

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 2006

Committee Members Present:	Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings
Supervisors Haskell	William Remington, Superintendent, Dept. of
O'Connor	Public Works
F. Thomas	William Lamy, Deputy Superintendent, Dept. of
Champagne	Public Works
VanNess	William Thomas, Chairman
Geraghty	Joan Parsons, Administrator
Girard	Joan Sady, Clerk
	Paul Dusek, County Attorney
	Alexander Gabriels, Supervisor
	Nicholas Caimano, Supervisor
	Carlene A. Ramsey, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist

Mr. Haskell called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Motion was made by Mr. F. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the last meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk.

Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings, distributed an Agenda packet to each of the Committee members and a copy is on file with the minutes.

Mr. Haskell called for a report on Agenda Item 2, Space. Privilege of the floor was extended to Mr. Remington who reported an RFP (request for proposal) was issued for both projects. He explained the RFPs were mailed late last week and would be opened on March 22, 2006. In addition, he said, the RFP stipulated that all of the consultants were to attend a mandatory meeting on Monday, March 6<sup>th</sup>. The intention, he noted, was to ensure that all bidders would be given the same explanation, same walk around, same opportunity to understand what the County was looking for.

As for Item 2B) Health and Human Services Building, Mr. Remington reported, the building would house the Office For the Aging, Health Services, Youth Bureau, Veterans Services, and Social Services. He said he learned, just this morning, that the Office of Employment and Training was also interested in relocating to the building.

Mr. VanNess commented, as a member of the Federal Programs Committee, he understood the annual lease on the Employment and Training Offices would be over \$43,000. He reminded the Supervisors the County had refused to sign the lease because it required a common lease area that was additional space at an additional cost.

Mr. Remington stated he would look into what type of square footage E&T would need and see how it would fit in to the Health and Human Services Building. He queried whether or not the Committee would like E&T included in the building.

Following a brief discussion, motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to authorize the E&T Offices be included in the Health and Human Services Building's design.

Mr. Girard observed the E&T Office was currently housed along with the State Department of Labor (DOL) in a 10,000 square foot space. He said he understood the State wanted to keep everything together and was willing to pay \$18 per square foot (sq.ft.) for its current space.

Mr. O'Connor entered the meeting at 2:05 p.m.

Mrs. Parsons observed that E&T's lease was never negotiated to a point where the County would authorize it for signature. At the last meeting, she stated, a resolution was passed to rescind any action on the lease.

Mr. Girard explained his position was that the State has been difficult and has not been helpful in the negotiations thus far. However, he also noted the State has emphasized its desire to keep the two offices together for funding, etc. Therefore, he queried whether or not the County would want to invite the State to relocate the DOL in the new Health and Human Services Building, and pay the County the same \$18 per square foot.

Mr. Remington commented that the building was already at 76,500 sq. ft.. If the DOL offices were to be added (at 10,000 sq. ft.) he noted that was a sizeable addition to the building.

Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to limit the Health and Human Services Building to just the E&T Department, at this time.

Mr. Remington pointed out that once the new building was completed and all the Departments relocated, the old Social Services Building would be removed. He also stated the former WIC building may need to be removed to free up some space for the new building.

Returning to Agenda review at Item 2A) Building Addition Proposal, Mr. Remington explained the RFP had been broken down into 4 separate blocks of work, as he referred to pages 2 & 3 of the RFP (a copy is attached to the minutes, for further information).

Mr. Haskell observed that Judge Krogmann was in attendance today and he invited him to speak to the Committee regarding the Court's needs and desires.

Judge Krogmann reported that on December 29, 2005 he toured the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors

of Building 5 with Chairman Haskell, Supervisor O'Connor and the County Administrator, Joan Parsons. He said the group had discussed the concept of the Office of Court Administration possibly filling in the void resulting from the relocation of various County offices, including everything associated with the Board of Supervisors. He acknowledged that the Office of Court Administration had missed the opportunity to expand into the void resulting from the Sheriff's Office relocating (a year or so ago). He noted that space would have solved the Court's needs on a short-term basis.

Judge Krogmann explained the new proposal regarding Building 5, offered more of a long-term solution for the various Courts. Therefore, he reported he had immediately contacted Judge Caruso, the Administrative Judge of the Fourth District, who in-turn passed the request up the line to the Office of Court Administration (OCA) in New York City. He reported that OCA has acted quickly, including the Budget Offices.

Judge Krogmann reported he had consulted with the various judges and it seemed the available space may be most advantageous to the Family Court and all of its related agencies. In fact, he remarked that at 3:00 p.m. today, he was scheduled to meet with OCA personnel, their architect, Budget personnel and Judge Breen to discuss, in much more detail, the concept of relocating to Building 5.

Therefore, Judge Krogmann stated, the OCA would need to respond to the opportunity. He acknowledged that the sooner an answer could be provided, the better it would be for the Courts and for the County. He said the OCA was aware of the County's need for a quick response and he was hopeful that today's meeting would expedite an answer.

Mr. Wm. Thomas said that if OCA was not interested in relocating to the available space, he wondered what other options the OCA would exercise.

Judge Krogmann commented the only other option would be new construction to provide the additional space required. He concurred with Mr. Thomas that the County would be responsible for the new construction costs that the OCA would in-turn rent back from the County.

Mr. Thomas clarified that the OCA would agree to pay the costs for renovations of an existing structure, but would not pay the costs of new construction.

Judge Krogmann stated that he felt the Court's move into Building 5 would make a lot of sense, financially, for the County. He said he expected the OCA Budget people to propose that the County pay for the expenses to convert the Board Room into a Court Room.

Mr. O'Connor pointed out the OCA's slow response to the former Sheriff's Office, a year ago, was in no way due to any action by Judge Krogmann. He also commended Judge Krogmann, for whatever he said to the OCA, because "today's 3:00 p.m. meeting was the fastest he has seen any group move in a long time."

A brief discussion ensued regarding a variety of building security methods available.

Mr. Haskell extended his appreciation to Judge Krogmann for attending today's meeting and for providing such a thorough update to the Committee. He urged the Judge to keep the Committee apprised of any actions taken following the 3:00 .m. meeting with OCA.

Mr. Remington stated the current proposal was the first time the County had tackled such a comprehensive project and addressed the space needs of the Courts, as well. He urged Judge Krogmann to stress upon the OCA the magnitude of the project and the useful life of at least 20 years.

In summary, Mr. Remington reported a very rough cost estimate on the proposed projects would be approximately \$32 Million (for the new H&HS building across the road at 76,000 sq. ft.; MC addition at 28,000 sq. ft. with 14,000 in the basement; Office renovations of 10,000 sq. ft.; Court Room and Offices of 15,000 sq. ft.; and the old Jail wing of 15,000 sq. ft.)

Mr. Haskell observed that page 3 of the Agenda packet contained Mr. Remington's "Best Guess Schedule" for the construction projects. He said when he compared the Normal and the Fast Track Schedules, he felt the Fast Track was way too slow.

General discussion ensued regarding the time line.

Mr. O'Connor remarked that May to December for design and bid was far too long.

Mr. Haskell reminded the Committee members of how quickly and efficiently the new Corrections Facility was constructed.

Mr. Remington pointed out that a large portion of the Corrections Facility had been precast offsite and then assembled in modules. He observed the current projects were attempting to address the needs of a dozen different departments that all wanted input on the building.

Mr. Haskell urged the Committee to designate 2 or 3 key people to determine the office arrangements and limit the individual input.

Mr. Caimano remarked that once the Construction Manager was hired, he felt that was the person the Committee would pressure to keep the project on track.

Mr. Remington said he understood the County Attorney's recommendation had been to hire the Engineer/architect through the current RFP; then issue a similar RFP for a Construction Manager. At that time, he said, the County could request work schedules from the experts.

Mrs. Parsons queried if anyone had reviewed the feasibility study and evaluated

whether or not the requested space was realistic.

Mr. Remington explained the feasibility study had never been completed, and had therefore been included in the current RFP. He confirmed the Board of Supervisors would certainly have input on the project design. He commented that project planning was the phase where you have the most control over costs. Once you get to final design, you have less control and once construction was started, you were basically locked in to whatever the costs were in the design.

Mrs. Parsons commented that the planning phase may be more time consuming than originally thought. Mr. Haskell explained that if the process could be expedited by a sub-committee meeting with Department Heads (in between Committee meetings) then he was willing to set that up.

Mr. Morehouse observed the H&HS Building space of 74,000 sq. ft. was the recommendation of Foit-Albert Associates, after they had met with each of the Departments in the Building. He explained that the Departments' requests had been modified within reasonable limits, and that a number of requests had been changed.

Mr. Remington confirmed the RFP bid opening would be held on March 22, 2006, and the walk around meeting would be held on March 6, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Haskell said he would like to join the walk around group on the 6<sup>th</sup>.

Discussion turned to whether or not a rough sketch of the proposed changes could be provided to the Committee members. Mr. Remington confirmed that he could take the existing blue prints that show where everything is now, and then mark up where the the changes were proposed.

Mr. Haskell requested Mr. Remington to prepare the rough prints that could then be mailed to the Supervisors, prior to the next Committee meeting.

Judge Krogmann left the meeting at 2:40 p.m.

Returning to the Agenda review, Mr. Haskell stated he was aware of a couple of Supervisors who would need to leave the meeting early today. He moved the discussion to the Septic System at Countryside Adult Home and invited Mr. Lamy to update the Committee.

William Lamy, Deputy Superintendent of DPW, explained that since the last Committee meeting, Carl Schroeder has been hired to evaluate the septic system and develop a plan to rehabilitate it. He noted the Sanitary Code has changed since the late 1970s when the building was first constructed. Therefore, he said, the Code now required any new system to be twice as large as the original, and the available space was very limited.

An alternative solution, Mr. Lamy noted, would be to convert the facility to a sewer

system and Carl Schroeder has been working on an "order magnitude" estimate (or desk-top estimate) on a pump station and a force main to hook in with the town sewer system. He cautioned the project may run as high as a-half million dollars for the best, permanent solution for the Countryside Adult Home.

Mr. Lamy apprised that he had also consulted with NYS DEC and learned they would be more flexible with rehabilitation than new construction, in regards to building systems in fill, rather than existing ground.

Mr. Lamy suggested the Committee could simultaneously explore:

- ✓ the sewer system hook-up,
- ✓ a complete replacement system, or
- ✓ a package plant - that would disinfect and discharge to the Schroon River.

Mr. Lamy cautioned that none of the options were cheap. He said he expected to have real budget figures within the next month, once the cold weather started to fade.

Mr. Haskell pointed out the Countryside Adult Home was located in the Town of Warrensburg and he acknowledged Mr. Geraghty, Town of Warrensburg Supervisor, was in attendance. Mr. Haskell stated he was hopeful Mr. Geraghty would advise his Town Board that the County was looking to tie in with the Town Sewer. Mr. Haskell proposed the Town might consider a 20-year waiver on sewer fees in exchange for the installation of the 1.7 miles of sewer line out to the main sewer line. He noted the project would now make the sewer system available to any resident between the Home and the main road.

Mr. Geraghty agreed to bring the request to the Warrensburg Town Board and apprise the Committee of its response.

Mr. Lamy explained he planned to keep both the NYS DOH and DEC offices informed of the County's efforts. He said he was working with a failed system and he cautioned the State agencies may not allow the County enough time to do the Sewer District Extension. Another possibility, he noted, was perhaps the County could be an out of district user and contract directly with the Town, but that would not allow other people to connect to the pipe. He also pointed out the Town would need to examine its discharge permit and capacity to be sure additional flows would not create a violation for the Town.

Mr. Haskell stated the Warrensburg Town well was just below the Countryside Adult Home and he emphasized the need to remedy this system just as quickly as possible.

Mr. O'Connor left the meeting at 2:50 a.m.

General discussion developed as to what types of grant funds might be available for the project.

In an effort to expedite the search for funds, motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. F. Thomas, and carried unanimously to authorize Mr. Remington to submit a grant application for whatever grant programs can be identified as possible sources for the septic system rehabilitation, and to authorize a resolution be prepared for the March 17<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. A copy of the resolution request for is on file with the minutes.

Hal Payne, as Director of Countryside Adult Home, expressed his concern with the creation of a sewer district, since it could take up to 2 years for completion. He cautioned the system was very fragile and could fail again as soon as the ground thawed.

Mr. Remington explained that there were some temporary fixes that he felt the DOH would authorize, provided a more permanent solution was also in the works.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. Lamy left the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

Turning back to Agenda review on the Cooling Tower, Mr. Morehouse stated it may be more appropriate to hold that discussion until the Office of Court Administration has responded.

Moving to Staffing Positions, Mr. Morehouse directed attention to the Building Maintenance - Staff listing included with the Agenda packet. He explained all of the employees listed were billed to the Municipal Center Billing Code, with the exceptions listed at the bottom of the page. During the course of the year, he noted, that any one of his employees could be sent to another County building to assist as needed.

Mr. Remington confirmed there were additional maintenance employees throughout the County. Mr. Champagne commented that he was looking for a more comprehensive list of the maintenance staff throughout the County, and who they report to.

Following a brief discussion, Mr. Haskell requested the Clerk of the Board, Joan Sady, to compile a list of all maintenance people throughout the County, and who they report to. He said his intention was to get a grasp on the chain of command.

Discussion ensued.

Returning to Agenda review at Fleet Management, Nurses, Mr. Morehouse reported the vehicles were now being serviced at the DPW garage in Warrensburg. He explained when a car is scheduled for service, the vehicle is left at his Office and he provides them with a fleet vehicle for the day.

Responding to questions from various Supervisors, Mr. Morehouse explained the

vehicle to be serviced was then driven to Warrensburg by someone in his Department since they often need to commute during the day, anyway.

Mr. Remington stated that often times, Mr. Morehouse has dropped a car off on his way home from work, or picked one up in the morning, on his way into the Office. Mr. Remington reported a very workable plan had been developed and implemented with very few minor details left to be worked out.

Mr. Geraghty left the meeting at 3:02 p.m.

Mr. Remington noted a new software program was being looked at. However, he said, he was very pleased with how well the group of female nurses were working together with his group of male mechanics. In addition, Mr. Morehouse confirmed the repair work was being billed directly back to the Nurse's Budget and he expected the County would see a cost savings due to more preventive maintenance being done.

Moving on to Frank Morehouse's vehicle, Mr. Remington explained the transport of the nurse's vehicles had lead to this next Agenda Item. He reported that Mr. Morehouse has been leaving a county vehicle at the highway garage in North Creek. For background information, Mr. Remington explained the DPW used to have a messenger on staff (at a grade 8 position for \$36,000 a year) to courier papers and spare parts back and forth between Warrensburg and the Municipal Center. When the person retired, he said the position was deleted although materials still needed to be transported back and forth. Since that time, he noted that Mr. Morehouse has done the transporting since he drives right past the Warrensburg Office on his way to and from work each day.

Mr. Remington pointed out the current Vehicle and Travel Policy did not provide a vehicle for Mr. Morehouse on a daily basis. He presented a request to the Committee to amend the Vehicle and Travel Policy to allow Mr. Morehouse to leave a county vehicle at the North Creek Highway Garage on a daily basis.

Mr. VanNess commented that when the Policy was developed, it was his understanding it was left to each Department Head's discretion to advise the Board as situations developed. He stated he felt Mr. Remington had presented a situation and demonstrated sound reasoning as to why a change would be needed.

Responding to questions from various Supervisors, Mrs. Parsons explained the original Travel Policy has been set up so a Department Head would contact the County Administrator to obtain approval for a vehicle to go home with an employee who was not identified in the Travel Policy. She explained that recently, Mr. Morehouse has needed to bring a vehicle back and forth every day for either DPW or the Fleet Management. Therefore, she said she suggested that Mr. Remington bring this request to the Committee to "clean this up" so that daily approval was no longer needed.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess and seconded by Mr. Champagne to authorize the

Vehicle and Travel Policy be amended to allow Frank Morehouse to leave a county vehicle at the North Creek Highway Garage.

Responding to Mr. Haskell's question regarding the type of vehicle driven, Mr. Remington explained it was either a 2-wheel drive pick up truck or one of the nurse's cars, or a fleet vehicle.

Following a brief discussion, Mr. Haskell called the question. Motion was carried by majority vote, with Mr. Haskell opposed.

Mr. Haskell commented that he felt the County had established a very strict policy and he did not feel the Committee should waiver from it.

Returning to Agenda review at Item 3, New Business, Mr. Morehouse reported that one of the nurses had requested signs be posted that prohibited weapons. Mr. Payne, as a member of the county-wide Safety Committee, explained the request probably originated from their last meeting. He noted the Safety Committee had discussed it at length.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Payne reported that two of his employees had come across a very large switch blade knife on the ground, in between the Social Services Building and Westmount Health Facility. He noted that when he brought the knife to the guards at the Social Services building, the guards showed him 2 5-gallon buckets of confiscated weapons at the entrance to the building. He said the weapons ranged from throwing stars, brass knuckles, knives, etc.

Mr. Haskell stated that if a visitor was found to be carrying a weapon in the building, yet there no signs posted, he did not think anyone could do anything about it. Mr. VanNess commented, that to the best of his knowledge, there would have to be some type of a warning (or notice of policy) before you could enforce it. He said he felt the posting of a sign would serve as official notice of such policy, much like No Trespassing Signs need to be posted.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. F. Thomas and carried unanimously to authorize the No Weapons Signs be posted, contingent upon the County Attorney's approval.

Turning to Agenda Item 3B, Mr. Morehouse reported a new contract was needed for the monitoring of the Municipal Center's fire, intrusion and panic alarms. He noted that Mahoney Notifier was the low bidder, for an annual fee of \$702.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. F. Thomas and carried unanimously to authorize a contract with Mahoney Notifier for the monitoring service of the Municipal Center's fire, intrusion, and panic alarms at a cost not to exceed \$702

annually, and to authorize a resolution be prepared for the March 17<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. A copy of the request form is on file with the minutes.

As for Agenda Item 3C, PA (public address) System, Mr. Morehouse reported the Safety Committee had recently expressed concerns over the lack of a public address (PA) system in the building. He explained the PA capabilities were already in place in the Public Health Department and the old Sheriff's Office wing. He further noted the current phone system has the capability to be used as a PA system and Scott McLaughlin of the Information Technology Department, has been busy setting that up. He said he would keep the Committee apprised as to the status of the PA system.

Mr. Morehouse reported that a fire alarm had gone off earlier this morning and he was very concerned that almost no one exited the building. He requested permission to send a blanket e-mail instructing all employees to exit the building when a fire alarm is triggered.

Continuing, Mr. Morehouse explained that as soon as a fire alarm is sounded, the phone in his office immediately starts ringing to verify whether or not it is a "real fire alarm." He declared that his phone should not be ringing - that people should automatically leave the building, period.

Mr. Haskell noted that a Department Head meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, March 21, 2006 and he asked Mr. Morehouse to explain the situation at that time. Mr. Haskell suggested that perhaps some type of enforcement policy should be considered if employees do NOT leave the building.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. Haskell directed attention to Agenda Item Co-Gen Possibilities as he extended privilege of the floor to Thomas Garrett of Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. Mr. Garrett introduced his colleague Craig Johannsen as the engineer who was in charge of the Westmount Health Facility co-generation project.

Mr. Garrett explained their usual presentation would include a Power Point presentation but in view of the time constraints, he said, he would prefer to try and highlight the important details. He distributed a copy of the Siemens' Preliminary Proposals for Energy and Infrastructure Upgrade on both the Warren County Municipal Center and the Countryside Adult Home (copies are on file with the minutes).

Mr. Garrett turned to the Municipal Center proposal and he explained the County already had an existing water source heat pump system already in place. He stated the preliminary study indicated the system could be adapted to a geo thermo heating/cooling system. He noted such a system uses the temperature of the earth to either pre-heat or pre-cool the building which would eliminate the use of fossil fuel for the winter months.

Mr. Garrett continued to review the Process Summary in detail, as outlined in Section I of the Municipal Center Proposal. His comments were submitted in writing and are on file with the minutes.

Mr. Garrett commented that all of the upgrades mentioned in the study were linked to NYSERDA funds that could help to pay some of the costs. He noted Section II highlighted the potential facility improvement measures (FIMs).

Responding to Mr. Champagne's questions, Mr. Garrett stated that it may be possible for the geo/thermo system to handle the heating of the building, at least when the outside temperature stays above -25° (F). He noted the existing boilers would remain in place as a stage 2 heating system.

Mrs. Parsons and Mrs. Sady left the meeting at 3:25 p.m.

Turning to the Financial Analysis at Section 4, Mr. Garrett noted the potential project cost was approximately \$654,344, turn key. He confirmed the proposal had been based upon the current Municipal Center building's configurations.

Mr. Champagne pointed out the County was preparing to begin extensive renovations to the existing Municipal Center.

Mrs. Sady re-entered the meeting at 3:26 p.m.

Mr. Garrett responded to questions as he stated the basic core of the preliminary proposal would remain essentially the same since the square footage would remain intact. However, he noted that if the County decided to completely remove a section of the structure, the proposal would be adjusted accordingly.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. Garrett explained the proposal on the table today did not include a co-gen facility due to the high cost of fossil fuels at this time. He noted that if the prices were to stabilize within the next couple of years, he said a co-gen system may be more feasible. He referred to the Pro Forma Data portion of Section 4 and he pointed out a positive cash flow was guaranteed, every year, including the maintenance services.

Mr. Garrett stated that today's presentation was also a request for permission to conduct the study so the preliminary proposal could be proven true. He explained the study would cost the County a total of \$79,696 ONLY if Siemens can prove the savings would be correct AND the County declined the project.

Mr. Remington commented the proposed building renovations included a new climate control system in the old jail section and a 45,000 sq. ft. addition attached to the existing 180,000 sq. ft.. He queried how Siemen's would ever be able to find what budget neutral would be.

Following an extensive discussion, Mr. Wm. Thomas stated it was his understanding that if Siemens completes the study and proves the County could save money the County would pay for the study costs AND would move ahead with the project.

Mr. Garrett acknowledged that today's Agenda was the first he had learned of the County's expansion plans. He said that Siemens hoped to be part of the expansion project. He apprised that another part of Siemens One services could save the County additional dollars by obtaining the infrastructure direct from the manufacturer. As an example, he pointed out a environmental control system would be sub-contracted to a mechanical contractor who marks it up and sends it to the general contractor who marks it up and bills the County. He mentioned Siemens One was currently working Siena College in just such a fashion and he said he could document the savings, if desired.

Following an extensive discussion, Mr. Wm. Thomas suggested the Committee consider exploring this project.

Additional discussion ensued regarding the RFP that had been issued and mailed to the various bidders.

Mr. Payne suggested the Committee could authorize an addendum to the existing RFP which would apprise the bidders that they would be working in conjunction with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. Mr. Haskell concurred and commented he felt the basic goal was to save the taxpayer's money and the County could tell the architects they would be working with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc.

Mrs. Parsons concurred with Mr. Payne's comment regarding an addendum to the RFP.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried by majority vote, with Mr. Champagne opposed, to authorize an addendum to the RFP to include the Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. regarding energy services.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried by majority vote, with Mr. Champagne opposed, to authorize a contract with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. regarding energy services at the Warren County Municipal Center and forward the request on to the Finance Committee. [*Subsequent to the meeting it was determined the Finance Committee did not need to review the request – resolution would be prepared for the March 17<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes.*]

Mr. Garrett directed attention to the Countryside Adult Home Preliminary Proposal. He summarized that when they visited the facility, they found a very old, tired facility and he referred to Section II of the proposal which detailed the potential facility improvement measures.

Mr. Garrett commented, in view of the time, he would attempt to abbreviate the

presentation, somewhat. Turning to Section 4 for the Financial Analysis, he noted the potential project cost was \$176,052. As it stands, he said, the projection at the end of 15 years was for a cash flow of \$133,000, yet the window replacements could be included with the project.

Mr. Garrett declared this project was a simple and straight forward one, unencumbered with geo/thermo, etc.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to authorize a contract with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. for energy services at Countryside Adult Home at a cost not to exceed \$21,700 and to forward the request to Finance Committee. A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes. *[Subsequent to the meeting it was determined the Finance Committee did not need to review the request – resolution would be prepared for the March 17<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes.]*

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion by Mr. VanNess and seconded by Mr. Champagne, Mr. Haskell adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Carlene A. Ramsey, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist