

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: PUBLIC SAFETY

DATE: FEBRUARY 28, 2008

---

---

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS VANNESS  
BENTLEY  
O'CONNOR  
BELDEN  
HASKELL  
STEC  
GIRARD

OTHERS PRESENT:

BUD YORK, SHERIFF  
AMY MANNEY, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF  
EMERGENCY SERVICES  
BRIAN LAFLURE, 1<sup>ST</sup> DEPUTY FIRE COORDINATOR  
FREDERICK MONROE, CHAIRMAN  
JOAN SADY, CLERK  
PATRICIA NENNINGER, SECOND ASSISTANT COUNTY  
ATTORNEY  
JOANN MCKINSTRY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES  
SUPERVISORS GERAGHTY  
TESSIER  
CHARLES FIEGL, *THE POST STAR*  
AMANDA ALLEN, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST  
*Please see the attached guest sign-in sheet, on file with  
the minutes, for the additional attendees.*

---

---

Mr. VanNess called the meeting of the Public Safety Committee to order at 10:55 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Belden, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the January 24<sup>th</sup> Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Bud York, Sheriff, who distributed copies of the Sheriff & Communications agenda to the Committee members. *A copy of the agenda is on file with the minutes.*

Sheriff York began the agenda review with the first item listed, which referred to discussion regarding the seized and unclaimed bicycles held by the Sheriff's Department. He said that in their evidence bay they held a number of unclaimed bicycles that in the past had been sold on behalf of the County; however, he stated, the County Attorney's Office had advised of the possibility of liability exposure in using this procedure. Sheriff York apprised that he no longer wanted the bicycles to be sold, as he preferred that they be donated to charitable organizations throughout the County. He added that if the Committee was in agreement he would contact the County Attorney to determine the legality of the donations.

Mr. Belden stated that he was in favor of Sheriff York's suggestion, provided that the bicycles were donated in the condition in which they were obtained, incurring no cost to the County. Sheriff York replied that this would certainly be the case and he added they would also require that the organizations receiving the bicycles sign a waiver absolving the County of any liability.

Motion was made by Mr. Girard, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to donate the seized or unclaimed bicycles being held by the Sheriff's Department to charitable organizations of Warren County, on an as-is basis, pending the approval of the County Attorney. *A copy of the Resolution Request form is on file with the minutes.*

Sheriff York stated that agenda item two referred to the Warren County Sheriff Department's 2007 Annual Statistical Report, a copy of which was included in the agenda. He asked the Committee members to review the Report at their leisure and contact him with any questions they might have.

Moving to agenda item three, Sheriff York advised that they were considering moving the Sheriff sub-station located in the Town of Warrensburg back to its original location at the DPW (Department of Public Works) Shop in Warrensburg. He said that in discussion with William Lamy, DPW Superintendent, regarding the matter he had been advised that Mr. Lamy had no issue with the relocation and that the space previously occupied by the Sheriff's Department had remained unused since their departure. Sheriff York stated that there would be no cost to the County for the move; and he added that because the sub-station was located in the Senior Citizen's Center, when they vacated the premises that space would be returned for the Senior's use. He noted that he had discussed the issue with Mr. Geraghty, who had agreed that occupation of the Senior Citizen's Center was not appropriate because they should not be mixing arrestees with the elderly population.

Motion was made by Mr. Belden, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously authorizing the Sheriff's personnel to move from the Warrensburg sub-station back to their previous location at the DPW Shop in Warrensburg.

Sheriff York reminded the Committee that during their previous meeting a resolution had been authorized that would allow the Sheriff's Records Department to charge a fee of \$25 for all accident report requests. He said that since that meeting he had been advised by the County Attorney's Office that there was a State Law in place that prevented this action; therefore, he said, the request had been withdrawn. Sheriff York stated that this item required no further action and had been presented for the Committee's information only.

Agenda item five referred to discussion of a possible shortfall in overtime and part-time funding, Sheriff York announced. He said that the Budget had included \$100,000 less in overtime funding for the Law Enforcement Division and only \$173,000 had been budgeted for part-time salaries for 2008, regardless of the fact that almost \$280,000 had been spent in 2007, some of which had been transferred from the Overtime Budget. Sheriff York stated that because the Overtime Budget had been drastically reduced, he did not know how they would fund any overages in part-time salary costs. He said that although there was no issue currently, they might be forced to address this matter prior to the end of 2008 and he wanted the Committee to be aware of the situation. Sheriff York pointed out that the agenda included a Budget Performance Report, which he encouraged the Committee members to review at their convenience.

Sheriff York advised that agenda item six pertained to prior discussion and Committee authorization to commission an audit of the Sheriff's Department and its Divisions, due to the change in administration upon his taking office. He said that he had sent out an RFP (Request for Proposal) to various auditing firms, as well as the State Comptroller who would perform the audit at no cost to the County. Sheriff York stated that the response from the State Comptroller's Office had been that although they would perform the audit, they recommended that it not be done presently because they had done one only a year ago, at which time they had found no problems. He said that he agreed with the State Comptroller's statement and could not justify putting forth the effort to perform another audit in light of the fact that no adverse results had been found during the previous one. Therefore, Sheriff York advised, he was withdrawing his request for the Departmental audit.

Mr. VanNess asked if Committee action was necessary to rescind their prior approval to seek out an audit and Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, replied in the negative, noting that because the approval was given on the Committee level, and not by resolution, no action was necessary. In addition, she stated, the withdrawal would be noted in the Committee minutes.

Proceeding to agenda item number seven, Sheriff York apprised that he was researching the possibility of sending personnel for K-9 training. He said that both the dog and training necessary were being donated to the County and they would only need to facilitate travel to Cooperstown, NY, where the State Police would provide the training. Sheriff York noted that a K-9 Unit was a great program that helped with drug issues and he was very excited to see it reinstated in Warren County.

Mr. VanNess stated that he and Sheriff York had spoken extensively about the possibility of reinstating the K-9 Unit and also of the lawsuit that had ended its previous existence in Warren County. He said that although there was no guarantee that a similar situation would not occur again in the future, Sheriff York intended to meet with the County Attorney to discuss the issue at length to avoid lawsuits and liability in the future. Mr. VanNess stated that this seemed to be a good opportunity for the County as both the dog and the K-9 training were being donated.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he remembered the trials and tribulations surrounding the lawsuit against the County and unless Sheriff York could convince him that this was a worthwhile venture that would have no repercussions in the future, he would not be in favor of reinstating the K-9 Patrol. Sheriff York replied that while he hoped to convince all of the Supervisors that the K-9 Unit was a worthwhile venture, it was his opinion that the lawsuit had been based on differing personalities and could have been avoided through different management. He added that although he did not expect a similar situation in the future, he would meet with the County Attorney to ensure that every possible step was taken to avoid such an occurrence. Mr. O'Connor stated that he was not making his statement of non-support without having sufficient information. He apprised that when the K-9 Unit was in place he had known the Officers handling the dogs, as well as the dogs themselves, and was very familiar with the problems that had resulted.

Mr. VanNess pointed out that both the Washington County Sheriff's Department and the State

Police had successfully maintained K-9 Units for a number of years with no issues arising such as the one experienced by the Warren County Sheriff's Department. He said that he agreed with Sheriff York in that the lawsuit had been attributed to personality conflicts. In addition, Mr. VanNess apprised, because theirs had been one of the first K-9 Units in the area, it was possible that the proper protocol was not in effect when the Unit was introduced and it was his hope that if the K-9 Unit were reintroduced the proper procedures would be undertaken. Sheriff York advised that he hoped to have all of the particulars surrounding the reinstatement of the K-9 Unit in place for presentation at their next Committee meeting, as the training in Cooperstown, NY was scheduled to begin on May 1<sup>st</sup>.

Resuming the agenda review, Sheriff York presented a request to fill the vacant position of Communications Officer. He explained that this position was being vacated by a young lady who had been very capable and efficient; however, he said, she was leaving the position to continue her education in pursuit of a career as a school teacher.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the request to fill the vacant position of Communication Officer, base salary \$30,100, due to resignation, and refer same to the Personnel Committee. *A copy of the Notice of Intent to Fill Vacant Position form is on file with the minutes.*

Sheriff York announced that agenda item nine pertained to discussion on HIDTA (High Intensity Drug Traffic Area). He explained that approximately \$330,000 per year was available in funding for manpower, equipment, K-9 Units and vehicles for the K-9 Units over a 20 year period, totaling \$6.6 million. Sheriff York stated that receipt of this funding was not guaranteed and they had only recently begun the process for obtaining it. He noted that HIDTA was responsible for the tracking of drugs and gangs and their closest location was in Albany; and he added, that they did not have a hub for the Northern corridor, where a considerable amount of drugs were coming into the Country from Canada. Sheriff York stated that HIDTA was in search of a location for a hub in this area and if Warren County was chosen it would include the implementation of a computer mainframe system to track drug and gang information, as well as manpower, K-9 dogs and vehicles to transport those dogs.

Mr. Belden asked Sheriff York to keep the Committee informed of the status of this issue and Sheriff York replied that he certainly would. Mr. Belden stated that one of his concerns was that in prior agreements such as this they were required to add staff and when the grant funds ran out the County was required to continue paying for the position, as it had become necessary. Sheriff York replied that if Warren County was chosen as a hub location, the funding indicated would be received for a 20-year period, so this would not be an immediate concern.

Concluding the agenda review, Sheriff York suggested that the County adopt a Local Law allowing payment for medical expenses from inmate health insurance policies. He pointed out that a number of Sheriff Departments across the State had already adopted Laws allowing this practice and there was no reason why Warren County should not do so also. Sheriff York apprised that there had been an instance during the prior year where a female inmate had been incarcerated for three months,

during which time she had required an extensive bone marrow procedure which had cost the County about \$50,000 in medical fees. He said that these charges were insidious and it was his feeling that the County should seek out reimbursement from inmate medical coverage, as well as Medicaid. Sheriff York advised that as per Paul Dusek, County Attorney, the adoption of a Local Law was necessary to proceed in this manner.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to approve the request to authorize the County Attorney to proceed in drafting a Local Law allowing the County to obtain payment for medical expenses from inmate health insurance, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the March 21<sup>st</sup> Board meeting. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Sheriff York noted that he wanted the Committee to be aware of the potential for a huge expense to the County, resulting from the arrest of a Glens Falls man who had been detained for possession of a significant amount of cocaine. He explained that the perpetrator was being treated at Albany Medical Center for injuries sustained during the arrest, which might possibly require facial surgery. Sheriff York said that because the man had been arraigned by the Warren County Sheriff's Department at Albany Medical Center, the costs of his medical care had become the responsibility of the County. He added that costs for this facial surgery had the potential to reach the range of \$100,000.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Sheriff York thanked the Committee and exited the meeting at 11:18 a.m.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Amy Manney, Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Services, who distributed copies of her agenda to the Committee members. *A copy of the agenda is on file with the minutes.*

Mrs. Manney advised that agenda item number one pertained to two requests to amend the County Budget, the first of which was to increase estimated revenues and appropriations in the amount of \$8,911 from Deferred Revenues (A.691.00) to appropriate excess grant funds from 2007 to be expended in 2008.

Motion was made by Mr. Belden, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the request to amend the County Budget in the amount of \$8,911 as outlined above and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

The second request Mrs. Manney stated, was for an amendment to the County Budget to increase estimated revenues and appropriations in the amount of \$2,327 to be appropriated from Deferred Revenues (A.691.00), also to appropriate excess grant funds from 2007 to be expended in 2008.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Haskell and carried unanimously to approve the request to amend the County Budget in the amount of \$2,327 and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mrs. Manney announced that her final request was for a transfer of funds, which she detailed as follows:

<u>From Code:</u>	<u>To Code:</u>	<u>Amount:</u>
A.3640.411 Civil Defense - Rent	A.3640.130 Part-Time Salary	\$12,000

Motion was made by Mr. Girard, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to approve the request for a transfer of funds as outlined above and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. VanNess stated that as there was no further business to be presented, they would now begin the joint meeting of the Warren and Washington Counties Public Safety Committees to discuss the Emergency Services Training Center (ESTC). Mr. VanNess began the meeting with the following speech:

“Before starting this morning, I have a few comments. I want to congratulate Co-Committee Chairs Chip Mellon and Butch Chase and their Committees on a great job. This Committee consisted mainly of a group of volunteers that worked very hard, held numerous meetings, and invested several hours into making this recommendation to our Boards.

“I would also like to thank the tireless efforts of Warren County Fire Coordinator Marvin Lemery; Washington County Fire Coordinator Ray Rathbun, and Warren County Deputy Coordinator Brian LaFlure. I know Brian and Marv have been working on this since the early 1970's.

“Last, but not least, I want to thank our respective Counties for giving Supervisor Lindsay and myself the authority and trust to work on this Project. Both Boards have taken some unjustified hits by trying to be open with the information we were working on. I believe today's outcome will prove that if the system is allowed to work and it is done properly it will work.

“I know we are still a long way from home but we continue to inch closer and we finally see a light at the end of the tunnel. When I joined this group my theory was if we can train one firefighter, EMS (Emergency Medical Services) worker or Police Officer at this facility and it helps make sure they make it home that night, the facility has paid for itself.

“Again, thank you to everyone that has been, and still is, involved in this project.”

Subsequent to a round of introductions, Mr. VanNess asked Mr. LaFlure to begin discussion with regard to the Project. Mr. LaFlure thanked Mr. VanNess, and everyone involved in the Project, for their efforts. He noted that this had been a long process, with the Project and placement plans changing along the way. In the beginning, Mr. LaFlure said, he'd had a preference for the location of the ESTC, but since reviewing the material presented by the Laberge Group, he believed that their

recommendation would present a better scenario than the location he had initially preferred and would be the best choice for the Counties, responders and all parties involved. He said that the Counties had empowered the Committee, through the Fire Coordinators and others involved, to work with the Laberge Group to narrow the fourteen properties initially proposed for the project to four. Mr. LaFlure explained that more research was done and the Laberge Group had come prepared with a recommendation of the best and most cost effective site for the Project.

Jim Clarke, Project Manager from LaBerge Group, distributed information to the Committee members regarding the site selection for the ESTC, *a copy of which is on file with the minutes.*

While Mr. Clarke distributed his informational packets, Mr. VanNess introduced Sean Maguire, of the NYSDOS (New York State Department of State) Shared Services Committee, which had assisted with the grant funding received in connection with the ESTC. Mr. VanNess advised that Mr. Maguire had chosen to attend the meeting because he was very enthusiastic about the project and its progress. In addition, Mr. VanNess noted, Dr. Ronald Heacock, President of Adirondack Community College (ACC), was also present and had rescheduled his day in order to attend.

Mr. Clarke began his presentation by giving a brief history of the ESTC project. He advised that the Committee had initially been developed to determine the size of the training facility needed to accommodate the classroom instruction and emergency services training needs for the two Counties. Mr. Clarke said that essentially, those needs had resulted in the creation of a 13,000 sq. ft. building that consisted of a fire training center, classrooms, mass confidence building and two storage buildings. He noted that from the assessment of classroom instruction, there were approximately ten hard props that would be incorporated at the ESTC to facilitate training needs, ranging from auto extraction to electricity related matters and also to address tanker truck and HAZMAT (hazardous materials) training. Mr. Clarke stated that they had prepared a concept diagram, including all of the facets intended for the ESTC and had determined that a 6.5 acre site would be the absolute minimum area required for the facility.

As previously mentioned by Mr. LaFlure, Mr. Clarke stated that there had initially been fourteen prospective sites for the ESTC which had subsequently been pared down through analysis to four sites which were the ACC East site; ACC West site; Ciba-Geigy property and the Dix Avenue property. He said that they had then applied the concept diagram to all four sites to determine the visual and technical impacts of the project, as well as the initial cost development factors.

Mr. Clarke directed the Committee to a Comparative Site Evaluation, *included in the packet distributed and on file with the minutes*, which listed the 11 criterion on which the site selection had been determined, as well as the scoring system used to evaluate the sites. He explained that the criteria ranged from Site Location and Access; Site Useable Size and Configuration and Site Topography and Soils Classification to Flexibility of Use and Neighborhood Acceptance. Mr. Clarke stated that based upon all evaluation, the Dix Avenue site was determined the best fit for the project. He noted that the Dix Avenue site was actually comprised of two separate parcels of 12 and 18 acres. Mr. Clarke then directed the Committee to a detailed aerial picture of the site which clearly reflected the Dix Avenue site, as well as the others considered. He stated that it was the opinion of the Laberge Group

that the Dix Avenue site represented the best balance for the criteria associated with the development of the ESTC; and he added that the Dix Avenue site allowed the flexibility for future expansion. Mr. Clarke said that because the training provided at the ESTC would evolve based on future codes and procedures, expansion flexibility allowing the ESTC to grow as necessary would be a benefit to both Counties.

Mr. Stec stated that he was very pleased to see the ESTC project progress as it had been ongoing for many years and was of significant importance to both Warren and Washington Counties. He asked how the Comparative Site Evaluation was developed and what the ESTC project cost differences were between the recommended site and the other sites considered. Mr. Clarke replied that the Evaluation had been developed to give a baseline in determining what site best suited the ESTC, as well as the major differences between the sites. He added that some of the factors considered had been the amount of existing infrastructure available to support the ESTC, the costs of buffering and screening it and the environmental issues present. Mr. Clarke noted that the Ciba-Geigy Property had represented several unknown factors regarding environmental concerns, which had caused it to score the lowest on the Comparative Site Evaluation. As far as project costs, he stated, there was a relatively small difference in the budgets, about 10 - 15%, that would be applied to each site. Mr. Clarke pointed out that there was a Shared Municipal Services grant in place that could not be accessed until a site for the project was chosen. He added that once the site was designated, the grant funds could be applied for the planning and engineering costs necessary to further the project.

Mr. LaFlure stated that one of the reasons they had previously been interested in placing the ESTC at ACC was due to the existing infrastructure. He explained that the Training Center Committee had expressed their concern that if the ESTC was moved to another site, without such an infrastructure, the project costs would be substantially different. After the site study results were provided, Mr. LaFlure said, he was very surprised to see that the cost differences between the sites, with the exception of the Ciba-Geigy property, were so minimal. He added that in light of this information, the group had reviewed the other factors surrounding the sites and had determined that the Laberge recommendation was indeed the best site for the ESTC.

Mr. Stec noted that because all of the sites being considered were located within the Town of Queensbury, he was very happy to see that "Neighborhood Acceptance" was listed as one of the analysis items in the Comparative Site Evaluations. He said that regardless of the fact that they had faced considerable public opposition to the project based on placement, they could now proceed with complete confidence because the Dix Avenue site had received the highest rating possible for this category, as well as with the assurance that the costs for the project would not be considerably more than they would have been for any other site. Mr. Stec noted that although he was new to the Committee and his role in the progression of the Training Center project had been relatively small, he knew a number of people who had been involved in the project for quite a long time and he commended them, as well as the Committees from both Warren and Washington Counties, for all of the work they had done to progress the project. Mr. Stec added that, in light of the information presented by the Laberge Group, the Dix Avenue site recommended seemed to be best for the project.

In order to give the Washington County Supervisors the history of the site recommended for the Emergency Services Training Center, Mr. VanNess apprised that the Dix Avenue site was comprised of two parcels that Warren County had taken ownership of for unpaid land taxes. He said that Patricia Nenninger, 2<sup>nd</sup> Assistant County Attorney, had been working diligently to legitimize the acquisition of the property as they anticipated questions about the matter in which the County had acquired the property, as well as how it would be shared with Washington County. Mr. VanNess said that they now needed the Public Safety Committees from both Warren and Washington Counties to approve the site and continuation of the Training Center project, to be subsequently approved by each Board of Supervisors, in order to proceed.

Mrs. Nenninger pointed out that in 2002 a resolution had been passed by the Warren County Board of Supervisors to designate the Dix Avenue parcels for Airport purposes. Therefore, she said, they would have to go through an internal process to have the property re-designated before it could be used for the ESTC. Mrs. Nenninger explained that in order to re-designate the property they would have to refer the matter to the Airport Committee to be sure they had no objection to the change. Additionally, she said, the proximity of the property to the Airport also needed to be considered as the necessary clearances from the FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) should be acquired before any additional steps were undertaken. Mr. VanNess added that because burning drills would be performed at the Training Center, FAA approval would be required as inevitably, some smoke might enter the flight space. He asked Mr. Clarke if he'd had any opportunity to research FAA regulations as they might pertain to this matter and Mr. Clarke replied that he was unprepared to speak on the matter. However, Mr. Clarke said, there were no issues within the concept plans, as far as building height, that would cause the FAA any immediate concern related to elevation or impact on the glide path. Mr. VanNess said that he assumed that as the project progressed the Laberge Group would maintain contact with the FAA to be sure that none of the activities performed would interfere with their guidelines and Mr. Clarke replied affirmatively.

When asked about the lack of documentation regarding the environmental aspects of the project, Mr. VanNess apprised they were aware that some mediation would be required for wetlands and wildlife; however, he said, the two parcels combined to form an area of approximately 32 acres, which was far more than the 6.5 acres required for the ESTC. Mr. VanNess added that as the project progressed Laberge Group would be reviewing the environmental effects and performing the required studies. He reminded the group that the intention of the meeting was to gain the approval of both Counties on the site recommended by the Laberge Group.

Mr. Belden pointed out that an extension of the runway at the Warren County Airport was intended and prior to defining this as the chosen site, it was his feeling that a meeting should be held with William Lamy, DPW Superintendent, to be sure that this project would not interfere with those plans. In addition, he noted, the FAA should be contacted to ensure that no FAA regulations were going to be violated. Mr. VanNess replied that he had spoken with Marshall Stevens, former Airport Manager, prior to his leaving the position with the County, at which point Mr. Stevens had been made aware of all aspects of the project, and Mr. Stevens indicated he did not foresee any issues. However, Mr. VanNess added, he agreed that they should speak with Mr. Lamy to reinforce this belief.

With respect to additional concerns of the Washington County Supervisors regarding the existence of wetlands on the Dix Avenue site, Mr. LaFlure apprised that of the entire 32 acre site, it had already been determined that only approximately 20 acres would be usable without wetland mitigation. He said that this would allow for the acreage necessary to initially place the ESTC, as well as sufficient space for expansion in the future. Mr. VanNess added that any future expansion of the ESTC would occur as it was afforded through receipt of grant funding and at no burden to the taxpayers of either County. He said that during future expansion if they did begin to encroach upon the wetlands, a mitigation process might be required, but they would address the matter when necessary.

Chairman Monroe pointed out that the recommended site appeared to be just west of the extension to Runway 1, which was the most active runway. Because the prevailing winds came from the west, he said, this issue should be addressed with the FAA early in the project because if smoke blowing across the runway was an issue the site might not be feasible. Mr. Clarke replied that the type of training that would be conducted at the facility causing smokey conditions would be done infrequently, and could reasonably be coordinated with the FAA so that it did not impede the operations at the Airport. Mr. VanNess apprised that both Saratoga and Schenectady Counties had similar training facilities in close proximity of their Airports. He added that if the Counties approved the site, the next step would be to approve the environmental and FAA studies to be performed to ensure that the site was legally suitable for placement of the ESTC.

Mr. LaFlure advised that the ESTC was intended to be a predominantly clean burning facility, meaning that although some evolutions would require burning, installed scrubber systems would remove the smoke from the air before it dissipated. He added that theatrical smoke would be used for the majority of exercises.

When asked for his opinion of the site chosen, Dr. Heacock apprised that ACC's interest in the ESTC had been in promoting training and building programs in that area. He said that he and his staff had been in touch with other Community Colleges in the area to determine the types of training that could be generated and had discovered that it would be very easy to work with the ESTC to assist them in obtaining the best use of the Facility through their expertise. He said that although they would not generate nearly the amount of FTE (Full-Time Enrollments) they had originally anticipated from the ESTC, due to the alternate location, they were still interested in becoming involved in the project. Dr. Heacock pointed out that other Community Colleges also maintained a teaching arrangement with offsite Training Centers and said that ACC was more than anxious to see what they could do to expand the training programs offered. He added that they were very supportive of the project.

When asked what Committee action was necessary to advance the project, Mrs. Nenninger advised that four resolutions would be required, and she outlined them as follows:

- 1) Approving the Dix Avenue site as the location for the Emergency Services Training Center, subject to change of the designation of the Airport property and FAA approval;

- 2) Authorizing an inter-municipal agreement with Washington County to continue the agreement with Laberge Group, including a 50/50 split of the outstanding property taxes for the Dix Avenue site;
- 3) Authorizing an agreement with Laberge Group to continue work on site review including FAA and engineering studies;
- 4) Authorizing execution of the SMSI (Shared Municipal Services Incentive) grant agreement (*previously mentioned by Mr. Clarke, funds have been granted but cannot be obtained until a project site is chosen and approved by both Counties*).

Mr. VanNess asked if the dedication of the site and phasing of the project would allow access to the grant funds. Mr. Maguire replied that NYSDOS had not executed the grant contract because a budget and a work plan had not yet been developed for the ESTC project, and before a work plan could be developed a site had to be chosen. He noted that the grant funding would be available until March 31, 2010; however, he added, NYSDOS would require an agreement to phase the project to ensure that the grant funds awarded would be used to develop a usable facility.

When asked if a budget had been determined for the first phase of the project, Mr. VanNess replied that previously they had been unable to determine this figure as a site had not been determined. He added that if the Committees voted to accept the recommended Dix Avenue site, they could then determine a budget outlining various phases of the project.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Bentley and carried unanimously to approve the Dix Avenue site as the location for the Emergency Services Training Center, subject to change of designation of the Airport property and FAA approval, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the March 21<sup>st</sup> Board meeting.

The Washington County Public Safety Committee then authorized the same resolution.

Motion was made by Mr. Sec, seconded by Mr. Belden and carried unanimously to authorize an inter-municipal agreement with Washington County to continue the agreement with Laberge Group, including a 50/50 split of the outstanding property taxes for the Dix Avenue site, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the March 21<sup>st</sup> Board meeting.

The Washington County Public Safety Committee then authorized the same resolution, contingent upon the approval of their County Attorney.

Upon discussing the costs of the next phase of the project, relating to engineering, environmental and FAA studies, Richard Laberge, of Laberge Group, advised that he was unprepared to speak of contract costs but would review the RFP previously submitted to provide a determination of this figure, which he could deliver to the Committees within the following week.

Mr. Stec suggested that a schedule be developed including not to exceed amounts for each phase of

the project and also empowering the Chairmen of each County's Public Safety Committee, along with the Chairmen of the Board for each County, to authorize moving forward to the next phase as necessary, rather than returning to a joint Committee to gain such authorization.

Motion was made by Mr. Bentley, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to authorize an agreement with Laberge Group to continue work on site review, including FAA and engineering studies, with a schedule of costs and milestones to come from Laberge Group and also to allow the Chairman of the Board and Committee Chairman authorization to advance the project at each milestone, contingent upon execution of the inter-municipal agreement; and the necessary resolution was authorized for the March 21<sup>st</sup> Board meeting.

The Washington County Public Safety Committee then authorized the same resolution.

Motion was made by Mr. Bentley, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to authorize execution of the Shared Services Grant, contingent upon the passage of the previously authorized resolutions, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the March 21<sup>st</sup> Board meeting.

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, on motion made by Mr. Belden and seconded by Mr. Bentley, Mr. VanNess adjourned the meeting at 12:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist