

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: MARCH 26, 2008

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: OTHERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS HASKELL	WILLIAM LAMY, DPW SUPERINTENDENT
O'CONNOR	FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS
VANNESS	REPRESENTING CLARK PATTERSON LEE:
GIRARD	JOHN J. MARTIN
GOODSPEED	JON NORRIS
	BETH CURRAN

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: REPRESENTING BOVIS LEND LEASE:

SUPERVISORS THOMAS	JOHN HORGAN
CHAMPAGNE	PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ATTORNEY
	HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES
	JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
	SUPERVISORS BENTLEY
	KENNY
	STRAINER
	TAYLOR
	TESSIER
	RICHARD MURPHY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF FISCAL SERVICES
	FRANK O'KEEFE, COUNTY TREASURER
	ROBERT LYNCH, DEPUTY TREASURER
	KAREN PUTNEY, ADMINISTRATOR OF FIRE PREVENTION AND BUILDING CODE ENFORCEMENT
	JULIE PACYNA, PURCHASING AGENT
	ROBERT METTHE, DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
	FRED AUSTIN, BUILDING PROJECT MANAGER
	ROBERT PHELPS, COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
	DAVID CEDERSTROM, <i>THE CHRONICLE</i>
	AMANDA ALLEN, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Haskell called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 9:30 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. O'Connor and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the February 26, 2008 Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the agenda were distributed to the Committee members; *a copy is also on file with the*

minutes.

Mr. Haskell advised that along with the agenda, a list of costs for the proposed Health and Human Services Building (HHSB), as developed by the Construction Manager Bovis Lend Lease, had been distributed; *a copy of this document is also on file with the minutes*. He noted that this documentation reflected the HHSB project costs as \$16,923,742, with a cost per square foot of \$262.38, which was very close to the \$16.9 million budget the Board of Supervisors had authorized for the project.

Mr Haskell pointed out that this document also included alternatives for the HHSB, which would increase the aforementioned project costs. The first option, he announced, was for the addition of an 8,300 sq. ft. unfinished basement at a cost of \$614,940, which amounted to an approximate cost of \$74 per sq. ft. for storage space. Mr. Haskell stated that the Core Team recommended this addition as the majority of the storage space available to the County was already full. He added that this might also prove to be an inexpensive solution for the space needed to house the voting machines being purchased by the Board of Elections. Mr. Haskell noted that the basement space would not be set up to accommodate office space needs but would be solely for storage use.

Mr. VanNess reminded the Committee that in previous meetings they had discussed the possibility of erecting a metal building at the site on which the old Sheriff's Building currently stood and he asked if a price for this project had been determined. John Martin, of Clark Patterson Lee (CPL), responded that they were still in the preliminary stages of reviewing this project and a cost had not yet been derived. However, Mr. Martin added, they had identified three possible options for space to house the voting machines, the first of which would be to demolish the old Sheriff's Building and build a metal building in its place. The second option, he announced, would be to renovate the old Sheriff's Building to a bare bones status solely to house the voting machines and the third would be to house them in the proposed basement of the HHSB. Mr. Martin stated that they had already determined that the cost to demolish the old Sheriff's Building would be in the range of \$700,000; therefore, he said, renovating the building had become a promising solution that would be less costly than demolishing it for the placement of a new building. He then notified the Committee that in determining costs for all of these options, they would present two alternatives for each analysis to reflect the costs for bare bones storage space for the voting machines and another to reflect the costs to add office space to move the Board of Elections into that same space.

Mr. Kenny asked if the figures presented for the addition of a basement to the HHSB included the costs for electrical wiring and lighting, and Mr. Haskell replied affirmatively. Mr. Kenny then asked if the basement would be heated and cooled and Mr. Haskell replied that the basement would be heated but it would not be cooled. Mr. Kenny stated that although he agreed that they needed to be very frugal in determining the costs for the HHSB, the addition of a basement appeared to be sensible.

Discussion ensued with respect to the addition of a basement to the HHSB.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to add a

basement consisting of 8,300 sq. ft. to the proposed Heath and Human Services Building, at an additional cost of \$614,940, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the next Board meeting.

Mr. Haskell stated that the second alternative listed pertained to the inclusion of provisions for the future addition of a fourth level to the HHSB. He explained that for an additional cost of \$982,433, the appropriate steel supports would be included in the Building so that in the event the County chose to add an additional story at a later date they could do so. Mr. Haskell advised that the Core Team was not recommending this option due to the considerable cost and the uncertainty of whether or not the additional floor would ever be added.

Mr. O'Connor agreed with the Core Team's determination, stating that he was not in favor of the additional provisions and preferred that the funds be spent to rehabilitate the old Sheriff's Building. Mr. Goodspeed also agreed; however, he added, in light of the manner in which County services were growing, inevitably, there would come a time when the County would once again realize space issues. He suggested that due to the ever changing technology and highly effective manners of communication, it might make sense to decentralize some of the services offered by the County by expanding their localities into the northern portions of the County.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Goodspeed and carried unanimously to eliminate option two, to add future capacity for a fourth story, as a possibility for the proposed Health and Human Services Building.

The third alternative listed, Mr. Haskell explained, referred to the purchase of a back-up generator for the HHSB, the cost of which was estimated at \$75,000. He pointed out that there was currently an emergency back-up generator located at the Municipal Center Annex that could be moved to the HHSB. Mr. Haskell reminded the Committee that this generator had previously been sought by the Countryside Adult Home; however, he noted, their existing generator had been brought up to standards and was now sufficient to meet their needs. He said that it was the suggestion of the Core Team that the generator currently in place at the Municipal Center Annex be transported to the HHSB, although there would be a lapse of a couple of months where they would be susceptible to power outages until the installation of the generator was complete. Mr. Haskell stated that in light of the substantial amount of money they would save by using equipment the County already owned, the risk was worthwhile.

Mr. VanNess asked if there would be costs incurred to move the generator and Mr. Haskell replied affirmatively. He added that they would have to further investigate whether or not the DPW could move the generator or if they would have to hire an independent contractor to relocate the equipment. Regardless of the method used, he said, he was sure that the costs would be less than what would be required to purchase a new unit.

Karen Putney, Administrator of Fire Prevention and Building Code Enforcement, noted that moving the generator would leave her Department with no backup power source. Mr. Haskell replied that when the generator was moved they would make arrangements to directly connect that building, as

well as the Detention Home, to the Westmount Health Facility in order to ensure that a back-up power source was available.

Motion was made by Mr. Goodspeed, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to move the generator at the Municipal Center Annex to the proposed Health and Human Services Building and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 18th Board meeting.

Mr. Haskell apprised that the fourth alternative listed pertained to the addition of an enclosed bus stop in front of the HHSB to protect those citizens partaking of public transportation from the elements. He said that although an initial cost of \$20,000 had been estimated for this addition, they had since been advised that Glens Falls Transit would install the bus stop at no cost to the County.

Moving to the fifth alternative, Mr. Haskell stated that this item referred to the future of the Department of Social Services (DSS) Building located at the Municipal Center Annex. He noted that this option consisted of three parts, which were the abatement of the DSS Building, to rid the building of asbestos and other harmful materials, at a cost of \$100,000; demolition of the existing building, at a cost of \$350,000 and removal of the parking lot and pavement, at a cost of \$80,000; totaling \$530,000 for all portions. Mr. Haskell apprised that the Core Team had unanimously decided to leave the existing parking lot in place because in the future they would inevitably require another building and that would be a perfect location, therefore, it seemed senseless to remove one parking lot just to put down another in the future. However, he said, the Core Team did recommend that both the abatement and demolition be done upon completion of the HHSB in light of the changing standards implemented by the State of New York. Mr. Haskell pointed out that if the abatement was done but the building was not demolished, in the future the State might determine that there were additional items that required removal, leading to increased abatement costs.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he was inclined to agree that both the abatement and demolition should be done together in light of the State's frequently changing procedures. Conversely, Mr. Goodspeed stated that an argument could be made to defer the demolition of the DSS Building until the County had fulfilled its financial obligations to the burn plant and the overall fiscal health of the County improved. Mr. Haskell stated that they certainly could postpone demolition of the DSS Building; although, he noted, he was sure that the demolition prices would escalate in the meantime. Mr. O'Connor then stated that before choosing to postpone the demolition, they should research and consider the costs to appropriately maintain the building in an unoccupied state. He added that they should review these costs to be sure that it was fiscally prudent to maintain the building for awhile prior to demolishing it, rather than doing it when the HHSB was completed.

Mr. Haskell stated that the primary concern of the Core Team had been the possibility of vandalism of the building once it was unoccupied and the County's liability exposure for any trespassers entering it.

William Lamy, DPW Superintendent, asked if the abatement and demolition costs for the DSS Building would be included in the bonding process for the HHSB if the work was done upon

evacuation of the DSS Building and Mr. Haskell replied affirmatively. Mr. Lamy pointed out that if this procedure was used, the funds would come from the bonding project, rather than becoming an appropriation from the County's annual budget, as they would if the demolition was delayed until a later date. Mr. Haskell noted that in the future when another building was eventually needed, the demolition costs for the DSS Building could be included in that building project.

Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, noted that the DSS Building had an intrusion alarm that could be left intact to deter vandals if they chose to demolish the building at a later date.

Mr. Martin advised that the DSS Building could not be demolished until the HHSB was completed, which he estimated to be mid 2010; therefore, a decision did not have to be made until that time. Mr. Goodspeed replied that although this may be true, the financial obligation of the demolition costs would have to be addressed presently as they would have to be included in the bonding process for the HHSB.

Mr. Girard stated that he was not in favor of delaying the demolition if they would be required to heat the DSS Building once it had been vacated and he asked what measures would have to be taken once the Building was empty. Mr. Haskell replied that in his opinion the building would not have to be heated and would only require that the water lines be drained, incurring minimal expenses. However, he said, he was hesitant to delay the demolition as in the future it might be determined that the abandoned building was appropriate for storage or something on a short term basis, leading to re-occupation of the DSS Building, which was not favorable given the deterioration of the building.

Discussion ensued.

It was the consensus of the Committee that further discussion on this matter was necessary prior to making a definitive decision as to when the DSS Building would be demolished. Mr. Haskell asked Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings, to prepare an estimation of the costs that would be incurred to maintain the DSS Building, with only electrical service, for presentation at the next Committee meeting.

Moving to the sixth alternative outlined, Mr. Haskell pointed out that \$600,000 was listed as the Furniture and Fixture Expense (FFE) project budget for the HHSB. He explained that representatives of CPL, as well as Mr. Payne and Julie Pacyna, Purchasing Agent, had toured the DSS Building to determine what existing office furniture could be used in the new building and what required replacement, at which time they had decided that only about half of the existing furniture could be used. Mr. Haskell pointed out that the HHSB would include several additional areas, such as waiting and visitation rooms, not currently included in the DSS Building, which would require all new furniture and he asked Mrs. Pacyna to speak on this matter.

Mrs. Pacyna stated that the first step in this process was to determine the caliber of furniture the

Committee wished to purchase for the HHSB as, even at State contract pricing, it was possible to spend a considerable amount on furniture. Mrs. Pacyna added that they also had the option of saving funds initially by purchasing lower quality furniture, although those items might not last as long as some of the higher priced units of better quality.

When asked what caliber of furniture the \$600,000 FFE budget was based upon, Beth Curran, Interior Designer for CPL, explained that the initial budget had been estimated at \$1.2 million to furnish the entire HHSB, which they had simply split in half when the determination was made that approximately half of the existing furniture could be used. However, Ms. Curran pointed out, the furniture that could be reused in the HHSB did not translate to furnishing half of the new building, as it was quite a bit larger than the DSS Building. She added that it was her feeling that the \$600,000 FFE budget would not be sufficient for all of the furniture needs.

Ms. Curran advised that the initial \$1.2 million estimate had been based on the purchase of a "B" grade of furniture. She noted that evolving technology had given the capability to produce furniture more cheaply, although this also meant that most of the furniture had a shorter use life. Ms. Curran apprised that she had reviewed the listing of furniture purchased for the Municipal Center when it was built in the 1960's and at that time most furniture was made of steel and could be counted on for a very long life, which was not the same case currently.

The \$1.2 million figure given, Ms. Curran stated, was a general estimate that would be refined once they were able to determine the actual furniture needs of the HHSB. She pointed out that the desks and furniture purchased for the Municipal Center in the 1960's were not intended to hold computer equipment and because they could now obtain desks intended for such purposes, and also to transmit data, they could reduce the number of electrical and data outlets needed by partaking of these new advancements. Ms. Curran said that although they could certainly purchase cheaper office equipment, she encouraged the Committee to purchase items made for current and future technology.

Mr. Goodspeed asked how many employees would be working in the HHSB and Mr. Payne replied that there would be approximately 160. Mr. Payne then stated that he found the furniture cost estimates to be astronomical and he cited that \$550 had been budgeted for each office chair, \$200 for each stackable chair, *such as those used in the break rooms*, \$3,200 to \$3,400 for each desk or workstation. He said that he felt these numbers were far from reasonable and Mr. Goodspeed agreed.

John Horgan, of Bovis Lend Lease, stated that it was important to remember that the costs of the workstations included provisions for partitions, which would be placed rather than hard walls and those costs had to be considered also. Ms. Curran stated that they had not been hired to make the furniture purchases, but rather to guide the County in purchasing what was necessary. She added that these figures were based on worst case scenario costs and she was absolutely confident that these figures would be reduced. However, she noted, until they started meeting with Warren County staff to determine the absolute furniture needs, the figure could not be reduced and she reiterated that the \$1.2 million estimate represented an overall budget from the schematic phase of the project.

Mr. Haskell advised that because the FFE budget would have to be included in the bonding process for the HHSB, the Committee now had to determine what figure was acceptable.

Mr. Girard suggested an appropriate compromise might be to increase the FFE budget to \$800,000. Mr. VanNess agreed with Mr. Girard's suggestion and added that any unused funds should be returned to offset the bond. Frank O'Keefe, County Treasurer, confirmed that the funds bonded for the FFE budget could not be used for any other purpose and, therefore, had to be returned to the bond.

Discussion ensued with respect to the FFE budget.

Motion was made by Mr. O'Connor, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried by majority vote to increase the Furniture and Fixtures Expense Budget for the proposed Health and Human Services Building project to \$800,000, with Mr. Goodspeed voting in opposition.

Mr. Haskell apprised that the seventh, and final alternative listed, referred to the Information Technology (IT) budget for the HHSB, and he asked Robert Metthe, Director of IT, to address this item. Mr. Metthe distributed copies of the proposed IT budget for the HHSB to the Committee members; *a copy of which is on file with the minutes.*

During his presentation, Mr. Metthe noted that a considerable portion of the \$310,961.51 IT budget would be attributed to the purchase of a telephone system. He explained that the system they intended to purchase allowed for both the telephone and data to run through the same line, increasing overall efficiency. Mr. Metthe stated that because the telephones currently in use were outdated, it made much more sense to purchase a new system, and in the process standardize the system used for the HHSB. Additionally, he noted, the new system would allow for the phones to be maintained and programmed from a centralized location, saving additional staff time and costs.

Mr. O'Connor pointed out that the IT budget included \$32,000 for the purchase of six 50" LCD monitors for the conference rooms in the HHSB and he said that he thought these prices were high. Mr. Metthe agreed with Mr. O'Connor's statement and he added that at the time this budget was developed the average price for the monitors was \$4,000 per unit. However, Mr. Metthe said, the prices had since decreased and he said that the prices for these units would be reduced by approximately half as the evolving technology would lead to lower prices for these items. He added that he expected a great deal of the technology expenses included in the budget to decrease by the time they purchased the items; however, he said, the budget had been developed based on current costs.

Mr. VanNess asked if the equipment included in the IT budget allowed for future upgrades and advancement as the technology changed and Mr. Metthe replied affirmatively. Mr. Haskell pointed out that although evolving technology would lead to lower priced equipment in some areas, he was sure that it would lead to increases in other areas.

Mr. Metthe apprised that the telephone units listed were estimated at a cost of \$400 per unit; however, he said, he was aware of a supplier from whom he could purchase the units at a cost of \$300 each. He advised that he had estimated the cost at \$400 per unit as that was the average rate they would be paying if he could not obtain them from the lower priced supplier.

Mr. Morehouse pointed out that a figure of \$30,000 had been estimated for the installation of a Kronos timekeeping system in the HHSB, which had not been included in the IT budget. He said that rather than reducing the budget, it might be better to leave the estimates as they were to allow funding for this purchase.

When asked for a better explanation of the Kronos system, Mr. Lamy advised that this was used to keep track of employee time and attendance, and was currently in use by both the DPW and the Westmount Health Facility. He added that this system allowed for information to be transferred directly to the Treasurer's Office for payroll use. Mr. Payne pointed out that this might be a good opportunity to standardize the entire County in the timekeeping methods used by installing the Kronos system at the Municipal Center also. Mr. Morehouse stated that regardless of the timekeeping method chosen, some sort of time-clock would be required and he estimated the cost of a standard time-clock to be approximately \$1,000.

Robert Phelps, Commissioner of the Department of Social Services, stated that it would be a good idea to install the Kronos system because a considerable portion of his duties included reviewing his employee's time cards and much of this time could be saved through the use of the automated timekeeping system.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Girard deduced that the purpose of the meeting had been to approve budgets associated with the project for use in the bonding process and he asked if the Committee would still have some control over how the budgets were used. Mr. Haskell replied affirmatively, noting that they would ask Mrs. Pacyna and Mr. Metthe to return to the Committee with the listings of the items they intended to purchase for approval once those items had been determined.

Mrs. Pacyna pointed out that she would not be responsible for determining what items were purchased. She explained that the Department Heads would come to her with their requests and she was then involved in the approval process to be sure that the purchases were made in the correct manner. Mr. VanNess stated that although he understood that Mrs. Pacyna was not responsible for determining what would be purchased, he felt that she could certainly alert the Committee to any purchases that seemed unwarranted or too costly.

Mr. Kenny asked if the costs of implementing a more sophisticated timekeeping system, such as those using a thumb print scanning method, had been reviewed. Mr. Morehouse replied that he was in the process of doing so; however, he noted the \$30,000 he had quoted for the Kronos timekeeping system would also cover the costs of a biometric system, such as the one suggested by Mr. Kenny.

Mr. Metthe stated that one of the big projects the IT Department was currently working on was to determine the best available timekeeping system for the County and he noted that he would be making a trip to Washington County during the following week to view the system they were using. He explained that Washington County had implemented the Kronos timekeeping system on a County-wide basis, the costs for which had been estimated in the area of \$300,000. Mr. Metthe said that they would be working with surrounding Counties and the Treasurer's Office to determine what was the best choice for Warren County and he advised that his Department was in the infancy of researching the use of the New World system currently in place, as an alternative to the Kronos timekeeping system and the costs associated with it.

Mr. Goodspeed asked Mr. Metthe if he was comfortable with the New World system and Mr. Metthe replied affirmatively, adding that the system had saved the County thousands of hours of work.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. O'Connor and carried unanimously to reduce the Information Technology Budget for the proposed Health and Human Services Building to \$295,000.

Mr. Haskell apprised that by including the additions and changes approved by the Committee, the HHSB project total had now risen to approximately \$18.6 million, which would have to be approved by the full Board of Supervisors at their next meeting.

Moving along, Mr. Haskell apprised that although a figure had not yet been derived for its use, they had requested quotations on the implementation of geo-thermal energy in the HHSB, as had been installed for the Municipal Center. He distributed copies of an article pertaining to geo-thermal energy and the savings that could be obtained through its use; *a copy of the article is also on file with the minutes*. Mr. Haskell stated that once the geo-thermal system had been installed at the Municipal Center, it had eliminated the need for the cooling tower and the majority of the boilers used. He said that CPL was currently working on developing an estimate for the costs that would be incurred by tying the HHSB into the geo-thermal system already in place at the Municipal Center. Mr. Haskell added that once the costs of the system were delivered, those quotations would also include a time-line reflecting the amount of time it would take for the savings incurred from the use of the geo-thermal heating system to offset the costs to implement it. He stated that they would discuss this matter further once the financial aspects of this addition were determined.

Mr. Payne advised that in working with Paul Dusek, County Attorney, and Bovis Lend Lease with regard to their contract for the HHSB project, some questions had been raised with respect to the phasing of the project and the costs attached. He explained that currently, the project was scheduled for two phases, which were the site plan phase and the building phase, which would allow for construction to begin in July of 2008. Mr. Payne advised that they now recognized the potential to save approximately \$200,000 by combining these phases to form a single bid for the project.

Mr. Horgan stated that he could not commit to the monetary figures relayed by Mr. Payne without first researching them for accuracy. However, he said, the double bid approach would allow for the

building phase to begin sooner and for the construction crews to take advantage of the winter months as the steel frame would be established during the fall, allowing enclosure of the building so that the construction crews could work through the winter. He said that if they were forced to delay the installation of the steel structure until the winter months, as they would through the single bid process, the entire project schedule would be delayed as they would not be able to enclose the building until spring.

Mr. Martin stated that the CPL project schedule called for the bonding decisions to be made by May 16th, in order to complete schematics and allow for the bid periods to run from July 15 through August 15 by using the double bid package. Mr. Norris added that if the single bid process was used, the bid process would not begin until after the completion of all schematics, which would not allow for bidding to begin until October of 2008.

Mr. Haskell stated that he was in favor of the two bid approach which would allow for the building to be completed more quickly and Mr. O'Connor agreed. Conversely, Mr. Goodspeed stated that by proceeding with the single bid option, reducing the furniture budget and delaying the abatement and demolition of the DSS Building, they had the opportunity to save the County \$1 million. Mr. Haskell pointed out that if the project were delayed further any savings would be eaten up by the escalating costs of construction materials.

Mr. Martin stated it was his opinion that the project should be moved ahead as quickly as possible, which would require some discipline on the Supervisors' part as once the foundation of the building was set, the design and size could no longer be changed.

Mr. Goodspeed asked Mr. Martin if it was possible for the County to spend the extra funds to proceed with the two phase option as per their suggestion, and then for the project to be delayed anyway and if he foresaw any such scenarios. Mr. Martin replied that rising costs would be realized in escalating construction costs and also engineering costs if the project was delayed. He added that if the proposed Luther Forest Project came to fruition, construction costs could escalate considerably. Mr. Martin stated that although there was the possibility of some type of issue arising that would cause the County to expend the additional funds and still end up on the same project schedule, he felt that the County would not really be saving anything by choosing the single bid option because their savings would be offset by rising construction costs. He noted that in spite of the tangible risks, this was the way in which typical businesses ran, in that time is money and they attempted to fast track any project they could.

Mr. Morehouse asked if it was possible to attain lower bids from construction companies able to keep their crews working throughout the winter and Mr. Horgan replied affirmatively. He explained that the quicker they could sign on a construction company the better, as labor rates traditionally rose in the spring and it was better to lock in the services when those costs were lower. Mr. Horgan reiterated that the savings of \$200,000 they referred to had not been derived by Bovis Lend Lease, and although they would be glad to determine the exact savings, he was not able to commit to this figure.

When asked by Mr. Haskell, Mr. Horgan apprised that construction costs could increase by as much as 10% if the project was delayed for an additional six months.

Mr. Goodspeed stated that based on the explanation given by Messrs. Martin and Horgan he was now confident in agreeing that they should elect the two phase bids suggested by the project engineers to accelerate the HHSB project.

Discussion ensued.

Pending discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that the two phase bid plan should be used.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Mr. Morehouse, who began the agenda review with item 2b, Energy Curtailment Specialists. He stated that although information regarding this item had been presented previously, there had been some confusion as to what it involved. Mr. Morehouse apprised that Energy Curtailment Specialists sought to develop a contract with Warren County which would require the County to use its generators as the primary source of power for County buildings if there was an emergency electrical situation in other parts of the State, specifically in the downstate area. He explained that this would not be an everyday occurrence and the County would be paid based on the kilowatt usage, amounting to approximately \$7,000 per year, and in addition would pay for fuel and labor costs incurred during these times. Mr. Morehouse stated that he had initially presented this request because it seemed both a good source of revenue and an opportunity to exercise the County's generators, which was not a bad thing. He added that the County would be able to opt out of the contract at any time if they were unhappy with it. Mr. Morehouse advised that if the Committee was interested in researching this matter further he would contact Energy Curtailment Specialists to schedule a formal presentation to the group.

Pending further discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that this request should be considered further and Mr. Morehouse was given direction to contact Energy Curtailment Specialists to schedule a presentation.

Along the same lines, Mr. Payne advised that he and Mrs. Pacyna had signed on with a group affiliated with NYSAC (New York State Association of Counties) who would provide studies on the purchase of utilities for all County Buildings except for the Westmount Health Facility. He said that once the results of the report were received they would be discussed further.

Mr. Morehouse stated that agenda item 3a pertained to an unpaid CPL invoice, which required input from Mr. Dusek. He said that because Mr. Dusek was not currently in attendance they would move on to item 3b, which consisted of a request for a new contract with IBS Septic. Mr. Morehouse stated that the County currently held a contract with Stone Septic for sewage removal; however, he said, they occasionally encountered issues with clogged drains, at which point alternate services were required. He apprised that IBS Septic was a local company that previously held the sewage removal contract with the County and, therefore, were familiar with the County's system. Mr. Morehouse

stated that because the contract was for less than \$2,000, a bid was not necessary.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to authorize a new contract with IBS Septic for drain cleaning and camera inspection as needed for a total amount not to exceed \$2,000, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 18th Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Morehouse advised that agenda item 3c reflected a request for a new contract with Fire Control Systems, Inc. for yearly sprinkler system inspections throughout the County buildings. He said that they do not currently have such a contract and the services were being requested through the County's insurance broker.

Motion was made by Mr. Goodspeed, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to approve the request for a new contract with Fire Control Systems, Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$600 per year and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 18th Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Dusek entered the meeting at 11:25 a.m.

Returning to agenda item 3a, Mr. Dusek apprised that he was in receipt of an unpaid invoice in the amount of \$19,642 from CPL. He said that he had researched the origins of the bill and found that it the result of services provided through the fall months in relation to meetings with the Core Team and the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Dusek stated that he was unable to find any resolutions authorizing the work or payment; therefore, he said, a resolution was necessary to authorize such payment.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Goodspeed and carried unanimously to authorize payment in the amount of \$19,642 to Clark Patterson Lee as outlined above and the necessary resolution was authorized for the April 18th Board meeting.

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Mr. VanNess and seconded by Mr. Goodspeed, Mr. Haskell adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist