

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: NOVEMBER 30, 2010

---

---

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS THOMAS  
VANNESS  
WOOD  
MCCOY

OTHERS PRESENT:

JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS  
FREDERICK MONROE, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD  
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ATTORNEY/ADMINISTRATOR  
NICOLE LIVINGSTON, DEPUTY CLERK OF THE BOARD  
KEVIN GERAGHTY, BUDGET OFFICER

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

SUPERVISORS CHAMPAGNE  
GIRARD  
BELDEN

SUPERVISORS LOEB  
MCDEVITT  
MERLINO  
STEC  
STRAINER  
TAYLOR

DON LEHMAN, THE POST STAR

AMANDA ALLEN, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

---

---

Mr. Thomas called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 11:15 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mrs. Wood and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the prior Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings, who distributed copies of the meeting agenda to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda is also on file with the minutes.*

Commencing with Agenda Item 2A, HSB (Human Services Building), Mr. Morehouse presented two requests for installation of additional equipment within the HSB, the first being for the installation of five extra PA (public address) speakers at a total cost of \$1,196 and the second for installation of a temperature sensor in the portion of the HSB where the IT (Information Technology) Server Room would be located, at a total cost of \$1,064. He noted that this equipment was not included in the original construction plans, but was now necessary in light of new plans to move additional Departments into the Building. Mr. Morehouse explained that the temperature sensor in the IT Server Room would be monitored by the company currently providing monitoring services for the HSB, alerting them if the temperature in the Server Room rose above a specified level which might make the area inhospitable to the server equipment. He advised the costs for both installation projects would be funded under Capital Project No. H263.9550 280, Design & Construction of the Health & Human Services Building.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. McCoy and carried unanimously to approve both requests as outlined above and the necessary resolutions were authorized for the December 17<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. *Copies of both requests are on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Morehouse apprised that Agenda Item 2A, Municipal Center, pertained to a recommendation received from the Safety Committee to install a panic alarm at the Information Desk located at the main entrance to the Municipal Center Building. He said the cost associated with the panic button installation totaled \$495 for both the necessary equipment and installation services and he advised that Mahoney Notify Plus, Inc. would monitor the alarm at no additional cost to the County. Mr. Morehouse noted that the necessary funding for this project was available within his existing budget and he said he did not think a resolution was required to approve the work.

Mr. VanNess questioned whether the \$495 cost included the expense of running new wire to the panic button and he asked if County staff could do the work to lower the charge. Mr. Morehouse replied that the total reflected all costs for equipment purchases and installation. He noted that Mahoney Notify would have to do the wiring work because the panic button had to be connected to their server equipment for monitoring purposes. Mr. Morehouse said he believed the necessary wiring was already in place and just needed to be connected to the appropriate equipment when installed.

It was the consensus of the Committee that Mr. Morehouse should proceed with the necessary measures to install a panic button at the Information Desk.

Moving on to Agenda Item 2B, Committee Room, Mr. Morehouse reminded the Committee that during the prior Board meeting there had been some discussion and concerns that returning to the old procedure of using a Committee Room, which would be located in the area currently occupied by the Chairman of the Board and the Purchasing Office, might not be appropriate. He said that in discussing the matter further with Paul Dusek, County Attorney/Administrator, they had decided that the reintroduction of a Committee Room would be one of the last facets addressed in the renovation process. Mr. Morehouse added that as a possible solution, he and Mr. Dusek had considered placing the Committee Room in the larger space currently occupied by the County Attorney's Office, allowing the area previously identified for the Committee Room to be altered for use by the Chairman of the Board and the Budget Officer.

Mr. VanNess noted that it was important to remember that the Board Room would continue to be available for Committee meetings and an additional Committee Room would allow space for meetings to be held simultaneously in the event that one meeting exceeded the set meeting schedule.

Mr. Strainer stated his opinion that there were more members of the public, and non-Committee member Supervisors, attending Committee meetings than there had been in the past and he did not feel changing to a Committee Room setting would allow appropriate seating for everyone. He noted that if the current meeting were being held in the proposed Committee Room, the area would be very crowded, due to the number of additional Supervisors in attendance. Additionally, Mr. Strainer advised the ceilings were much lower in the areas identified to hold the Committee Room, which was not as conducive a setting as the Board Room. He concluded that in his opinion, it was a waste of time and money to renovate space specifically for the purposes of using it as a Committee Room and said they might be better suited to turn the space into a Conference Room which would only require a table and seating for smaller groups.

Mr. Loeb questioned whether the addition of a Committee Room for simultaneous meetings would have any affect on the Open Meetings Law and Mr. Thomas replied in the negative, advising that as long as the meetings started after the advertised time there would be no such conflicts. Mr. Strainer stated another issue with holding concurrent meetings would be that Supervisors serving on both of the Committees could only attend one. Mr. Stec interjected that the Committee Room would be used as an overflow room as necessary and the management of meeting times and locations was an administrative issue that could be addressed as necessary; he added that the need for additional conference space was a separate issue.

Mrs. Wood stated that she felt the issue faced was not with the purpose of the room but rather what it was being called and she suggested that instead of titling it a Committee Room, they should instead call it a Meeting Room that could be used by any committee, not necessarily only by Board of Supervisors' Committees.

Mr. Morehouse noted that at some point the Committee needed to address the occupancy limits of the Board Room pertaining to fire code regulations. He said that at some meetings with high levels of public attendance they were

coming very close to exceeding the occupancy limits and he felt that in the future they should consider reconfiguring the Board Room to address this matter. Mr. Morehouse reminded the Committee that they had attempted to raise the issue in the past, suggesting that the desks be removed and replaced with less space consuming tables; however, he said, these suggestions had met considerable resistance. He added that although this was not an issue that required immediate attention, he felt the matter should be reviewed in the future.

Mr. Tennyson said the new space could be configured to accommodate the largest groups possible with a Committee table and visitor seating, leaving the decision to the Committee Chairman to determine whether the Committee would meet in the Board Room or the Committee Room based on the level of attendance expected. Mr. Thomas opined that placing the Committee Room in the space occupied by the County Attorney's Office would be preferable because it was larger than the space originally identified. Mr. Strainer said he appreciated Mrs. Woods' suggestion to change the name of the room so as not to classify it for one specific use, but noted he maintained his opinion that using the Board Room was the best option for the Committee meetings because the amount of space available for use was not limited.

Concluding the agenda review, Mr. Morehouse addressed Agenda Item 3A, New Business, which consisted of a request to fill a vacant Cleaner position, base salary of \$23,298. He added that he also sought to fill a temporary Cleaner position and noted that funding for the positions was included in the existing budget. Mr. Tennyson interjected that this issue had been discussed as part of the 2011 Budget process, giving consideration to the fact that a position had been eliminated from the Buildings & Grounds Division based on their intentions to augment the snow and ice season with the temporary Cleaner position that would be used for the October through April time frame. He added that there was an increased need for cleaning services during the winter season due to the amount of salt, sand, and slush tracked into the buildings.

Motion was made by Mr. McCoy, seconded by Mrs. Wood and carried unanimously to approve the request to fill the Cleaner position as previously noted and refer same to the Personnel Committee. *Copies of the Notice of Intent to Fill Vacant Position forms are on file with the minutes. Note: Department Heads are not required to seek authorization to fill temporary positions by resolution, provided that the funds are available in the existing budget.*

Mr. Merlino said he had been approached by employees working in the HSB asking that handicapped parking spaces be installed at the rear of the Building to allow those employees easier access during the winter months. He advised that these handicapped spaces would be used primarily by employees, leaving the designated spaces at the front of the building for visitor use. Mr. Tennyson replied that this was an issue that could be addressed easily using the Airport staff and their painting machine; he added it was just a matter of determining the number of handicapped spaces appropriate for the parking available. Mr. Morehouse said the only concern he had with this issue was that the space behind the Building was currently being used as a loading area for anything coming into the building, including elections machines, which might cause some interference with handicapped access. He advised they could certainly review the area and determine where the best placement for handicapped parking spaces would be. Mr. Tennyson noted that handicapped parking spaces required more room than typical parking spaces, so although repainting the area to include designated parking areas would be simple, the Committee should note that the total amount of parking spaces available would be reduced. For example, he added, five normal parking spaces would be equivalent to three handicapped spaces.

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Mr. VanNess and seconded by Mr. McCoy, Mr. Thomas adjourned the meeting at 11:33 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist