-006B	6-8DL06 B	Mastic	Dark Brown Adhesive; Brittle	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-007A	6-8DL07 A	Tile	Brown Vinyl	12% Chrysotile	88% Non-Fibrous
				Total Asbestos: 12%	
12-06-01602-007B	6-8DL07 B	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-007C	6-8DL07 C	Felt	Black Tar-Like; Tan Fibrous	NAD	80% Cellulose 20% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-008A	6-8DL08 A	Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-008B	6-8DL08 B	Base Coat	Gray Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Report

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 48-4628

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-009A	6-8DL09 A	Skim Coat	White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-009B	6-8DL09 B	Base Coat	Gray Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-010A	6-8DL10 A	Mastic	Off-White Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
Top layer.					
12-06-01602-010B	6-8DL10 B	Tile	Black Vinyl	10% Chrysotile	90% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos:				10%	
12-06-01602-010C	6-8DL10 C	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	7% Chrysotile	93% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos:				7%	
Bottom layer.					
12-06-01602-010D	6-8DL10 D	Felt	Black Tar-Like; Fibrous	Trace <1% Chrysotile	80% Cellulose 20% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos:				Trace <1%	
Possible contamination from backing mastic.					
12-06-01602-011A	6-8DL11 A	Cove Base	Black Vinyl	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-011B	6-8DL11 B	Mastic	Tan Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-012	6-8DL12		Black Tar-Like	7% Chrysotile	93% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos:				7%	
12-06-01602-013	6-8DL13		White Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 48-4628

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-014	6-8DL14		Gray/Clear Adhesive; Rubbery	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-015	6-8DL15		Gray Rubbery	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-016A	6-8DL16 A	Other *	Black Rubbery	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
*Membrane					
12-06-01602-016B	6-8DL16 B	Sealer-Roof	Black Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-017	6-8DL17		White Fibrous	NAD	2% Cellulose 90% Fibrous Glass 8% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-018	6-8DL18		Gray Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-019A	6-8DL19 A	Skim Coat	Off-White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-019B	6-8DL19 B	Base Coat	Gray Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-020	6-8DL20		Tan Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Report

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 48-4628

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-021A	6-8DL21 A	Tile	Black Vinyl	7% Chrysotile	93% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: 7%					
12-06-01602-021B	6-8DL21 B	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	2% Chrysotile	98% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: 2%					
Possible contamination from tile.					
12-06-01602-022	6-8DL22		Gray Granular	Trace <1% Chrysotile	100% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: Trace <1%					
12-06-01602-023	6-8DL23		White Fibrous	NAD	55% Cellulose 35% Fibrous Glass 10% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-024	6-8DL24		Yellow Fibrous	NAD	95% Fibrous Glass 5% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-025	6-8DL25		Black Brittle	NAD	2% Fibrous Glass 98% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-026	6-8DL26		Gray Brittle	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-027A	6-8DL27 A	Insulation	Tan/Yellow Fibrous; Silver Foil	NAD	55% Cellulose 25% Fibrous Glass 20% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-027B	6-8DL27 B	Silver Paint	Silver Paint Like	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 48-4628
Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-028	6-8DL28		Gray Cementitious	NAD	25% Fibrous Glass 75% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-029	6-8DL29		Gray Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-030	6-8DL30		Gray Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-031	6-8DL31		Tan Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-032A	6-8DL32 A	Tile	Brown Vinyl	3% Chrysotile	97% Non-Fibrous
				Total Asbestos: 3%	
12-06-01602-032B	6-8DL32 B	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-033A	6-8DL33 A	Tile	Black Vinyl	7% Chrysotile	93% Non-Fibrous
				Total Asbestos: 7%	
12-06-01602-033B	6-8DL33 B	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	4% Chrysotile	96% Non-Fibrous
				Total Asbestos: 4%	
12-06-01602-033C	6-8DL33 C	Underlay- ment	Brown Fibrous	NAD	95% Cellulose 5% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-034A	6-8DL34 A	Tile	Green Vinyl	4% Chrysotile	96% Non-Fibrous
				Total Asbestos: 4%	

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Report

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 48-4628

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-034B	6-8DL34 B	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	3% Chrysotile	4% Cellulose 93% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: 3%					
12-06-01602-035A	6-8DL35 A	Cove Base	Black Vinyl	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-035B	6-8DL35 B	Mastic	Cream Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-036	6-8DL36		White Fibrous	NAD	55% Cellulose 35% Fibrous Glass 10% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-037A	6-8DL37 A	Tile	Tan Vinyl	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-037B	6-8DL37 B	Mastic	Brown Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-038A	6-8DL38 A	Tile	Brown Vinyl	6% Chrysotile	94% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: 6%					
12-06-01602-038B	6-8DL38 B	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-039A	6-8DL39 A	Tile	Brown Vinyl	4% Chrysotile	96% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: 4%					

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 48-4628

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-039B	6-8DL39 B	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-040A	6-8DL40 A	Mastic	Tan Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
Top layer.					
12-06-01602-040B	6-8DL40 B	Tile	Yellow Vinyl	2% Chrysotile	98% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: 2%					
12-06-01602-040C	6-8DL40 C	Mastic	Black Tar-Like	5% Chrysotile	2% Cellulose 93% Non-Fibrous
Total Asbestos: 5%					
Bottom layer.					
12-06-01602-041A	6-8DL41 A	Cove Base	Brown Vinyl	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-041B	6-8DL41 B	Mastic	Gray Adhesive	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-042A	6-8DL42 A	Drywall	White Powdery; Tan Fibrous	NAD	20% Cellulose 3% Fibrous Glass 77% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-042B	6-8DL42 B	Joint Comp.	White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous
12-06-01602-043	6-8DL43		White Granular	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Report

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C

Client Number: 48-4628

Report Number: 12-06-01602

Project/Test Address: 62P-0132; Staunton, Virginia

Lab Sample Number	Client Sample Number	Layer Type	Lab Gross Description	Asbestos	Other Materials
12-06-01602-044	6-8DL44		White Rubbery	NAD	100% Non-Fibrous

QC Sample: 30-M1-1997-4

QC Blank: SRM 1866 Fiberglass

Reporting Limit: 1% Asbestos

Method: EPA Method 600/R-93/116, EPA Method 600/M4-82-020

Analyst: Sami Hosn

Reviewed By Authorized Signatory:



Tasha Eaddy
QA/QC Clerk

The condition of the samples analyzed was acceptable upon receipt per laboratory protocol unless otherwise noted on this report. Results represent the analysis of samples submitted by the client. Sample location, description, area, volume, etc., was provided by the client. This report cannot be used by the client to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any agency of the U.S. Government. This report shall not be reproduced except in full, without the written consent of the Environmental Hazards Service, L.L.C. California Certification #2319 NY ELAP #11714. All information concerning sampling location, date, and time can be found on Chain-of-Custody. Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C. does not perform any sample collection.

Environmental Hazards Services, L.L.C. recommends reanalysis by point count (for more accurate quantification) or Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM), (for enhanced detection capabilities) for materials regulated by EPA NESHAP (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants) and found to contain less than ten percent (<10%) asbestos by polarized light microscopy (PLM). Both services are available for an additional fee.

400 Point Count Analysis, where noted, performed per EPA Method 600/R-93/116 with a Reporting Limit of 0.25%.

LEGEND: NAD = no asbestos detected

44pam



EHS
Laboratories™

Environmental Hazards Services, LLC
www.leadlab.com 7469 Whitepine Rd
(800)347-4010 Richmond, VA
(804)275-4907 (fax) 23237

Asbestos Chain-of-Custody

12-06-01602



Due Date:
06/15/2012
(Friday)
ER ML

S

Company Name: Froehling & Robertson Address: 1734 Seibel Drive NE City/State/Zip: Koanoke/Virginia/24012
Phone: (540) 344-7939 Fax: () E-mail: mwrliston@fandr.com Acct. Number:
Project Name / Testing Address: 62P-0132 City/State (Required): Staunton/Virginia
Collected by: R. Wriston and D. Lleras Purchase Order Number:

Turn Around Times: 1 - Day 2 - Day 3 - Day Weekend (Must Call Ahead)
If no TAT is specified, sample(s) will be processed and charged as 3-day TAT.

No.	Client Sample ID	Date Collected	ASBESTOS							AIR				COMMENTS	
			PLM	PLM Print Count 400	PLM Print Count 1000	PLM NY Protocol	PCM	TEM Certified (Bulk)	TEM/HERA (Air)	Time On	Time Off	Flow Rate (L./min)	Total Time (minutes)		Volume (Total Liters)
1	6-8DL01	6-8-12	✓											Plaster from basement women's restroom	
2	6-8DL02	6-8-12	✓											Plaster from basement women's restroom	
3	6-8DL03	6-8-12	✓											Plaster from basement women's restroom	
4	6-8DL04	6-8-12	✓											Floor tile from conference room 1st floor	
5	6-8DL05	6-8-12	✓											Plaster from deed's room 1st floor	
6	6-8DL06	6-8-12	✓											Cork floor tile from deed's room vault 1st floor	
7	6-8DL07	6-8-12	✓											9" floor tile from civil record's room 1st floor	
8	6-8DL08	6-8-12	✓											Plaster ceiling from civil record's room 1st floor	
9	6-8DL09	6-8-12	✓											Plaster wall from civil record's room 1st floor	
10	6-8DL10	6-8-12	✓											Floor tile/mastic from civil office 1st floor	
Released by: Mary Beth Wriston			Signature: <u>Mary Beth Wriston</u>							Date/Time: <u>6/11/12/3:30pm</u>				Date/Time: <u>6/12/12</u>	
Received by: <u>JHogge</u>			Signature: <u>JHogge</u>							Date/Time: <u>6/12/12</u>				Date/Time: <u>6/12/12</u>	



EHS Laboratories

Environmental Hazards Services, LLC
www.leadlab.com 7469 Whitepine Rd
(800)347-4010 Richmond, VA
(804)275-4907 (fax) 23237

Asbestos Chain-of-Custody

1002
~ For Lab Use Only ~

Company Name: Froehling & Robertson Address: 1734 Selbel Drive NE City/State/Zip: Roanoke/Virginia/24012
Phone: (540) 344-7939 Fax: () _____ E-mail: mwrison@fandr.com Acct. Number: _____
Project Name / Testing Address: 62P-0132 City/State (Required): Staunton/Virginia
Collected by: R. Wriston and D. Lleras Purchase Order Number: _____

Turn Around Times: If no TAT is specified, sample(s) will be processed and charged as 3-day TAT.

_____ 1 - Day _____ 2 - Day ☒ 3 - Day _____ Same Day (Must Call Ahead) _____ Weekend (Must Call Ahead)

No.	Client Sample ID	Date Collected	ASBESTOS						AUR			Volume (Total Liters)	COMMENTS	
			PLM	PLM/PC (Count 47)	PLM/PC (Count 100)	PLM NY Protocol	RCM	TEVI Chatfield (Balls)	TEVI/ASHERA (M)	Time On	Time Off			Flow Rate (L/min)
1	6-8DL11	6-8-12	✓											Baseboard/mastic from deed's room 1st floor
2	6-8DL12	6-8-12	✓											Tar from around vent-roof
3	6-8DL13	6-8-12	✓											Caulking from around chimney-roof
4	6-8DL14	6-8-12	✓											Caulking from around tower-roof
5	6-8DL15	6-8-12	✓											Gray caulking from seam on roof
6	6-8DL16	6-8-12	✓											Membrane/sealer-roof
7	6-8DL17	6-8-12	✓											Attic insulation
8	6-8DL18	6-8-12	✓											Attic mortar from bricks
9	6-8DL19	6-8-12	✓											Wall plaster from chancery in basement
10	6-8DL20	6-8-12	✓											Ceiling Plaster from records room in basement

Released by: Mary Beth Wriston Signature: Mary Beth Wriston Date/Time: 6-11-12/3:30pm
Received by: Talvage Signature: Talvage Date/Time: 6/12/12



E-I-S
Laboratories™

Environmental Hazards Services, LLC
www.leadlab.com 7469 Whitepine Rd
(800)347-4010 Richmond, VA
(804)275-4907 (fax) 23237

Asbestos Chain-of-Custody

16008-

~ For Lab Use Only ~

Company Name: Froehling & Robertson Address: 1734 Seibel Drive NE City/State/Zip: Roanoke/Virginia/24012
Phone: (540) 344-7939 Fax: () E-mail: mwrison@fandr.com Acct. Number:
Project Name / Testing Address: 62P-0132 City/State (Required): Staunton/Virginia
Collected by: R. Wriston and D. Lleras Purchase Order Number:

Turn Around Times: 1 - Day 2 - Day 3 - Day Weekend (Must Call Ahead)
If no TAT is specified, sample(s) will be processed and charged as 3-day TAT.

No.	Client Sample ID	Date Collected	ASBESTOS						AIR			Volume (Total Liters)	COMMENTS
			PLM	PLM (Count 100)	PLM (Count 100)	PLM NY Protocol	PCN	TECH (Counted)	TECH (Counted)	Flow Rate (L/min)	Total Time (mins)		
1	6-8DL21	6-8-12	✓										Floor tile in criminal records basement
2	6-8DL22	6-8-12	✓										Window glazing in criminal records basement
3	6-8DL23	6-8-12	✓										Ceiling tile-peg board
4	6-8DL24	6-8-12	✓										Boiler insulation in front under jacket in boiler room in basement
5	6-8DL25	6-8-12	✓										Packing around pipeback in old records storage room in basement
6	6-8DL26	6-8-12	✓										Caulking on boiler near water line in boiler room in basement
7	6-8DL27	6-8-12	✓										TSI wrap-boiler room in basement
8	6-8DL28	6-8-12	✓										Mudded elbow at west stairwell in basement
9	6-8DL29	6-8-12	✓										Window glaze in exterior public restroom
10	6-8DL30	6-8-12	✓										Window glaze at storage men's
Released by: Mary Beth Wriston			Signature: <u>Mary Beth Wriston</u>										Date/Time: <u>6-11-12 / 3:30pm</u>
Received by: <u>THORPE</u>			Signature: <u>THORPE</u>										Date/Time: <u>6/12/12</u>



EHS
Laboratories™

Environmental Hazards Services, LLC
www.leadlab.com 7469 Whitepine Rd
(800)347-4010 Richmond, VA
(804)275-4907 (fax) 23237

Asbestos Chain-of-Custody

1008

~ For Lab Use Only ~

Company Name: Froehling & Robertson Address: 1734 Seibel Drive NE City/State/Zip: Roanoke/Virginia/24012
Phone: (540) 344-7939 Fax: () E-mail: mwriston@fandr.com Acct. Number: _____
Project Name / Testing Address: 62P-0132 City/State (Required): Staunton/Virginia
Collected by: R. Wriston and D. Lleras Purchase Order Number: _____

Turn Around Times : If no TAT is specified, sample(s) will be processed and charged as 3-day TAT.

1 - Day 2 - Day 3 - Day ☒ Some Day (Must Call Ahead) Weekend (Must Call Ahead)

No.	Client Sample ID	Date Collected	ASBESTOS						AIR			Volume (Total Liters)	COMMENTS	
			PLM	PLM Print Count 400	PLM Print Count 1000	PLM NY Protocol	PCM	TEM Charfield (Bulk)	TEM/HERA (Air)	Time On	Time Off			Flow Rate (L/min)
1	6-8DL31	6-8-12	✓											Plaster top coat in storage women's
2	6-8DL32	6-8-12	✓											Floor tile in holding cell 2nd floor
3	6-8DL33	6-8-12	✓											Floor tile (red/black with white streaks) jury room 2nd floor
4	6-8DL34	6-8-12	✓											Floor tile (green) in jury men's room 2nd floor
5	6-8DL35	6-8-12	✓											Cove base in jury men's room 2nd floor
6	6-8DL36	6-8-12	✓											Ceiling tile in jury men's room 2nd floor
7	6-8DL37	6-8-12	✓											Tan floor tile in old records room steps basement
8	6-8DL38	6-8-12	✓											Maroon floor tile in old records room basement
9	6-8DL39	6-8-12	✓											Black floor tile in old records room basement
10	6-8DL40	6-8-12	✓											Floor tile/mastic in court reporter office

Released by: Mary Beth Wriston Signature: Mary Beth Wriston Date/Time: 6-11-12/3:30pm
Received by: THOJ Signature: THOJ Date/Time: 6/12/12



EHS
Laboratories™

Environmental Hazards Services, LLC
www.leadlab.com 7469 Whitepine Rd
(800)347-4010 Richmond, VA
(804)275-4907 (fax) 23237

Asbestos Chain-of-Custody

1008

~ For Lab Use Only ~

Company Name: Froehling & Robertson Address: 1734 Seibel Drive NE City/State/Zip: Roanoke/Virginia/24012
Phone: (540) 344-7939 Fax: () E-mail: mwrinston@fandr.com Acct. Number: _____
Project Name / Testing Address: 62P-0132 City/State (Required): Staunton/Virginia
Collected by: R. Wriston and D. Lleras Purchase Order Number: _____

Turn Around Times: 1 - Day ☒ 2 - Day ☐ 3 - Day ☐ Weekend (Must Call Ahead)
If no TAT is specified, sample(s) will be processed and charged as 3-day TAT.

No.	Client Sample ID	Date Collected	ASBESTOS							AIR				COMMENTS
			PLAN	PLAN Print Chart 4-11	PLAN Print Chart 100	PLAN NY Protocol	PCM	TEM Certified (Bulk)	TEM/HERA (Air)	Time On	Time Off	Flow Rate (L/min)	Total Time (minutes)	
1	6-8DL41	6-8-12	✓											Cove base in bathroom break area 1st floor
2	6-8DL42	6-8-12	✓											Joint compound drywall in bathroom break area 1st floor
3	6-8DL43	6-8-12	✓											Window glaze-exterior front
4	6-8DL44	6-8-12	✓											Caulking-exterior
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
Released by: Mary Beth Wriston			Signature: <u>Mary Beth Wriston</u>						Date/Time: <u>6-11-12/3:30pm</u>			Date/Time: <u>6/12/12</u>		
Received by: <u>Tatogye</u>			Signature: <u>Tatogye</u>											



APPENDIX B

Interpretation of XRF Data Tables

XRF Data Tables



EXPLANATION OF XRF DATA TABLES

The table header displays the XL-309a serial number, site (optional), and data download date.

Column	Description
Reading No	Sample numbers.
Duration	Amount of time it took for the XRF to take the reading.
Units	Unit of measure that the XRF uses to report readings: mg/cm ² = milligrams per square centimeter.
Component	Specific building structural or design element being tested.
Substrate	Substrate. The type of material underlying the painted coating.
Side	Side of the structure where the specific reading was taken based on designations A, B, C, D, with A being the street (address) side of the structure.
Color	Color of the painted or varnished surface. (VARN = "varnished")
Result	Result of the test: NEG = negative POS = positive NULL = incomplete test / reading error

There is no inconclusive range for the Niton XL-309a.

Depth Index	A depth index reading of less than 1.5 indicates that lead is near the surface of the material tested. A depth index reading between 1.6 and 4 indicates that lead was found at a moderate depth. A depth index reading of 4 or higher indicates that lead was found deeply buried in the material tested.
Pbc	Combined L and K-Shell x-ray readings of lead level (in milligrams per square centimeter) with statistical precision range.
PbL, and PbK	L and K-Shell x-ray readings of lead level (in milligrams per square centimeter).

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Report

Reading No	COMPONENT	SUBSTRATE	SIDE	COLOR	FLOOR	ROOM	MISC 1	Results	PbC	PbL	PbK
1									2.21	0.39	0.01
2								Null	1	1	< LOD
3								Null	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
4								Negative	0.9	0.9	< LOD
5								Positive	1	1	< LOD
6	WALL	PLASTER	A	OFF-WHITE	BASEMENT	east		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
7	FLOOR	CONCRETE	A	BROWN	BASEMENT	east		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
8	DOOR	WOOD	D	WHITE	BASEMENT	east		Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
9	DOOR CASING	WOOD	A	WHITE	BASEMENT	east		Positive	4.1	4.1	< LOD
10	DOOR	WOOD	C	WHITE	BASEMENT	east		Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
11	STAIR-NEWEL POST	METAL	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	east		Positive	1.8	1.8	< LOD
12	STAIR-TREAD	CONCRETE	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	east		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
13	STAIR-RISER	WOOD	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	east		Positive	2.7	2.7	< LOD
14	WALL	ceramic	D	BEIGE	BASEMENT	east	w. rr	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
15	WALL	PLASTER	D	WHITE	BASEMENT	east	w. rr	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
16	DOOR	WOOD	D	WHITE	BASEMENT	east	w. rr	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
17	DOOR CASING	WOOD	D	WHITE	BASEMENT	east	w. rr	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
18	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	D	WHITE	BASEMENT	east	w. rr	Null	0.27	0.27	0.8
19	DOOR	WOOD	A	BROWN	FIRST	conf. rm		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
20	DOOR CASING	WOOD	A	BROWN	FIRST	conf. rm		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
21	WALL	PLASTER	A	WHITE	FIRST	conf. rm		Negative	0.7	< LOD	0.7
22	DOOR	METAL	B	BROWN	FIRST	conf. rm		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
23	DOOR CASING	WOOD	B	BROWN	FIRST	conf. rm		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
24	BASEBOARD	WOOD	B	BROWN	FIRST	conf. rm		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
25	DOOR	METAL	B	OFF-WHITE	FIRST	deed rm vault		Negative	0.7	0.7	< LOD
26	DOOR CASING	METAL	B	OFF-WHITE	FIRST	deed rm vault		Positive	2	2	< LOD
27	FLOOR	WOOD	A	tan	FIRST	deed rm vault		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
28	cabinet of deeds	METAL	B	OFF-WHITE	FIRST	deed room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
29	cabinet of deeds	METAL	A	BROWN	FIRST	deed room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
30	WALL	PLASTER	C	WHITE	FIRST	deed room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
31	BASEBOARD	WOOD	C	BLACK	FIRST	deed room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
32	DOOR	METAL	B	tan	FIRST	deed room		Negative	0.28	0.28	< LOD
33	DOOR CASING	WOOD	B	tan	FIRST	deed room		Positive	2.9	2.9	< LOD
34	COLUMN	PLASTER	B	WHITE	FIRST	deed room		Negative	0.21	0.21	< LOD
35	WALL	ceramic	B	WHITE	FIRST	deed room		Positive	2.6	2.6	< LOD
36	FLOOR	ceramic	B	multi	FIRST	deed room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
37	FLOOR	ceramic	A	multi	FIRST	FOYER		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
38	STAIR-NEWEL POST	WOOD	A	BROWN	FIRST	FOYER		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
39	STAIR-RAILING	WOOD	A	BROWN	FIRST	FOYER		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Reports

40	STAIR-STRINGER	WOOD	A	BROWN	FIRST	FOYER	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
41	bookcase	WOOD	B	BLACK	FIRST	Civil records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
42	FLOOR	ceramic	D	BLACK	FIRST	Civil records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
43	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	C	BLACK	FIRST	Civil records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
44	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	C	BLACK	FIRST	Civil records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
45	DOOR CASING	WOOD	A	BROWN	FIRST	Civil records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
46	BASEBOARD	WOOD	A	BROWN	FIRST	Civil records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
47	RADIATOR	METAL	C	silver	FIRST	Civil records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
48	WALL	PLASTER	A	WHITE	FIRST	Civil records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
49	MANTLE	WOOD	B	BROWN	FIRST	civil office	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
50	FLOOR	cerami	B	purple	FIRST	civil office	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
51	wall of fireplace	METAL	B	BLACK	FIRST	civil office	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
52	wall of fireplace	METAL	B	BLACK	FIRST	civil office	frame	Negative	0.8	0.8 < LOD
53	FLOOR	WOOD	A	BLACK	FIRST	civil office	frame	Negative	< LOD	< LOD < LOD
54	roof	METAL	A	silver		EXTERIOR	Positive	< LOD	5	< LOD
55	roof	METAL	A	WHITE		EXTERIOR	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
56	DOOR	WOOD	A	WHITE	BASEMENT	chan. records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
57	DOOR CASING	WOOD	B	WHITE	BASEMENT	chan. records rm	Positive	1.8	0.8	1.8
58	WALL	PLASTER	A	BEIGE	BASEMENT	chan. records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
59	COLUMN	METAL	A	RED	BASEMENT	chan. records rm	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
60	WALL	METAL	A	WHITE	BASEMENT	phone room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
61	BASEBOARD	WOOD	B	WHITE	BASEMENT	storage room	Positive	1.8	1.8	< LOD
62	WALL	WOOD	B	WHITE	BASEMENT	storage room	Negative	0.28	0.28	1.2
63	FLOOR	tile	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	storage room	Negative	0.13	0.13	< LOD
64	FLOOR	tile	A	RED	BASEMENT	storage room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
65	DOOR	WOOD	C	BEIGE	BASEMENT	storage room	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
66	DOOR CASING	WOOD	C	BEIGE	BASEMENT	storage room	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
67	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	D	WHITE	BASEMENT	storage room	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
68	shelves	WOOD	B	BEIGE	BASEMENT	scanning room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
69	STAIR-RISER	WOOD	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	server room	Positive	3.5	3.5	< LOD
70	STAIR-STRINGER	WOOD	A	BROWN	BASEMENT	server room	Positive	4.1	4.1	< LOD
71	DOOR	METAL	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	server room	vault	Positive	< LOD	< LOD < LOD
72	DOOR	WOOD	A	WHITE	BASEMENT	server room	vault	Negative	< LOD	< LOD < LOD
73	DOOR CASING	WOOD	B	WHITE	BASEMENT	server room	vault	Negative	0.5	0.5 < LOD
74	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	C	BLACK	BASEMENT	boiler room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
75	DOOR CASING	METAL	D	BROWN	BASEMENT	boiler room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
76	CEILING	METAL	N/A	BLACK	BASEMENT	boiler room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
77	DOOR	WOOD	B	WHITE	BASEMENT	west stairwell	Positive	4.2	4.2	< LOD
78	DOOR CASING	WOOD	C	WHITE	BASEMENT	west stairwell	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
79	STAIR-NEWEL POST	METAL	B	BLACK	BASEMENT	west stairwell	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Report

80	STAIR-RISER	WOOD	B	BLACK	BASEMENT	west stairwell	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
81	STAIR-STRINGER	WOOD	B	WHITE	BASEMENT	west stairwell	Positive	2.3	2.3	< LOD	
82	STAIR-STRINGER	WOOD	B	BLACK	BASEMENT	west stairwell	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
83	STAIR-TREAD	WOOD	B	gray	BASEMENT	west stairwell	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
84	WALL	ceramic	D	BEIGE	BASEMENT	w. stairwell rr	Positive	3	3	< LOD	
85	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	C	WHITE	BASEMENT	w. stairwell rr	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
86	DOOR	WOOD	D	BROWN	BASEMENT	lab	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
87	DOOR	WOOD	A	gray	BASEMENT	lab	Positive	3.1	3.1	< LOD	
88	DOOR CASING	WOOD	A	gray	BASEMENT	lab	Positive	5.4	5.4	< LOD	
89	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	A	BEIGE	BASEMENT	lab	Positive	24.1	< LOD	24.1	
90	WALL	PLASTER	D	GREEN	BASEMENT	storage room lab	Negative	0.27	0.27	< LOD	
91	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	A	GREEN	BASEMENT	storage room lab	Positive	1.6	0.4	1.6	
92	DOOR	WOOD	A	WHITE	BASEMENT	storage room lab	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
93	DOOR CASING	WOOD	D	WHITE	BASEMENT	storage room lab	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
94	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	D	BROWN	SECOND	holding cell	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
95	WINDOW-SASH	METAL	D	BLACK	SECOND	holding cell	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
96	FLOOR	tile	A	RED	SECOND	holding cell	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
97	BASEBOARD	WOOD	D	BROWN	SECOND	holding cell	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
98	WALL	PLASTER	C	RED	SECOND	court room	Null	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
99	WALL	PLASTER	C	RED	SECOND	court room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
100	CLOSET DOOR	METAL	C	gray	SECOND	jury passage	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
101	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	D	BROWN	SECOND	jury room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
102	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	D	BROWN	SECOND	jury room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
103	WALL	PLASTER	B	WHITE	SECOND	jury room	Positive	1.4	0.4	1.4	
104	DOOR	WOOD	A	WHITE	SECOND	jury womens rr	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
105	DOOR CASING	WOOD	B	WHITE	SECOND	jury womens rr	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
106	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	D	WHITE	SECOND	jury room hallway	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
107	BASEBOARD	WOOD	D	WHITE	SECOND	clerks office	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
108	DOOR	WOOD	D	WHITE	SECOND	clerks office	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
109	DOOR CASING	WOOD	C	WHITE	SECOND	clerks office	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
110	WALL	WOOD	B	WHITE	SECOND	judges chambers	Null	1	0.16	1	
111	WALL	WOOD	B	WHITE	SECOND	judges chambers	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
112	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	B	BLACK	SECOND	judges chambers	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
113	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	B	BLACK	SECOND	judges chambers	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
114	DOOR	WOOD	A	GREEN	BASEMENT	old records room	Negative	0.5	0.5	< LOD	
115	DOOR CASING	WOOD	B	GREEN	BASEMENT	old records room	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD	
116	DOOR	METAL	A	GREEN	BASEMENT	old records room	vault	Positive	7.2	7.2	< LOD
117	DOOR CASING	METAL	D	GREEN	BASEMENT	old records room	vault	Positive	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
118	WALL	METAL	D	YELLOW	BASEMENT	old records room	vault	Null	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
119	WALL	PLASTER	D	YELLOW	BASEMENT	old records room	vault	Null	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD

Appendix C - Hazardous Materials Reports

120	WALL	PLASTER	D	YELLOW	BASEMENT	old records room	vault	Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
121	WALL	PLASTER	D	WHITE	BASEMENT	old records room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
122	STAIR-RISER	WOOD	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	old records room		Positive	2.7	2.7	< LOD
123	STAIR-TREAD	CONCRETE	A	WHITE	BASEMENT	old records room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
124	STAIR-STRINGER	METAL	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	old records room		Positive	4.2	4.2	< LOD
125	STAIR-NEWEL POST	METAL	A	BLACK	BASEMENT	old records room		Positive	3.3	3.3	< LOD
126	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	B	BROWN	FIRST	break room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
127	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	B	BLACK	FIRST	break room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
128	WALL	DRYWALL	B	BEIGE	FIRST	break room		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
129	WINDOW-CASING	WOOD	A	BEIGE	front	EXTERIOR		Positive	20	< LOD	20
130	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	A	BEIGE	front	EXTERIOR		Negative	< LOD	< LOD	< LOD
131	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	A	BEIGE	front	EXTERIOR		Null	1	1	0.6
132	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	A	BEIGE	front	EXTERIOR		Null	1	1	0.6
133	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	A	BEIGE	front	EXTERIOR		Positive	1.9	1	1.9
134	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	A	BEIGE	front	EXTERIOR		Positive	2.3	1	2.3
135	WINDOW-SILL	WOOD	A	BEIGE	front	EXTERIOR		Positive	2	1	2



Appendix D - Timeline



The Augusta County Courthouse is located at the intersection of South Augusta Street and East Johnson Street in the City of Staunton, Virginia. The present building is the fifth Courthouse structure on the site; which has been virtually in continuous use since the organization of Augusta County in 1745.

1745

The first Augusta County Courthouse was a simple log structure built in 1745 by William Beverley. Beverley, who had received a land grant of 118,491 acres from Lt. Gov. William Gooch in 1736, had established his Mill Place (present day Staunton) near the center of that grant. He offered this log courthouse structure and two acres of land to the justices of the newly formed county. By July 16, 1746, Beverley had increased his offer to 25 acres.

Upon review of his offer, the county commission declined as it was found to be “entirely ill convenient and useless, being most part of it on a barren hill or mountain where the county cannot pretend to sell one lot...it affording neither firewood nor water, no spring being included in the whole twenty-five acres...” (Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish Settlement in Virginia). Beverley’s gift, however, was accepted in Williamsburg and the town platted in 1747. The courthouse and twenty-five acres were officially conveyed on April 21, 1749 and the town named Staunton.

1755

The first courthouse was sold and converted to a dwelling in 1755, when a second log structure, this one with a chimney and fireplace, was completed.

1789

As Staunton grew and developed, County commissioners saw the need for a new courthouse to symbolize the county’s transition from frontier to a more stable and prosperous community. The third courthouse, a two-story stone structure, was completed in 1789. The 1745 courthouse (and likely the 1755 courthouse) were razed to at this time.

1835

By 1833, Staunton was well-established and the home of Western Lunatic Asylum – the first building erected with public funds west of the Blue Ridge mountains. Contemporary accounts list among the many attributes of the town its beautiful edifices for public worship, elegant brick dwelling houses, several turnpike roads, and taverns kept in good style. (Kercheval)

It was against this backdrop that the 1789 courthouse was considered “an unsightly stone structure.” (Waddell). Therefore, in November of 1834 an advertisement appeared in the Staunton Spectator for proposals for the construction of a new courthouse. The contract for the design of the fourth Augusta County courthouse was awarded to Thomas R. Blackburn. A mention in Joseph Martin’s 1836 Gazetteer noted that the new building would be “unquestionably the finest building of its kind in any county in the state.” The 1789 courthouse remained in use until 1835 at which time the site was cleared. Original drawings for the 1835 courthouse, as well as some photographs survive.

The design of the fourth courthouse reflects Jeffersonian influences as Blackburn had worked on the construction of the West Range at the University of Virginia and had studied many of Jefferson’s reference books as well as Jefferson’s own courthouse drawings. Regarded as perhaps “the purest example of Jeffersonian classicism created” (Green) by any of Jefferson’s former workmen, its plan would be the foundation on which the current courthouse would later be erected.

The footprint of this courthouse is recorded on the 1899 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and shows that the 1835 courthouse was located at the rear of the courthouse lot abutting the alley.

1837

On May 11, 1837 the *Staunton Spectator* reported that gentlemen of Staunton and Augusta County had negotiated a \$300 contract price for Mr. Sully to execute a portrait of John Marshall after seeing the portrait painted by him hanging in the Common Hall in the City of Richmond. Mr. Sully accompanied the finished portrait and chose the location in which it would hang. The Board of Supervisors authorized a \$60 expenditure for hanging which took place on May 30, 1838. This is the portrait that today hangs over the judge's bench.

1900

May/June By the spring of 1900, the old courthouse was in need of modernization/remodeling. Court records show that a building committee was established by the Board of Supervisors (Court Order Book 4, page 16) and that T. J. Collins was hired as architect for the remodeling (Court Order Book 4, page 36 – June 4, 1900) to make two plans one with the courtroom on the first floor and one with the courtroom on the second floor and to provide cost estimates for each at a fee of \$300.

“Carefully examining into the situation confronting us and painfully aware of the ever present danger threatening the records of our County, which have been accumulating for more than a century, involving as it would in case of their destruction irreparable loss to our citizens as well as possible unending litigation in very many cases, we are firmly convinced that some initiating steps should be taken at once to avert the disaster which stares us in the face; and to this end we recommend that from the Levy of this year a sum equal to 10 cents on \$100 valuation be set aside as a nucleus towards an improvement or remodeling of our Courthouse as specified in the plans submitted or in others that may be adopted as feasible and to accomplish this would suggest that all other County improvements and interests not emphatically necessary should be made subservient to this special work and recognized necessity. (Pages 37-38)

Sept. 20 The Building Committee reported that they had advertised for the proposed rebuilding, had received bids, and had chosen the low bidder, A. F. Withrow and Company for the project at a fee of \$29,900.

October 7 A question of the disposition of the material coming out of the old courthouse, unfit for use in the new, was brought before the Board and an auction was authorized for this date.

October 8 Board considered revision of plans to extend the same five feet in front; and using Cleveland Hydraulic Press Brick for the Exterior. An additional sum of \$1,000 for the revision and \$300 for the brick was approved. The proposed changes were accepted and the total cost of the building was now listed as \$31,200.

October 23 Attention of the Board turns to the consideration of public sentiment “largely in favor of building a new courthouse and placing the new building in or near the middle of the Court House Square, instead of remodeling the old building and placing it on the old foundation.” The cost of such was estimated at \$4504 by A. F. Withrow per plans and specifications made by T. J. Collins. Withrow’s proposition stated “We will tear down all of the brick walls and tear out all of the foundation on the main body of the house and excavate 20 or 25 feet forward and build a new porch on the North to correspond with the South side, make all necessary arrangements to put plumbing from the rear of the corridor in the basement, all as laid out on the sketches submitted to you for \$4504. This price is based on our original figures and are just as low as we can possibly do it.”

The proposal was accepted and the cost of the new courthouse now was \$35,704. A motion was made to eliminate the steel blinds on the new building therefore saving \$504 which carried.

December 27 Cornerstone laid for new courthouse by Staunton Lodge No. 13, A.F. and A.M. this lodge having been in continuous and successful operation since October 28, 1786.

1901

January 26 The building committee recommended to the Board that the contractor build four pairs of circular steps to the porches for the new courthouse for \$600 which was ratified.

At the same meeting “the question of revising the plans of the new courthouse to the extent of adding a tower was taken up. The T. J. Collins plans, reviewed by the contractor, resulted in an offer of \$4,200 additional cost for the project, which brought the total project cost to \$40,000.

February 8 Building Committee reported that they had contracted for the furniture and interior work with The M. Ohmer's Sons Company of Dayton, Ohio for the sum of \$4080, for the metallic work they had contracted with the Art Metal Construction Company of Jamestown, NY (the world's first manufacturer of metal furniture, also railings, etc.) for the sum of \$4,900, for the heating with the Staunton Heating Company of Martin's Ferry, Ohio for the sum of \$1,425 having made a "careful examination of several systems for heating public buildings..."

It was brought to the attention of the Board that the contract called for the interior woodwork to be pine. By unanimous vote the Board amended the contract to specify oak, and that the doors be of quartered oak and at additional cost of \$400.

June 8 Murray and Kilgallew, the contractors for plumbing, were instructed to put one washstand each in the county and circuit court clerk's offices not exceeding \$75 and if able to meet that price, to add one in the County treasurer's office.

August 10 An auction to sell the old court house radiators and the fencing was authorized

November 9 Date set for ceremonies "attending the acceptance and opening of the new Court House. An article in the *Staunton Spectator and Vindicator* on November 15 records the event. The ceremonies were called to order in front of "a large audience assembled in the spacious courtroom of the handsome new courthouse of Augusta County" by Elijah Coiner, president of the Board of Supervisors, a blessing of the audience and the work was invoked by Rev. Gen. W. Finley, D.D. of Tinkling Springs, the Hon. A. F. Withrow turned the keys to the building over to Mr. Smiley on behalf of the board. As part of the remarks it was stated that the complete cost of the building was \$55,257.32 of which \$24,824.50 had been paid and the remainder was secured by warrants at four percent.

Mr. W. A. Pratt gave a "chaste and ornate speech" and introduced Capt. James Bumgardner, Jr., one of the oldest practitioners at the Staunton bar. A marble tablet given by the Beverly Manor Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution was presented to the Board of Supervisors. It is built into the side wall of the courtroom.

The article described the courtroom as "large and fitted with opera chairs; the clerks' offices are provided with fireproof vaults for the safekeeping of papers, records, etc. The halls and stairways are broad, the floors being of artificial veined marble. The most modern appliance for heating are used and the building has both electric and gas lights.

Note: A ledger located at the back of Court Order Book 4, entitled "Statement of Costs attending the Construction of the New Court House, Removing Records, Etc. lists costs associated with the project

According to WPA Historical Inventory (dated 2-25-1937), there were originally eight rooms on the first floor and six rooms on the second.

"The rooms consisted of the Clerk's office, County Treasurer's office, Sheriff's office, a spacious courtroom, on the second floor, and the Judge's office and other small rooms or offices. The halls are large with marble floors. Some of the floors are of wood. The Court Room is covered with tiled linoleum. Around the walls of the Court Room are painted portraits of various clerks of the Court, Judges, and other officials."

1902

May Board instructs clerk to send to A.F. Withrow, the bill for the repair of the roof of the new courthouse in the amount of \$28.00.

1903

February 14 Call for additional roof repair and payment for work on tiling repair

1903 continued

March 28 It is brought to the attention of the Board that the roof on the courthouse is in “a very bad condition” and will have to be replaced with one of “the best tin.”

Flavin & Watson contracted for “putting a new tin roof on the courthouse” for \$600 with a two year guarantee.

Committee appointed to advertise and sell the slate taken from the roof of the courthouse

1904

March 31 The Commissioner of Public Buildings brings to the Board’s attention “that the plastering on the ceiling of the Court House is in a very bad condition and is constantly falling off and will have to be repaired.

Recommended that the contract for “repairing, frescoing and beautifying the walls and ceiling of the courtroom” be awarded to J. G. Valiant Company of Baltimore for \$400.

May 23 Building committee authorized to “do what is necessary to put the courthouse in thorough repair” and to contract for and install a new heating system.

June 18 Award of contract for “frescoing the offices and halls of the courthouse” awarded to J. G. Valiant of Baltimore for \$700.00.

December 12 Order “that guttering be placed over the main entrance to prevent water from falling in front on the same in bad weather.”

1938

By January of 1938, Court Order Book 10 shows that plans were being sought for the remodeling of the courthouse when Sam Collins came before the Board and stated that he could not enter into competition with other architects, but if all other architects were released he “would be glad to enter into the picture.”

January 27 Mr. S. Daley Craig of Daley Craig and Fleming Hurt, Architects of Waynesboro can before the Board with tentative plans and a cost estimate of \$34,400 and the following day the Board voted to employ him for the work.

March The lawyers occupying the Lawyer’s Row building north of the courthouse (Messrs. Timberlake, Peyton, Carter, Cochran, and Curry) spoke in opposition to the extension on the north side of the courthouse “stating it would effect property values adjacent to the courthouse, create a bad lighting situation, and thought that the addition, if an addition be added, should be placed on the front of the courthouse; but rather suggested in lieu of an addition, which they termed a piece-meal manner of building, that an entirely new courthouse be built which could be financed at this time at a very low rate of interest and would be looking toward the future for many years to come.”

After adjourning to meet privately with the architects and the Clerk the Board of Supervisors returned with the opinion that “no addition should be placed at the front of the courthouse; it being the opinion of the architects that a front addition would greatly increase the cost of remodeling.”

April 7 A public meeting was held at which the architects, Messrs. Craig and Hurt, presented the original plans adopted by the Board on January 28, 1938 as well as plans that addressed objections that had been raised by the attorneys. After considering comments the Board was of the opinion that original plans that called “for extending and enlarging the courthouse would adequately meet the needs for many years to come; and agreed with the architects in their recommendation to abandon the idea of remodeling the interior only.

April 28 The Clerk asked to Board about the possibility of securing a PWA grant for the remodeling. While it was decided that the Clerk should look into this, the wish was not to delay the building program and to continue with the plan to use County funds.

June 6 A special meeting was called to receive bids for the remodeling. H. H. Brooks was the low bid for general construction, W. R. Barnett for plumbing and heating, Eskay Electric Co., for electrical work, and Beverley Book Store for Equipment with a grand total of \$54,071 “for the work contemplated to be done.”

June 16 At the next meeting of the Board a resolution was passed to seek funds through the “Emergency Administration of Public Works for a grant to aid in financing the additions and alterations to the Augusta County Courthouse.” As they had reserved the right, all previously submitted bids were rejected.

July 28 The Board approved additional fees for the architect to prepare additional plans to be submitted to PWA specifications.

A wage scale for the project was also approved, pending PWA approval.

In order to assure the PWA that the County of Augusta was able to finance its part of the remodeling, a warrant was drawn from the General Fund to establish the “Augusta County Courthouse Building Fund” in the amount of \$35,491 which was 55% of the total cost of the proposed alterations and additions under project No. 1264.

Having been notified by the Public Works Administration of the Government’s willingness to assist the County of Augusta in making alterations and additions... by and through a grant of 45%, the Board of Supervisors voted to accept the offer of the PWA.

August 8 A special meeting was called at which a resolution was passed accepting the PWA aid.

At the same meeting a revised wage scale based on a prior project funded by the PWA (VA 1082-D) in Waynesboro on March 24, 1938 was adopted.

August 20 *The Staunton News-Leader* announced that “sealed bids for the alterations and enlargement of the historic Augusta County courthouse” would be advertised on that date by the Augusta County Board of Supervisors “and continued until September 7, when the contracts for the work will likely be awarded.” According to then Clerk C. K. Yancey the work fell into four categories; general construction, plumbing and heating, electrical work, and equipment. Of the overall \$52,000 budget, \$41,600 was allotted to general construction.

August 25 Wage scale adjusted again.

September 7 A special meeting was called to receive bids which are recorded in full in the court order book. Bids for the remodeling of the courthouse were opened in the presence of the eighteen to twenty bidders as well as the architects, Daley Craig and Fleming Hurt of Waynesboro, the Board of Supervisors, and Bennett B. Caldwell of the Atlanta PWA office.

September 8 *The Staunton News-Leader* printed the successful bidders with the equipment contract awarded to the Wilkinson Equipment Company of Philadelphia for \$5,868; W.S. Moffett of Staunton for plumbing and heating for \$4,682; Eskay Electric Co. of Staunton for electrical work for \$5,546. The low bidder for general construction was J. L. Clarke and W.C. Hicks of Crozet for \$37,300, however, due to a technicality this bid could not be accepted and the award for general construction went to H.S. Brooks of Waynesboro.

The paper reported that the supervisors also inspected the buildings at 16 and 20 South Augusta for temporary offices for courthouse officials.

September 17 *The Staunton News-Leader* records that the plans and grants to the Board of Supervisors had been approved and that work would start on September 26. Court order books transfer the courthouse to Staunton on September 27, 1938, once work has commenced.

September 22 The supervisors chose the Bowman Hardware building for temporary court offices and instructed the Clerk to make arrangements for heating the building.

1939

1938 continued

February 23 Certain unforeseen change sin the heating system required a change order. The changes listed in the court order book (page 389) include splitting the main in the clerk's storage room into two one-half inch lines and a number of changes in number and size of radiators. These changes were to be accomplished with no change in the contract price.

A letter from the director of the PWA asked the Board to erect a suitable bronze plaque to be paid for out of the funds already appropriated. The Board instructed the Clerk to have the architect draw a sketch to be submitted to PWA for approval.

June 15 Clerk was ordered by the Board to obtain prices on Venetian blinds after consideration of what kind of shades, blinds or awnings should be used on the courthouse.

June 28 A request for a change order included:

- Replastering of basement sidewalls of stairhalls #1 and #2 and the men's and women's toilets above the tile.
- Build out and replastering of the chimney in the Judge's office
- Patching the auditorium ceiling
- Cut off the chimney in the Chancery files room
- Close up fireplace and replaster wall
- Seven new doors specified as pine to be changed to oak
- New trim for six old basement windows
- Where grilles are called for in cupola for two exhaust fans these be changed to louvers with automatic shutters
- Tile in corridors 201, and 203 to be extended around pilasters to vestibules 201 and 202
- Old tile in first floor halls that is loose to be taken down and replaced
- Walls and ceilings of auditorium to be painted two coats, the plaster cove three coats
- In basement stairhall #2, men's toilet and women's toilet old concrete floor not to proper grade to be removed and replaced

And on the exterior:

- Concrete paving at northeast corner, also at northwest corner, and where paving was removed for new drain line, now concrete paving to be provided
- Paving in alley where new drain line was laid to be replaced
- Asphalt tile floor in Treasurer's Storage No. 1 and 2 to be omitted
- 4" concrete floor in boiler room to be laid
- New hardware to be provided for basement windows

Changes were also requested for plumbing and electrical work (page 413)

July 24 Special meeting called to accept work and assign quarters
School board received three rooms on the lower floor, the room on the second floor between the Judge and the Commissioner of Revenue, and the two rooms in the basement originally intended for the Sheriff.

July 31 The court order books return the courthouse to the county once the additions and alterations have been completed.

August 24 The Clerk reported that construction had been completed at a total construction cost of \$58,478.84

1941

May 22 Authorization of "construction of shelving for storage in the basement of the courthouse and letters on the doors of the various offices of the courthouse the respective names of these offices."

1947

April 3 Sealed bids were opened for painting the interior and exterior of the courthouse and decision was made to install Cellotex in the Board Room, and the offices of the Board

1949

June 9 Boar authorized the building committee to employ S.J. Collins the examine the courtroom and advertise for bids for redecorating said courtroom

July 12 Bids received but few responses so referred back to Collins with the request to try to secure more bids

July 18 Bids received and the contract awarded to J. S. Mathers for \$8,518 for specifications B, C, D, E, & G

Bids were also received on air-conditioning and the committee referred these to the Board for action, as this had not been discussed with them previously.

Building committee also noted that the "portraits in the Courtroom need cleaning and frames touched up before they can be hung on clean walls." Robert W. Johnson was hired at \$2.50 per hour.

July 25 Work starts on the remodeling of the courtroom

August 1 Called meeting of the committee as complications had arisen including "all the plaster fell from the ceiling of the Courtroom," "walls have cracked," and "the fan will have to be removed from the ceiling."

J.S. Mathers awarded the contract to prepare the courtroom for air-conditioning and received authorization to cut the necessary outlets and put in grates "as approved by S.J. Collins, Architect."

Archives of the T. J. Collins and Sons firm document the alterations and decorating of the courtroom including a reduction in the height of the wainscoting, removal of trim from windows flanking the judge's bench, a new console and pediment over the judge's bench, new plaster cornice and acoustic plaster finish on coved ceiling, closure of two fireplaces in courtroom and removal of mantels and hearths, new lighting, ceiling decoration, location of air conditioning unit over toilet rooms, additional HVAC ductwork, schematic for location of portraits on courtroom wall, and addition of ventilation louvers to doors.

August 4 S. J. Collins writes to the Board of Supervisors to draw their attention to the problem of there being "29 portraits which were placed around the walls indiscriminately and in a disorderly fashion." He states his intention that the portrait of John Marshall should be placed over the judge's platform and the portrait of Henry Holt, another Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Virginia be placed in the corresponding location at the opposite end of the room.

He further suggested that the portraits in the courtroom should be limited to jurists presiding over the Circuit Court and other members of the Staunton Bar and citizens of this locality. Portraits of clerks and other attendants and prominent attorneys were to be placed in conspicuous locations in corridors and other places in the courthouse. His plan also called for moving the stone tablets that "stick out like sore thumbs" to the first story corridor.

August 22 Accepted bid of Drumheller Electrical Company in the amount of \$5,422 for air-conditioning the courtroom.

Supervisors choose electric lights for the courtroom to be purchased from M. A. Hartley & Company – Number B-40073 – at a cost of \$675.00 each, from choices presented by Collins.

Accepted the recommendation of Collins regarding the arrangement of portrait subject to the approval of Judge Floridus Crosby.

September 30 Board authorizes S. J. Collins to secure prices on chairs for the courtroom and to purchase radiators "for the Courtroom in accordance with the new architectural design."

Board requests that Miller Lumber Company makes windows "at once" as they have to be installed by October 15, 1949.

1949 continued

November 3 S. J. Collins brings to meeting representatives from the Flowers School Equipment Company and the American Seating Company (both companies located in Richmond) to present prices on chairs. Board authorizes purchase of 128 chairs from Flowers School Equipment Company at \$9.85 each, installed and six chairs for the counsel table in the courtroom to match said table.

Supervisors request that Collins have J.S. Mathers place bust of John Brown Baldwin in Courtroom and to also have Mathers place plaques as suggested by Collins.

December 7 S. J. Collins writes to the Board of Supervisors with a number of requests to be considered at the Dec. 8 meeting.

Chairs to be delivered in January per order with addition of 10 chairs for attorneys and their clients and two swivel chairs for the clerk and sheriff.

Changes to heating in the courtroom for more efficient operation and less cost. Addition of valves to radiators in other rooms to maintain even temperature and reduce fuel consumption.

Needing further direction about footrests in jury box and whether or not to cut off passway between box and steps to Judge's bench.

Notification that clock with bronze numerals and hands to match has been ordered to be placed over Judge Holt's portrait.

Request to add dark red linoleum and nosing on table and asks for consideration that same be done to judge's bench and sheriff's and clerk's desks.

1988

In preparation for the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of Augusta County (November 1, 1738), several updates to the courthouse were made. Most notably, on the exterior, brick was laid over the concrete walkways in front of the courthouse. The Beverley Patent stone (discovered in 1908 by William McCue) that had previously been outside was moved into the east hallway along with its 1913 information marker. The flagpoles and map of the original bounds of Augusta County were also installed at this time.

In addition to the patent marker, several other historical displays were added in the east hallway, highlighting the history of the county, the courts, and a number of important individuals. Upstairs, the courtroom was the recipient of several improvements. Among these was the change from a charcoal gray to the current red wall color, based on consultation with the Virginia Historical Society, the installation of carpeting, and a slight change in the location of the separation railing. Curtains between the two sets of windows behind the judge's bench (dating to the 1949 remodeling) were removed and due to condition could not be reused. The current shutters were installed at this time.

At approximately the same time, the building's coal boiler was replaced with a gas boiler.

2004

Joe Johnson of the T. J. Collins and Son provided drawings for the remodeling of a new Courtroom 2, formerly a judge's office. MEI provided mechanical drawings. Originally, three separate rooms, one wall had already been removed and during this work the remaining wall was removed to 2'9" and the brick encased in wood. Other work included:

A judge's bench and clerk's desk was added at the opposite end of the room

2' by 2' ceiling tiles were added at this time

Existing light fixtures were relocated and augmented with new lighting

Celotex wallboard was removed and drywall installed above the wainscot

Damaged wood trim was repaired/replaced to match existing

Drywall was mounted on furring strips to cover existing glass block to courtroom interior

New shutters for window behind judge's bench

Closet added to house HVAC



Appendix E - Bibliography



Site visit to courthouse

Interviews with Augusta County Circuit Court staff, Clerk, and Judge

Augusta County Court Order Books, Verona Government Center

Augusta County Geographical Information Systems (online)

Staunton Public Library (microfiche)

Staunton Spectator and Vindicator - various dates

The Staunton News Leader - various dates

Hamrick Historic Photograph Collection

Historic Staunton Foundation

T.J. Collins and Sons Archive - 1901, 1949, 2004 drawings

Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps for Staunton

Architectural Inventory Sheet

Publications Archive to include:

Staunton in 1906, 1904 Rotogravure Staunton Evening News, Staunton in 1901

Virginia Department of Historic Resources: National Register Nominations

132-0001 Augusta County Courthouse

132-0024 Beverley Historic District

U. S. National Archives and Records Administration, Records of the Public Works Administration, Record Group 135 (1933-1945)

Beyer, Ed. and Rau, W. *Staunton, Va.* American Memory, Library of Congress. Original work published ca. 1857.

Chalkley, Lyman. *The Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish Settlement in Virginia: 1745 to 1800*. Rosslyn, VA: The Commonwealth Printing Company for Mary S. Lockwood, Honorary Vice president General, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. 1912

Crowder, Margaret A. *WPA Historical Inventory: The Court House of Augusta County* (dated 2-25-1937)

Frazier, William T. "T. J. Collins: A Local Virginia Architect and His Practice at the Turn of the Century" M.A. Thesis, University of Virginia, 1976.

Gordon, Armistead C. *Staunton, Virginia: Its Past, Present, and Future*. 1890

Green, Bryan Clark. *In Jefferson's Shadow: The Architecture of Thomas R. Blackburn*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press. 2006:

Hardenbergh, Don, ed. *Virginia Courthouse Facility Guidelines*. Williamsburg, VA: Courtworks. 2001

Historic Staunton Foundation. *Staunton, Va.: A Pictorial History* (Marceline, MO: Walsworth Press Inc. 1985)

Kercheval, Samuel. (2009). *A History of the Valley of Virginia* (1833; 3rd ed. 1902) (p. 62). (Electronic ed.2009). Rockwood, TN: EagleRidge Technologies. (Original work third ed. published 1902). Retrieved from <http://www.roanehistory.org/kercheval-valley-virginia>.

Morris, Brenda L. "The Courthouses of Augusta County" Senior Project, Mary Baldwin College, 1980. As published in The Augusta County Historical Society *Bulletin* Spring, 1989.

Peyton, J. Lewis. (2006). *History of Augusta County, Virginia*. (Electronic ed.). Rockwood, TN: EagleRidge Technologies. (Original work published 1882). Retrieved from <http://www.roanetnhistory.org/peyttons.php?loc=PeytonsHistory>

Waddell, J. A. (2006). *Waddell's Annals of Augusta County, Virginia from 1726 to 1871* (Second ed.). (Electronic ed.). Rockwood, TN: EagleRidge Technologies. (Original work second ed. published 1902). Retrieved from <http://www.roanetnhistory.org/bookread.php?loc=WaddellsAnnals>