

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: MARCH 31, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS GIRARD
WOOD
WESTCOTT
MONROE
STROUGH
CONOVER
SEEBER

OTHERS PRESENT:

JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS
ROSS DUBARRY, AIRPORT MANAGER
KEVIN B. GERAGHTY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
MARTIN AUFFREDOU, COUNTY ATTORNEY
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
FRANK E. THOMAS, BUDGET OFFICER
SUPERVISORS BEATY
BROCK
DICKINSON
MCDEVITT
MERLINO
SIMPSON
TAYLOR
MICHAEL SWAN, COUNTY TREASURER
TRAVIS WHITEHEAD, TOWN OF QUEENSBURY RESIDENT
THOMAS CLEMENTS, GLENS FALLS PILOTS AND OWNERS ASSOCIATION
HARRISON FREER, TOWN OF QUEENSBURY RESIDENT
DAN KANE, WARREN COUNTY RESIDENT
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
JODI CENTERBAR, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST
CHARLENE DIRESTA, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Girard called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 10:00 a.m.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Monroe and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous 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 agenda packet to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda packet is on file with the minutes.*

Commencing the agenda review, Mr. Morehouse said the first item on the agenda was an update on the RFP (Request for Proposals) for solar power conversion at Cornell Cooperative Extension, Countryside Adult Home and other County facilities. Jeffery Tennyson, Superintendent of the Department of Public Works (DPW), reported they were working on scheduling interviews with the respondents to the RFP and he anticipated presenting a recommendation at the April 27, 2015 County Facilities Committee meeting. He advised the DPW and CPL (Clark Patterson Lee) Engineers were working on developing summaries of the proposals which would be disseminated to the Committee members in advance of the next meeting for which Mr. Westcott thanked him.

Pertaining to the Municipal Center security update, Mr. Morehouse informed a new security desk had been constructed and placed at the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) entrance. He advised the vending machines had been temporarily relocated inside of the County Clerk's Office. He said he was awaiting an insurance certificate in order to move the blast wall further into the County Clerk's Office

to create a small lobby area with vending machines at the DMV entrance. He commented that the majority of the County employees had been recorded in the FOB System and he noted there were a few employees that would need to go to his Office in order to have their FOB numbers entered into the system. He anticipated the FOB's would be activated and the blast wall would be moved within the next couple of weeks. He mentioned that all of the Department Heads had submitted lists of their employees and the access which should be granted to them. He explained that access times for the Municipal Center would be 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; 4:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m.; or 24 hours per day, 7 days per week based on the information provided by the Department Heads. He advised that once everything was in place he would change the outside cores on the doors of the Municipal Center in order to activate the FOB System.

Mr. Tennyson pointed out that the security desk at the DMV entrance had been constructed by Buildings & Grounds staff members and he commented that they had done an excellent job. He said the security desk looked similar to the one at the Human Services Building but it had been constructed and not purchased. Mr. Girard asked about the need for the insurance certificate and Mr. Morehouse explained the blast wall would be relocated by an outside vendor and they were awaiting the proof of insurance for them. Mr. Tennyson stated the location of the blast wall was not impacting the security of the Municipal Center; he said the wall was being relocated in order to create a small lobby area where the vending machines would be located. Ms. Seeber complimented the Buildings & Grounds staff on the construction of the security desk and she said the faux stone work on the front of the desk looked very nice.

Concerning the Court Space Expansion Project update, Mr. Tennyson reported the County and their consultants had reviewed the final comments. He explained there had been comments received from the OCA (Office of Court Administration) Architect in mid February which had been resolved quickly; he said additional comments had been received a few weeks later which were minor and easily addressed. He added minor changes were made to the plans which were re-submitted to the OCA Architect and they were awaiting final approval on these plans. He advised a request had been submitted to the Facilities Review Board of the OCA which had the final approval of the plans. He said they had hoped this meeting would occur in March and he noted the 4th Judicial District and OCA Judges were eager to have the meeting scheduled. He stated they anticipated the Facilities Review Board would meet in April following which he would return to the Committee with requests for funding and the final design work. He noted there were a lot of stakeholders in the project and he was pleased they had reached a consensus on the plans. Mr. Monroe asked the anticipated construction start date and Mr. Tennyson responded he anticipated completing final design and going out to bid later in 2015. Mr. Tennyson said he anticipated the project would be under construction for most of 2016 and possibly into 2017. He commented they had planned to complete the design and go out to bid as soon as possible but due to the required approvals from outside agencies this had not been possible. He explained the submission to the Facilities Review Board included a draft construction schedule which would keep changing until final approval was received. He said once the Facilities Review Board approved the plans there would be more control over the construction schedule.

Mr. Monroe asked if it would be necessary to develop a plan for temporary office space for the new Family Court Judge for 2016 and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively. Mr. Tennyson stated the need for temporary office space had been discussed in a stake holders meeting but it had been determined that focus should be placed on the permanent office space first; he said the next step was to focus on the solutions for temporary office space. He advised when the final construction schedule was determined, the length of time that temporary office space would be required would be known. He recalled the earlier concept was to move forward quickly in order to go out to bid and possibly complete construction by January of 2016 or early in the spring of 2016. Mr. Tennyson

explained that local Court staff had indicated their tolerance for a certain amount of inconvenience during the construction. As the construction time frame had changed, he continued, it would be necessary to discuss the possible inconvenience with the Court staff again. He pointed out the new Family Court Judge and his staff would require office space as of January 1, 2016. He said the plan for the temporary office space would need to account for the anticipated completion date of the construction.

Mr. Conover inquired about the financing for the project and the changing interest rates and Michael Swan, County Treasurer, responded he would have a phone conference with the County's fiscal advisor later that day. Mr. Swan anticipated he would provide a report on the financing of this project at the April 8, 2015 Finance Committee Meeting. He commented the interest rates were at an all time low but they were anticipated to increase as the year progressed. Mr. Girard said the OCA had suggested that the County not proceed too quickly with the bonding because final approval from them was needed prior to doing so. He noted a final cost estimate for the project would also be required by CPL in order to know the amount to be bonded. Mr. Tennyson said they did not anticipate any problems with receiving the approval of the Facilities Review Board in April and once that approval was received, the cost estimate and construction schedule would be finalized. He added CPL would also finalize their estimate for the final design phase, the bidding phase and the construction inspection and support phase. He commented they would also estimate the costs for the temporary office space and he said he was unsure if it was appropriate to include these costs in the bonding. He asked Mr. Swan to pose that question during his phone conference with the financial advisor. He indicated he had a discussion with Matt Smullen and Jon Norris, of CPL, pertaining to where the construction schedule could be accelerated and they had some good ideas which could be incorporated.

Mr. Brock asked the necessary square footage for the new Family Court Judge and his staff and Mr. Tennyson explained the Court Space Needs Assessment detailed the square footage necessary for the permanent office space. Mr. Tennyson advised it would be necessary to have discussions with the Judges and their staff to determine if they were amenable to accepting a certain amount of inconvenience with the temporary office space. He stated it would be necessary to combine some temporary relocations and renovations and possibly a temporary building similar to temporary classrooms utilized by schools. He noted renting office space was also an option for the temporary measures, as well as consolidating and using any available space in County buildings. He pointed out security issues were a primary concern in determining the solution for the temporary office space. Mr. Brock asked if the temporary solution would be for approximately 18 months and Mr. Tennyson replied that currently it looked as if the permanent office space could be occupied in early 2017. Mr. Brock asked if there was a cost estimate for renting office space and Mr. Tennyson replied earlier estimates had ranged from \$9 to \$10 per square foot up to \$15 to \$17 per square foot; however, he added, these estimates had been for long term leases of office space.

Travis Whitehead, Town of Queensbury resident, said he found it disturbing that six months ago this Committee was discussing the options and had estimated it would be difficult but possible to complete the construction before the arrival of the new Family Court Judge. He added now the Committee was being told that temporary office space would be required for one year to 18 months which he said was a considerable difference. He noted that the decision might have been different if it had been known that temporary office space would be needed for such a length of time. He said the Committee could have considered a permanent solution utilizing the available space in County owned buildings or by leasing commercial office space. He indicated the DMV could have been relocated to the Aviation Mall in order to create the necessary space for the Courts within the Municipal Center Building. Ms. Seeber stated she wanted to ensure that all of the vacant space within the Municipal Center would be utilized if possible for the temporary office space required for

the new Family Court Judge and his staff. Mr. Girard explained that it was through no fault of the Warren County Board of Supervisors that the construction schedule would proceed through 2016 and possibly into 2017. He further explained the County had been aggressive in trying to move the process forward with the engineers but the problem was that the OCA and their Architect's approvals were required and this took some time. He said the County had no control over the amount of time it took to receive the approvals and he noted the Hon. Vito C. Caruso, 4th District Administrative Judge, had assisted in expediting the process with the OCA and the Hon. David B. Krogmann, Supreme Court Judge, had assisted with local issues. He indicated the OCA was not concerned with the expense which might be incurred by the County because their main concern was ensuring the construction of appropriate courtrooms and office space. He expressed the County had been diligent with ensuring the approval of the permanent court space plans. He noted there would be costs involved with the temporary space but he did not anticipate difficulties with receiving the OCA approval of same. Mr. Girard informed there would be 16 new judgeships in New York State commencing January 1, 2016 and Warren County was being used as the template for other Counties to follow because they were moving forward quickly with the process.

Ms. Seeber asked if there was any form of reimbursement available and Mr. Tennyson explained the existing court space would continue to be utilized and on January 1, 2016 there would be a new Family Court Judge and his staff who would require additional square footage. He explained the OCA paid a rental rate for the space based on the square footage and there would be immediate operational reimbursements through maintenance in lieu of rent. Mr. Morehouse commented there would be a one year lag time in the increase because the Courts were billed based on the prior year. Mr. Tennyson assured the Committee members his goal in determining the solution for the temporary office space was to minimize all of the temporary expenses to the extent possible. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Conover opined the most important matter pertaining to the Court Space Expansion Project was the financing and he commented that even fractional increases in the interest rate would result in a major impact when bonding \$16 million. Mr. Girard pointed out a .5% increase in the rates would result in approximately \$3 million in additional costs over the 20 year life of the bond. Mr. Conover stated the analysis of the options for the Court Space Expansion Project had been thorough and the Board of Supervisors had decided to expand the existing court space on the Municipal Center Campus. Mr. Westcott commented the need for the temporary office space presented the opportunity to look at the available space within the Municipal Center, as well as office space available for lease within the community as a means to potentially reduce the cost of the construction. Mr. Girard asked if Mr. Westcott was referring to a temporary or permanent solution and Mr. Westcott replied if it could work on a temporary basis it was possible that other County Departments could be relocated into the temporary office space after it was vacated by the Courts making it a permanent solution. He said this would open up additional space which could possibly be used for the expansion of the Courts. A brief discussion ensued.

Chairman Geraghty exited the meeting at 10:38 a.m.

Mr. Monroe asked if the OCA controlled when the County could go out to bond and he said if they did not control it, then it seemed the County should bond immediately before the interest rates increased resulting in a large impact on the final total cost of the project. Paul Dusek, County Administrator, stated he had discussed the matter with the Judges and the representatives from the OCA. He explained the OCA did not control when the County could bond; however, he added, until the OCA approved the plans, the final project costs were unknown. Mr. Monroe suggested an estimated amount could be bonded so that the current rate would be locked in for at least that amount. Mr. Dusek advised the timing of the bonding was one of the reasons Mr. Swan would be

talking to the financial advisor later today; he said they would have a report for the April 8, 2015 Finance Committee meeting and he added they were aware of the issue of increasing interest rates. Mr. Strough asked if the County could approve the bonding at the highest estimated cost and as long as the actual amount bonded was less there would be no issues; Mr. Dusek agreed and he added it would then be necessary to determine when the bonds should be sold. He indicated this was one of the issues that Mr. Swan would discuss with the financial advisor. A discussion ensued.

In reference to the comment pertaining to Warren County being the template for the 16 new judgeships, Mr. Tennyson expressed this was not due to Warren County moving too hastily or other Counties moving too slowly; he said the other Counties had different conditions, facilities and options. He stated that in 2004 and 2005 court space issues had been identified in Warren County but had not been dealt with due to budget constraints. He added the urgency for Warren County to move quickly with the Court Space Expansion Project had been compounded by the pre-existing court space issues in addition to the needs of the new Family Court Judge and his staff. He commented the Board of Supervisors had been prudent in moving forward quickly while completing a thorough and fast analysis of the options. Mr. Monroe said he was unsure of the current status of Judge Krogmann but his understanding was that there was a possibility he would become re-certified and continue to serve; he asked if it was anticipated that Judge Krogmann would continue to have Chambers after a new Supreme Court Judge was elected. Mr. Girard said these scenarios had been included in the Court Space Needs Assessment. Mr. Morehouse mentioned his understanding was that if Judge Krogmann decided to continue his position, the County was obligated to provide him with Chambers and office space; he commented that would result in 3 Supreme Court Judges in Warren County.

This concluded the Buildings & Grounds portion of the Committee meeting and the Airport portion of the meeting commenced at 10:52 a.m.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Ross Dubarry, Airport Manager, who distributed copies of the agenda packet to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda packet is on file with the minutes.*

Commencing the agenda review, Mr. Dubarry stated the first item pertained to a request to address the County Facilities Committee from Thomas Clements, of the Glens Falls Pilots and Owners Association. Mr. Clements thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak; he informed he was an attorney with offices in the City of Glens Falls and had previously worked as an Assistant County Attorney. He informed his real passion was flying noting he was a local pilot and a member of the Glens Falls Pilots and Owners Association. He apprised that less than a year ago, a prominent member of our community, Mr. John Michaels, had passed away. He explained Mr. Michaels had been a resident of the Town of Bolton who served on several community boards. He mentioned Mr. Michaels had been a local pilot who was a prominent Angel Flight Pilot. Mr. Clements pointed out that Mr. Michaels had completed over 125 Angel Flights, taking patients from Floyd Bennett Memorial Airport and other local airports to their medical appointments. Mr. Clements stated the Glens Falls Pilots and Owners Association would like to honor Mr. Michaels by naming a road on Airport property after him. He explained there was a road which ran in front of the bus garage to the new north T-hangars which currently had no official name. He suggested this road be named, John Michaels Way, and he indicated he had asked Mr. Michaels family and they were in favor of the concept. Mr. Clements mentioned the Glens Falls Pilots and Owners Association were amenable to covering the cost of a street sign which would meet the standards of the Town of Queensbury Highway Department. Mr. Strough stated he was surprised this road did not currently have a name because he thought this was a requirement of the E-911 System. He said he was in favor of naming the road, John Michaels Way, and he agreed this prominent Angel Flight Pilot was deserving of the

honor. Mr. Tennyson pointed out the road in question was the North Gate Driveway which most likely had a Queensbury Avenue address for the purposes of the E-911 System. He agreed this decision would fall under the purview of the County because it was not on the highway system. Mr. Clements commented the street sign might require the "private drive" notation. Mr. Westcott thanked Mr. Clements for the suggestion and said it was a fitting tribute and he was in favor of the concept. He stated that Mr. Michaels had been a wonderful member of the community and he personally knew people who had benefitted from his work with the Angel Flights.

Motion was made by Mr. Conover, seconded by Mr. Westcott and carried unanimously to authorize the Queensbury Avenue North Gate Driveway to be named John Michaels Way at the request of the Glens Falls Pilots and Owners Association in honor of John Michaels, a deceased Angel Flight Pilot. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 17, 2015 Board meeting.*

Mr. Dubarry requested authorization to submit a grant application to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), in an amount not to exceed \$600,000 for the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Preliminary Engineering for Phase III of the Runway 1/19 Extension Project. He said this grant had a \$30,000 local matching funds requirement and he pointed out that page 3 of the agenda packet contained the Program Narrative. He apprised that page 4 of the agenda packet contained a list of some of the time sensitive tasks which totaled \$31,075. He said page 5 of the agenda packet reflected a request to increase Capital Project No. H303.9550 280, Environmental Assessment/Preliminary Engineering Runway 1 Extension, by \$30,000 to reflect the local matching funds requirement for the grant. He commented he was requesting the increase to the Capital Project in order to proceed with the time sensitive tasks in advance of receiving the grant award.

Mr. Westcott pointed out the Program Narrative stated the runway extension was needed to provide the required length for current and anticipated aircraft traffic and he asked what the current and anticipated aircraft traffic was. Mr. Dubarry responded this information was included in the Purpose and Needs Statement of the EA; he added the current aircraft that used this runway were a group of aircraft whose operations had exceeded the substantial use threshold considered by the FAA as justifying the project. Mr. Westcott said he felt the statement meant the number of aircrafts that used the runway and Ms. Wood disagreed noting it was the type of aircrafts. A brief discussion ensued.

Ms. Seeber asked if the \$30,000 required local matching funds could include in-kind services and Mr. Dubarry responded there were projects for which in-kind services could be completed as part of the matching funds requirement but this needed to be approved in advance during the grant application process. He advised this particular project was environmental, planning and engineering based and there was not a lot of work which could be completed by the County. He added they included the maximum allowable administrative expenses for reimbursement which essentially counted towards the local matching funds requirement. Mr. Monroe said it looked as if the majority of the work was environmental; he asked if it would be necessary to contract this work out and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively. Mr. Tennyson explained the time sensitive tasks were a subset of a larger scope of work which would be completed during the summer season. He advised this was why Mr. Dubarry was requesting to increase the Capital Project in advance of the grant award to allow this work to commence this summer. Mr. Monroe asked which entity was mandating this work and Mr. Dubarry replied that Phase III of the project had been recommended by the FAA. Mr. Dubarry reminded the Committee members they had been coordinating with the NYSDEC (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation). He advised the FAA did not want to write a

determination on the Federal EA without knowing if the NYSDEC and Army Corps of Engineers would permit the project. He said the permitting process could alter the environmental document enough to cause some issues for the FAA. He explained this project incorporated a heavy design effort with the final environmental work for the FAA along with the permitting application for the NYSDEC and the Army Corps of Engineers. He noted this would all move forward simultaneously allowing the project to advance in a timely fashion and provide the NYSDEC with the information they needed to permit the project.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough and seconded by Mr. Conover to authorize the submission of a grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT; to approve the request to increase the Capital Project as outlined above and to forward same to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Westcott stated he would vote in opposition of the motion because the current and anticipated aircraft traffic was still unclear. Mr. Monroe said his understanding of the discussion was that the current aircraft traffic was anticipated to continue with 3% annual increases. Mr. Westcott asked the current aircraft traffic and Mr. Tennyson responded the information was contained on the EA which he did not have with him. Mr. Tennyson noted the document had been distributed multiple times but he would be glad to send it to Mr. Westcott again after the meeting. Mr. Seeber agreed this information had been provided in the past and she said she was comfortable with the motion and the fact that the aircraft traffic was a combination of the type and number of aircrafts using the runway. Mr. Girard asked if it was correct to assume that the project would not have progressed to this point if the FAA did not feel the necessary thresholds had been met and Mr. Dubarry replied that was correct.

Mr. Girard called the question which was carried by majority vote, with Mr. Westcott voting in opposition, to authorize the submission of a grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT, in an amount not to exceed \$600,000 for the Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Engineering for Phase III of the Runway 1/19 Extension Project and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 17, 2015 Board meeting; and to approve the request to increase Capital Project No. H303.9550 280, Environmental Assessment/Preliminary Engineering Runway 1 Extension, as outlined above and forward same to the Finance Committee. *Copies of the resolution request forms are on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Dubarry requested authorization to submit a grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT in an amount not to exceed \$1,120,000 for the Land Easement/Acquisition for Phase II of the Runway 30 Approach Project. He noted this was the obstruction removal project off the approach to Runway 30 for which the local matching funds requirement was \$56,000. He commented the Program Narrative was on page 7 of the agenda packet and a map depicting the lands and easements to be acquired was on page 8. He advised there were no changes or updates to report and the land owners were agreeable to moving forward with the project. He said this grant funding would allow the County to acquire the land and easements and he informed the FAA was currently writing the determination for the EA which would pave the way for this project. Mr. Strough commented these acquisitions would create the potential for two of the lots to be available to the County for future sale for light industrial or other uses. Mr. Dubarry agreed noting it had always been his intent that any land not used for aviation purposes could be subdivided and marketed for various purposes. He noted with this project the parcels were across from a public road and were not well suited for aviation purposes other than protecting the approach to Runway 30.

Chairman Geraghty re-entered the meeting 11:08 a.m.

Mr. Strough advised the sale of the parcels would more than likely exceed the \$56,000 in local matching funds in addition to having the potential to increase the number of jobs in the area depending on the purchasers. Ms. Seeber asked if the legacy costs to the runway extension were \$2,700 to \$3,000 per year for maintenance and Mr. Dubarry responded he did not remember the exact dollar amount; however, he continued, the runway extension project would result in some additional mowing, paving and light maintenance and he would categorize these costs as minor. Ms. Seeber stated that at \$3,000 per year in additional costs, the cost per property owner in Warren County was less than one cent. She said there had been a lot of discussions pertaining to the legacy costs which would be incurred by taxpayers and she wanted to clarify this amount was less than one cent per property owner per year. Mr. Dubarry commented that after the projects were completed it would be easier to maintain the land because there would be fewer obstacles to navigate. He apprised that for this particular project, 11 acres of trees would be cleared and the area would need to be mowed in the future.

Mr. Westcott stated for clarification purposes that the total dollar amount was \$1,120,000 and the FAA paid 90% of that amount from the Federal excise taxes on aviation charges. He noted the local matching funds requirement was \$56,000 or 5%. He said it had just been stated that this land to be purchased with FAA money would be re-sold or used by Warren County for purposes other than aviation. Mr. Strough explained the County only required the avigation easement of the property for aviation safety purposes; he said there were properties which the County might not require in the future which could be sub-divided and sold. He apprised the property around the Airport was zoned for light industrial purposes. Mr. Tennyson advised the FAA recognized there were difficulties with purchasing private property adjacent to Airports and there were Federal rules which protected the property owners regarding segmenting the parcels. He commented that if there was development or land leases for private purposes on those parcels, that revenue would reduce the operating costs at the Airport. He apprised the FAA recognized the need to effectuate the acquisition of necessary parcels and generate new revenue streams to offset operating expenses at the Airport. Mr. Conover opined there was nothing more important in the terms of future viability of an Airport than the protection of the flight paths and protection zones. He said utilizing this grant funding to acquire these lands and avigation easements only enhanced the Airport. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Tennyson pointed out this project was the final step in the acquisition of these properties; he said the valuations of the parcels and appraisal reports had been discussed and approved by the FAA. He explained this step was a follow through on multiple prior resolutions approved by the Board of Supervisors and this final step basically accepted the money for the acquisitions and placed it into the capital project so the County could close on the properties and move forward with the obstruction removals. Mr. Beaty commented the County would pay property taxes to Washington County on this land and hope that they would be able to sell the property in the future. He said the current property owner had listed the property for sale for some time and the current designation of the land included wetlands and timber. He stated there was a reason why this land had not been purchased and developed in the past and it was because no one currently had any interest in developing it. He noted that until the land was sold, the County would pay taxes to Washington County; Mr. Strough pointed out it was very likely that Washington County would be willing to grant a variance on the taxes because they would also benefit from Airport improvements. He commented that as the Airport was improved, the properties in question would become more valuable and marketable. Mr. Conover stated it was important to note the price of the acquisition of property by municipalities was established through an appraisal process. He mentioned it was very common for a County or municipality to own property in other Counties.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough and seconded by Ms. Wood to authorize the submission of a grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT as outlined above.

Mr. Whitehead said the problem of mitigating tree penetrations on Runways 12 and 30 was already dealt with by the Board of Supervisors with Resolution No. 101 of 2011 and he read an excerpt from the resolution, as follows:

RESOLVED, that the Airport Manager submit a grant application to the Federal Aviation Administration/New York State Department of Transportation for the construction/installation of the Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPI's) for Runway 12 and/or Runway 30 to mitigate for tree penetrations on runway approaches....

Mr. Whitehead commented that Resolution No. 101 of 2011 had been adopted by unanimous vote in February of 2011. He said the resolution had resulted from discussions between the FAA, C&S Engineers and Don DeGraw, the previous Airport Manager, in a meeting held on June 2, 2009. He submitted a document containing notes from the June 2, 2009 meeting and Resolution No. 101 of 2011 for the record; *a copy of the document is on file with the minutes.* He read from the meeting notes included on the document, as follows:

Don Degraw's preference is to use PAPI's to raise the glide angle over fixed obstructions on R/W 12-30. C&S to calculate GP & TCH based on obstructions to remain. FAA has verbally approved (C&S to verify) this approach with Don. No threshold displacements or relocations are planned.

Mr. Whitehead reiterated there was already a resolution adopted by the Board and he opined that until this resolution had been dealt with further resolutions should not be considered. He said the next resolution request to be presented was to place a PAPI on the land being acquired at a cost of an additional \$80,000. He said he concurred with doing so and he felt the cost of \$80,000 was reasonable. Mr. Dubarry said he was familiar with the meeting notes referred to by Mr. Whitehead and he explained that in 2009 the FAA and C&S Engineers did look at the possibility of raising the angle of the PAPI as the visual approach guidance to the runways. He said the analysis had determined the approach path needed to clear the existing obstructions would be too steep, unsafe and not permissible. He mentioned this was why the project was changed to include acquisitions and tree removals. He stated the need for the PAPI's and the design phase of the next project was to mitigate the existing obstructions which were not practical to be removed, such as the property owner's house but instead the angle of the PAPI would be raised slightly on the Runway 30 end. Similarly on the Runway 12 end, he continued, there were numerous trees in the rolling hills residential neighborhood and they were proposing tree removal to mitigate, as well as raising the glide path angle slightly. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Westcott asked what type of aircraft glide slopes were used for the new analysis. Mr. Dubarry stated this was a PAPI and the standard glide path was 3 degrees and typically the maximum was a 3.3 degree increase on the glide path to clear obstructions because it was visual and not instrument based. He explained this was a visual guidance which had no bearing on what type of aircraft was used. Mr. Westcott asked if jets landed on this runway and Mr. Dubarry replied jets were capable of landing on that runway. Mr. Westcott said his understanding was that 2% or less of the aircrafts used this runway but propeller planes used it on a regular basis; he added his understanding was that propeller planes had a steeper glide slope than jets. Mr. Dubarry responded he could request more detailed information on how the glide path was established from C&S Engineers and Mr. Westcott said he would like to see that information.

Harrison Freer, Town of Queensbury resident, stated that jets did take off and land on this runway, mainly as a crosswind runway. He noted that certain large jets with small tires would not be able to land on the runway but jets did land there particularly when there was a westerly wind. He explained the runway was slanted in the direction that it was because the prevailing wind was from the west during certain times of the year. He said he was unsure where the 2% statistic had been

obtained from but he commented this amount seemed low. He stated this runway was used routinely for crosswind training for student pilots and the notion that jets did not or could not land there was incorrect. He mentioned jets would normally land on the north-south runway if it was dry with no crosswind. He expressed one advantage of having two runways was that if there was an accident on the main runway it was possible to divert air traffic to the second runway. He added this was an advantage which did not require the entire Airport to close down if there was an accident. Mr. Girard asked about the importance of crosswind training for student pilots and Mr. Freer responded it was a required training and proficiency in order to obtain any type of pilots license. Mr. Girard asked if obstructions to the runway would cause problems when teaching a student pilot the crosswind training and Mr. Freer responded that the removal of tree obstructions was a normal course of meeting the FAA safety requirements for runways and protection areas and the tree obstructions would be scary to a student pilot. Mr. Freer reiterated the 2% statistic seemed low; however, he added, even if that number was correct, there were vital tasks which occurred on this runway and jets did land there on a routine basis. Mr. Girard asked if \$56,000 for the County's share to obtain the lands and remove the obstructions was an excessive amount and Mr. Freer replied in the negative.

Mr. Westcott agreed it was necessary to remove the runway obstructions and he thanked Mr. Freer for clarifying the jet traffic on the runway. He asked if Mr. Freer had any idea of how many jets used this runway on a routine basis and Mr. Freer replied he could not provide an exact number but he had seen jets take off and land on this runway. Mr. Freer commented it made sense to always take off into the wind. Mr. Westcott asked if these jets were taking off and landing safely and Mr. Freer replied affirmatively. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Girard called the question which was carried by majority vote, with Mr. Westcott voting in opposition, to authorize the submission of a grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT in an amount not to exceed \$1,120,000 for the Land Easement/Acquisition for Phase II of the Runway 30 Approach Project. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 17, 2015 Board meeting.*

Mr. Dubarry requested authorization to submit a grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT in an amount not to exceed \$80,000 for the Runway 30 End Obstruction Mitigation and the Runway 12/30 PAPI Final Design and Installation. He noted the required local matching funds totaled \$4,000 and the Program Narrative was on page 10 of the agenda packet.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Conover and carried unanimously to authorize the submission of a grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 17, 2015 Board meeting.*

Mr. Dubarry requested authorization to submit a grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT in an amount not to exceed \$675,000 to acquire snow removal equipment (multi-function sweeper and plow) and Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting (ARFF) gear. He noted the required local matching funds totaled \$34,000 and the Program Narrative was on page 12 of the agenda packet; he added a photograph of the equipment to be purchased was on page 13 of the agenda packet. He explained the ARFF gear had a serviceable life of about 5 years and the grant funding would allow for the replacement of the existing gear. He stated the snow removal equipment would replace two pieces of existing equipment. He mentioned the Airport had highly specialized snow removal equipment and he noted in 2011 they had purchased a new snow blower, referred to as a rotary plow by the FAA, which was capable of removing 5 tons of snow per hour and casting it 150 to 200 feet into the in field. He said this piece of equipment was essential because it prevented the creation of hazardous snow banks

in the aircraft movement areas. Mr. Dubarry mentioned the Airport also had a runway broom which enabled the runways to be brought down to bare pavement conditions following a snow fall which was essential for aircraft safety. He reminded the Committee members that they were not allowed to use road salt at the Airport; however, he added, there were FAA approved ice melting materials which could be purchased, but were very expensive. He said that due to the cost of these materials they were used very sparingly and this past winter they were not used at all. Mr. Dubarry explained the equipment to be purchased with this grant funding was a combination snow plow and runway broom with an air blaster. He said the purchase of this piece of equipment would eliminate one piece of equipment from the Airport's snow removal fleet and would allow for efficiency with one operator performing two functions. Mr. Beaty asked if the designation of Part 139 required the Airport to own certain equipment and Mr. Dubarry replied that the designation allowed the Airport to qualify for the funding to cover the cost of the ARFF equipment and gear. Mr. Dubarry explained the Part 139 designation allowed the Airport to be eligible for the piece of equipment being purchased which they otherwise would not be. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Girard asked how old the equipment being replaced was and Mr. Dubarry replied there was a 1987 Sweepster (runway broom) which was a 27 year old piece of equipment well beyond its serviceable life. Mr. Dubarry said they would also be replacing a 2004 plow truck which was 11 years old and the FAA considered the serviceable life on snow removal equipment to be 10 to 12 years. Ms. Seeber stated for clarification purposes that given the age of the existing equipment, the Airport would need to replace the equipment anyway and they were saving the County a considerable amount of money by doing so through an FAA grant. She asked what would happen to the old equipment and Mr. Dubarry responded the plow truck would be transferred to the DPW because it was in relatively good condition. He explained this equipment stayed at the Airport and was only used during the winter months and was never used with road salt resulting in the equipment continuing to be in very good condition. Mr. Tennyson stated the DPW had re-purposed any piece of Airport equipment with any useful life remaining and he noted the Highway Manager was happy to receive former Airport equipment because it was always in good condition.

Motion was made by Mr. Conover, seconded by Ms. Seeber and carried by majority vote, with Mr. Westcott voting in opposition, to authorize the submission of the grant application to the FAA/NYS DOT in an amount not to exceed \$675,000 to acquire snow removal equipment (multi-function sweeper and plow) and ARFF gear. *A copy of resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 17, 2015 Board meeting.*

Mr. Dubarry requested authorization for the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to execute a revised State Contract Schedule A-1 for the 2012 ARFF Building Expansion Project. He explained this project had been completed some time ago but the FAA and the State were straightening out some of their paperwork. He said this revised Schedule A-1 would allow the State to issue the County's final reimbursement payment for this project.

Motion was made by Mr. Conover, seconded by Ms. Wood and carried unanimously to approve the request as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 17, 2015 Board meeting.*

Mr. Dubarry requested authorization to execute a Federal Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) form as part of the approval process for a future pavement crack sealing and repair project anticipated for 2016. He explained this was the environmental document which was part of the Federal environmental approval process for this project. He noted a copy of the CATEX form started on page 17 of the agenda packet. Mr. Conover said it seemed this would be important for any maintenance program at the Airport.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough, seconded by Ms. Wood and carried unanimously to approve the request as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 17, 2015 Board meeting.*

Pertaining to the fuel farm upgrades, Mr. Dubarry anticipated receipt of the NYSDOT grant agreement in the next 2 to 3 weeks for the upgrades to the aviation fuel farm. He said receipt of the agreement would necessitate the establishment of the capital project and a new contract with McFarland Johnson for the design, bidding and inspection services for that project. Mr. Tennyson explained they were trying to inform the Committee members of the impending receipt of the grant agreement because if it was received prior to the April 17, 2015 Board meeting, he intended to solicit approval of a Pre/Post Committee Meeting Resolution Request. He commented that he did not like to present out of Committee requests any more than necessary; however, he added, this resolution should be approved as quickly as possible because there was a current operational need at the Airport. He advised this was a 90% State grant and the required 10% local matching funds had been budgeted. It was the consensus of the Committee that a Pre/Post Committee Meeting Resolution Request form be completed as soon as the grant agreement was received to allow for approval at the April 17, 2015 Board meeting.

Pertaining to the soil contamination found at the construction site of the new Airport Restaurant, Mr. Dubarry informed the soil sampling and testing had been completed and the contracts were in place for the contaminated soil to be removed commencing on April 1, 2015. He added the work should be completed no later than Friday, April 3, 2015 and the total cost for the soil remediation was anticipated to be approximately \$4,000. He said he anticipated turning the site back over to Richard Schermerhorn, of Rich Air, to resume construction of the restaurant. Mr. Tennyson explained that this situation had not been anticipated and was not budgeted, but he felt they would be able to absorb the costs. Mr. Conover asked how much soil had to be removed and Mr. Tennyson replied 80 to 100 tons.

Mr. Dubarry apprised the final tree removal had been completed on the approach end to Runway 1 and this information had been submitted to the FAA for removal from their database which would enable the approach minimums to Runway 1 to be lowered. He added this process could take some time and a new minimum approach was not anticipated until November or December of 2015. Mr. Strough asked if the approach minimum was the decision altitude and Mr. Dubarry replied affirmatively adding this would impact the decision height and the visibility for this runway. Mr. Tennyson pointed out the final tree removals had been completed by Airport staff members.

Mr. Dubarry announced that the Airport's Wildlife Hazard Management consultant would be on site on April 24, 2015 to perform their annual Wildlife Management Mitigation and Firearm Safety Training for Airport personnel. Mr. Conover commented the Committee had discussed completing a tour of the Airport at a future County Facilities Committee meeting as soon as the weather was agreeable.

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Ms. Wood and seconded by Mr. Monroe, Mr. Girard adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Charlene DiResta, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist