

**WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES**

**DATE: MARCH 30, 2007**

---

---

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

SUPERVISORS HASKELL  
O'CONNOR  
F. THOMAS  
CHAMPAGNE  
VANNESS  
GERAGHTY  
GIRARD

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

WILLIAM LAMY, DPW SUPERINTENDENT  
ROBERT PHELPS, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
COMMISSIONER  
WILLIAM THOMAS, CHAIRMAN  
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ATTORNEY  
HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE &  
FISCAL SERVICES  
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SUPERVISORS BELDEN  
BENTLEY  
CAIMANO  
GABRIELS  
KENNY  
MASON  
STEC  
TESSIER  
FRANK O'KEEFE, TREASURER  
JULIE PACYNA, PURCHASING AGENT  
FRED AUSTIN, BUILDING PROJECT COORDINATOR  
TODD LUNT, HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR  
ROBERT IUSI, PROBATION DIRECTOR  
WILLIAM MCGARR, VETERANS' SERVICES DIRECTOR  
MARSHALL STEVENS, AIRPORT MANAGER  
RICHARD SCHERMERHORN , SCHERMERHORN  
COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES  
GENE HINNERS, 333 GLENS ST. ASSOCIATION  
CONNIE FARRINGTON, WARREN COUNTY RESIDENT  
KATHLEEN SONNABEND, TOWN OF QUEENSBURY  
PETE CALDWELL, CITY OF GLENS FALLS  
MADELINE FARBMAN, *THE POST STAR*  
AMANDA ALLEN, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

---

---

Mr. Haskell called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 9:50 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to accept the minutes of the February 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Privilege of the floor was extended to William Lamy, DPW Superintendent who distributed copies

---

of the agenda to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Haskell stated that agenda review would begin with item 2b, radon mitigation in the old Civil Defense area of the Municipal Center basement. Mr. Lamy apprised that a copy of the MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) received from RFA (Rist-Frost Associates, P.C.) with respect to the radon mitigation study was included in the agenda and listed an estimated cost of \$9,900. Mr. Lamy stated that the radon issue was a known factor and although expert advisement was needed as to how to proceed with the mitigation, he believed that the procedure could be completed by County staff. He said that he expected to fund the MOU with monies saved through personnel consolidation by the institution of the 'to-be-formed' Office of Emergency Services, which was the intended occupant of the area requiring radon mitigation.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to authorize Mr. Lamy to accept the MOU received from RFA and proceed with the radon mitigation study in the basement of the Municipal Center.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. F. Thomas and carried unanimously to authorize a transfer of funds in the amount of \$9,900 from Code A.3640 110 ( *Civil Defense - Salaries- Regular*) to Code A.1620 470 ( *Buildings-Contracts*) to fund the RFA radon mitigation study and to refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the request is on file with the minutes.*

Proceeding to the new business portion of the agenda, Mr. Lamy advised that item 3a referred to the DSS (Department of Social Services) and their use of County fleet vehicles. He reminded the Committee that the DSS was currently facing a transportation issue and Robert Phelps, DSS Commissioner, had expressed the need for 20 additional fleet vehicles if his employees were no longer allowed to use personal vehicles for work purposes and receive reimbursement for mileage. Mr. Lamy apprised that Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, Mr. Phelps and himself had met and discussed various scenarios and costs to alleviate the issue. As a result of this meeting, he stated, a summary had been compiled comparing the total spent by the DSS for Case Worker travel in 2006 to the costs of purchasing 20 vehicles, leasing 20 vehicles under State contract prices and leasing 20 vehicles from Enterprise.

Mr. Lamy briefly reviewed the summary, *a copy of which is on file with the minutes*, explaining that in 2006 approximately \$78,454 in mileage reimbursement costs had accumulated from the DSS Case Workers' use of personal vehicles for work purposes. He noted that these costs were aided at 50% reimbursement, leaving a total County cost of \$39,227, based on a total of 176,301 miles driven. The next scenario, Mr. Lamy apprised, was the purchase of 20 cars by the County under State contract, comparable to those driven by the Health Department Nurses, at a cost of approximately \$11,000 per vehicle. He said that insurance, maintenance, fuel and miscellaneous costs over the estimated eight-year life span of the vehicle and an anticipated interest rate of 8% for the purchase had been added to this cost, less salvage value, to determine a total annual cost of \$70,030 for the 20 vehicles. When applied, the 50% State aid reduced the total County cost to \$35,015 annually. Moving to the leasing options listed, Mr. Lamy explained that the lease of 20 vehicles under State

contract prices, including insurance, maintenance and gas costs would total \$99,919 and with 50% aid applied the total cost to the County would be \$49,959. Comparatively, Mr. Lamy apprised, the cost of 20 vehicles leased from Enterprise, accounting for the same maintenance and fuel costs, would total \$192,580 with 50% aid reducing the total County cost to \$96,290.

Mr. Lamy noted that because the leasing costs were considerably higher than the other options listed, the Committee was now faced with the decision as to whether they should purchase the additional 20 vehicles for the Department's use or continue to allow the DSS employees to use their personal vehicles and reimburse mileage. He said that one of the costs not accounted for in the purchase option was the time and effort of staff to transport the vehicles to the Warrensburg DPW shop for maintenance. He said that depending upon where the new Health and Human Services Building was located, there might also be parking issues in storing the additional vehicles, exacerbating the problems anticipated. By locating the newly purchased vehicles at the Municipal Center, costs would be incurred to ferry employees between the Municipal Center and the DSS building, Mr. Lamy stated. He said that although it was difficult to place a dollar value on these issues, they were relevant nonetheless.

Mr. Phelps noted that the recent amendments to the Travel Policy eliminated the use of personal vehicles for work related travel except in the event that a County fleet vehicle was unavailable. However, he noted, there was a point when it was actually less expensive for the County to allow the use of a personal vehicle and reimburse mileage than it was to use a fleet vehicle. For example, if a Caseworker were traveling less than 70 miles during any given day, the mileage reimbursement for the use of their personal vehicle was cheaper than the maintenance and fees associated with either using a fleet or rental vehicle. Mr. Phelps stated that for longer trips the use of a fleet vehicle was more economically appropriate. Upon presenting these facts, Mr. Phelps asked the Committee for direction in how he should appropriate travel for his staff.

Referring to the summary of options provided by Mr. Lamy, Mr. VanNess pointed out that the maintenance fees listed were estimated at \$3,000 per vehicle over an eight-year life span and he said that the figure was on the low end as one major breakdown could total that amount. Additionally, he noted, the recommendation at the end of the summary suggested that the employees be allowed to continue the use of their own vehicles, and the travel policy be amended to allow for such practice, in light of the problematic parking, maintenance and logistics issues. Mr. VanNess stated that he agreed with the recommendation.

Mr. Phelps suggested that they continue to maximize the use of fleet vehicles, when available, for long trips and allow employees to use their personal vehicles for short trips and field work, receiving mileage reimbursement. He said that he intended to propose the purchase of two fleet vehicles for his Department's use in negotiating the 2008 Budget, the costs of which would be reimbursed by the State. Mr. Phelps noted that this game plan was not in line with the current Travel Policy and if the Committee were in agreement with his suggestion, an amendment to the Policy would be necessary.

Discussion ensued.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the issue and Mr. Phelps' suggestion to amend the Travel

Policy, be referred to the Budget Committee for further review, as that was where the Policy originated.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. F. Thomas and carried unanimously to refer the request to amend the Travel Policy to the Budget Committee for further review.

Returning to the review of the agenda, Mr. Lamy stated that item 3b pertained to space and security issues within the Probation Department. He explained that Robert Iusi, Probation Director, had expressed a need for additional space and the use of a magnetometer. Mr. Lamy stated that Frank Morehouse, Superintendent of Buildings, had introduced a couple of scenarios that would appease this request; however, in Mr. Morehouse's absence Mr. Lamy said that because he was not well versed in the implications of the scenarios offered, he could not appropriately discuss them. He said that he and Mr. Morehouse had agreed that the Space Committee should be reactivated to discuss the options available at length and determine the best possible solution for this situation and other similar situations that had arisen.

Mr. Haskell apprised that Mr. Payne and himself had met with Mr. Morehouse to review the scenarios suggested; however, neither were members of the Space Committee. He stated that the only remaining member of the Committee was Mr. W. Thomas and he should serve as Chairman of the Committee to decide who would be most appropriately appointed to serve the Space Committee, returning to the County Facilities Committee with his recommendations. Mr. W. Thomas agreed that he would proceed with this action, but requested that the Committee be given a more appropriate name. Mr. Haskell suggested that the name be changed to the Utilization Committee and Mr. W. Thomas agreed.

Mr. Caimano noted that he had attended the meeting during which Mr. Iusi had made his request. He said that Mr. Iusi was facing a serious security issue that should be addressed as quickly as possible.

Mr. Haskell advised that agenda item 3c referred to asbestos abatement in the old Sheriff's kitchen and areas of the Court System. He explained that the newly purchased carpeting intended for those locations could not be installed until the asbestos tiles currently located there had been removed and a RFP (Request for Proposal) was necessary to perform a study for the tile removal.

Mr. Champagne asked why the tiles needed to be removed if the carpet could be laid over it and Mr. Haskell replied that he thought the reason for the removal was to level the floor for appropriate carpet installation. He noted that Mr. Morehouse had all of the pertinent details of the project but was not in attendance. Mr. Lamy apologized for Mr. Morehouse's absence and he explained that Mr. Morehouse had been prepared to make a presentation on this item; however, a fire in the Municipal Center had forced the meeting to be rescheduled from its original date and Mr. Morehouse was now on vacation in Ireland.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to authorize the preparation of a RFP to perform a study on asbestos tile removal in the old Sheriff's kitchen and areas of the Court System.

Returning to agenda item 2a, referring to the Health and Human Services Building, Mr. Haskell apprised that Mr. Caimano had contacted *The Post Star* with the suggestion of locating the new building on the property currently occupied by the Municipal Center. He displayed a map of the property, referencing the portions occupied by the Municipal Center, Sheriff's Office and other occupied areas. He noted that although there would be savings in excavation, as the property was primarily flat, other issues, such as limiting the expansion of the Municipal Center, would arise. In reviewing the available portions of the parcel, Mr. Haskell said that he did not think that Mr. Caimano's suggestion was a viable option.

Mr. Kenny asked why expansion of the existing Municipal Center had not been considered rather than the construction of an entirely new building and Mr. Haskell replied that initially that had been a consideration; however, he said, at that time none of the Committee members were in favor of disturbing the face of the building.

Mr. Caimano explained that his suggestion to *The Post Star* had been made with the thought that the Municipal Center location already had electric, sewer, fiberoptic and other such utilities in place. He noted that funds might be saved by placing the new building such that the existing utilities could be used and the suggestion was worthy of further study to determine if it was a viable option.

Mr. Kenny stated that he felt an extension of the existing Municipal Center building and the use of the present mechanical and electrical systems might be more economical than constructing an entirely new building at a satellite location, requiring the installation of those utilities from scratch.

Discussion ensued with respect to the possible placement of the Health and Human Services Building.

Mr. VanNess raised the concern that there might be issues with the increase in traffic created by the addition at the Municipal Center. He added that this would certainly be a concern of their Courthouse Estates neighbors and those ramifications should be researched further prior to making a final decision. Mr. Caimano stated that he did not think that the Courthouse Estates residents would be affected; however, a traffic study could be performed to determine the effects of the addition.

Mr. Girard stated that there must have been some reason for the placement of the DSS Building where it was currently and he asked why that should be changed. Mr. Haskell replied that the building housing the DSS had been constructed prior to the Municipal Center. Fred Austin, Building Project Coordinator, expounded that the building had originally been built as a tuberculosis infirmary and was retrofitted by the County in 1982 for use by the DSS. He added that the retrofitting had been intended to last approximately 10 years with additional improvements, or decisions for a new building, to be made after that time.

Mr. Caimano stated that there were two major decisions in determining the fate of the project and they were that a new Health and Human Services Building was necessary and that the County was under financial constraints to produce it. He added that if the County were to spend an additional \$100,000 to be sure that the correct decision was made, ultimately saving \$5 million, that \$100,000

was money well spent.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Champagne stated that he was hesitant to proceed with the project without researching every possible option, and the additional costs would be money well spent, as Mr. Caimano expressed, even to be told that the option was not feasible. However, he added, the studies should be completed posthaste so as not to delay the project more than absolutely necessary. Mr. Champagne suggested that if the additional studies were approved, the engineers should be given only a 30-day time frame to complete them for presentation at the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Kenny noted that if the expansion of the Municipal Center was deemed favorable, the additions could be completed in phases, constructing them as needed and allowing the project to be spaced out over time.

Mr. VanNess asked if estimated costs for these additional studies were available and Paul Dusek, County Attorney, apprised that the price would vary depending upon the extent of the study. For example, Mr. Dusek explained, the cost could be as low as \$3,000 - \$5,000 if the study were only intended to determine if the structure would feasibly fit on the current parcel, and would increase depending upon the scope of the studies and information desired.

In addition to determining if the building would fit, Mr. Haskell stated that studies needed to be performed to discover if there would be cost savings by changing the placement of the building. Mr. Champagne suggested that a \$50,000 limit be set for the cost of the additional studies and Mr. Stec reminded the Committee that Mr. Dusek had stated that the costs of the studies could be as low as \$3,000. Mr. Stec countered that a proposal should be sought for an estimate of study fees rather than setting a \$50,000 limit and Mr. Haskell agreed with the suggestion. Mr. Haskell asked Mr. Dusek how this could be accomplished and Mr. Dusek replied that he could make contact with the project engineers to gain the estimated costs of the studies for presentation at the upcoming Finance Committee meeting.

Mr. Austin apprised that he and the rest of the Core Team had met with the project engineers during the prior week to discuss the option of expanding the Municipal Center building. He suggested that the Core Team and consultants be directed to investigate the situation and report back to the Committee with their findings. Mr. Austin added that he felt this could be accomplished in weeks rather than months and he believed that the consultants' contracts included an hourly rate for alternate work that would accommodate this action. He said that he did not feel this would cost more than \$3,000 to \$5,000 and would certainly not be as high as \$50,000, as some of the information needed was already known. Mr. Austin stated that within a month the Core Team, consultants and the Construction Manager could derive estimates of cost for presentation to the Committee that would be helpful in determining if this was a valid option or a waste of time.

Discussion ensued.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the study should include changes to the Health and

Human Services building schematics to make it fit the Municipal Center property as best possible, assuming that it was determined to be a viable option.

Mr. Stec noted that although, as a municipality, the County was not subject to zoning codes or Planning Board review, it was important to be aware of open space, aesthetics and traffic issues in determining the placement of the new building. He stated that the studies performed should include the traffic impact to the Glen Lake Road and Route 9 intersections and if the traffic impact was such that it made the placement problematic, it might be worthwhile to place the new building at the DSS location regardless of the difference in cost.

Mr. Girard asked what the project investment to date was and Mr. Haskell replied that he had not brought those figures to the meeting. Mr. Dusek apprised that at the end of 2006 the totals for both the engineer and the construction manager had been in the vicinity of \$650,000. Frank O'Keefe, County Treasurer, expounded that the fees for both the engineering services and construction manager were in the amounts of \$445,000 for the Health and Human Services Building and \$254,000 for the Municipal Center.

Mr. Girard asked if an estimate of the savings anticipated from moving the Health and Human Services Building to the Municipal Center location had been derived and Mr. Dusek replied that they had estimated those at approximately \$2 million; however, he added there might be additional savings not captured in their rough estimate. Mr. VanNess asked if definite figures would be given were the studies pursued and Mr. Haskell replied affirmatively.

Discussion ensued.

Motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Geraghty and carried by majority vote, with Messrs. Girard, O'Connor and VanNess voting in opposition, to authorize further study of the feasibility of placing the Health and Human Services Building on the property currently occupied by the Municipal Center, and to refer same to the Finance Committee to determine a source of funding for the study costs; *Mr. Dusek is to obtain an estimate of the costs for the studies prior to the Finance Committee meeting.*

Mr. VanNess stated that his main concern, and the reason he had voted against the motion, was the increase in traffic that would be caused by the addition and he said that he hoped extensive traffic studies would be performed for use in making a final decision. Mr. Haskell replied that traffic studies would be performed and he sympathized with Mr. VanNess' concern, as the flow of traffic in and out of the Municipal Center would certainly increase with the addition.

Mr. O'Connor said that although he had no issue with the additional studies, he had voted against the motion in light of the fact that the time frame for the project had been severely restricted. He reminded the Committee that such issues had been referred to the Finance Committee several times over the life of the project, delaying it time and again. Mr. O'Connor stated that the Committee had placed time limits on the project previously but had violated them themselves by referring matters here and there for further review. He said that if the Committee wished to extensively research the project that was fine however, they should not impose time limits that they could not keep

themselves and the project continued to move at a glacial pace. Mr. Haskell agreed that the project had been delayed several times; he noted that originally they had intended construction to commence in the Spring of 2007, and had now been delayed until the Spring of 2008 at the earliest. He noted that they faced the very real concern of the entire building being condemned prior to the construction of the new building, forcing the County to rent space for DSS, hampering them further.

Richard Schermerhorn, of Schermerhorn Commercial Properties, addressed the Committee, stating that he had listened to all of the Committee's concerns and agreed that if the County were able to use their own property for the new Building it would be the best scenario. He also agreed that by using the Municipal Center Property the County opened itself to future growth restriction, traffic issues and complaint from neighboring residents.

Mr. Schermerhorn reiterated that, as discussed in prior meetings, his proposal included the use of 16-acres of his property, on which studies had already been performed for traffic, noise, sewer and other such environmental issues. In addition, he said, a conduit had already been run under the Northway through which fiberoptics could easily be inserted and many of the hurdles required for both sites had already been accomplished for his property. Mr. Schermerhorn stated that if the public were in agreement, he would be willing to sell his property to the County for \$1.2 million with all of the approvals and studies performed; however, he noted, the offer would only be available for 45 days. Mr. Schermerhorn apprised that if the Committee factored in the value of the land and all of the studies performed, the price was excellent. He noted that the asking price did not include the costs to connect the sewer facilities to the property; however, the groundwork and studies for it were all in order. He stated that in his estimate the property currently occupied by the DSS building could easily be sold for \$1 million, as it was zoned for hotel and high density use, and its sale might be a viable option for the County to offset the cost of his property should they decide to choose that route.

Mr. Haskell thanked Mr. Schermerhorn for his offer and stated that it was another viable option which the Committee would consider. He noted that in the past, when Mr. Schermerhorn had been advertising the property at a higher asking price, the Committee had considered the purchase. Mr. Haskell stated that a special meeting of the Committee in the month of April would be required to further discuss the offer and to meet the 45-day time limit.

Mr. Haskell apprised that a letter with respect to the Health and Human Services building had been received from Peter Brothers, which he requested be read into the record. Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, read the letter aloud, and a copy of the submission is on file with the minutes.

Mr. Brothers' letter stated that the Board of Supervisors had not been forthcoming with project information; that the use of the former jail as office space had not been considered as an alternative to the construction of a new building and that the construction price was considerably higher than that of a hotel recently built for \$7 million. In response to these allegations, Mr. Haskell stated that Mr. Brothers had been in attendance at the public hearing held recently at which the Committee had remained until all public concern and questions had been addressed. He said that if Mr. Brothers had required further information with respect to any aspect of the project he needed only to raise his hand and ask. As for the use of the former jail for office space, Mr. Haskell apprised that at prior meetings the concern had been addressed and eliminated as the floor rating was not sufficient for office use

and he expounded that the floor rating was the exact reason the cost of the building was higher than that of a hotel. Mr. Haskell explained that the floor rating of a hotel was 85 lbs./sq.ft. while areas of the new building would require a floor rating of up to 200 lbs./sq. ft. Mr. Haskell stated that there was a very big difference between the construction of a hotel and an office building. In addition, he noted, they would be proceeding with a construction class 2a building implementing fire prevention measures that would not restrict the organization of the building in the future.

Mr. Haskell apprised that the public hearing, which had been held during the evening for the taxpayers convenience, was attended by approximately 62 residents of a County with 62,000 constituents. Mr. Haskell stated that these statistics led him to believe that the majority of Warren County residents were confident in the decisions made by their elected officials.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Lamy stated that in conferring with the County Attorney, a resolution was necessary to authorize an agreement with, and make restitution to, Hour Electric for the work done on the electrical system subsequent to the Municipal Center fire.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty, seconded by Mr. VanNess and carried unanimously to authorize a contract with Hour Electric Co., Inc. for electrical repairs to the main electrical entrance at the Municipal Center which was damaged on March 27<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Lamy noted that secondly, he was requesting the Committee's authorization to seek a proposal to complete the upgrade of the old electrical equipment for which replacement parts could no longer be purchased.

Mr. VanNess noted that because the repairs completed by Hour Electric Co., Inc. were done on an emergency basis a RFP was not necessary. He asked if a RFP would be needed to replace the remaining breakers as that work would not be considered an emergency and Mr. Dusek stated that the level of importance of the project would have to be determined. Mr. Haskell stated that there was one remaining bank of breakers, which were installed 45 years ago. He apprised that when the emergency services were needed to restore electricity to the building, Hour Electric Co., Inc. was advised to replace only the items necessary to re-open the building; however, they were directed to prepare for the future replacement of those breakers. In retrospect, Mr. Haskell stated that Hour Electric should have been asked to replace all of the breakers during the emergency maintenance, eliminating this confusing situation.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty, seconded by Mr. VanNess and carried unanimously authorizing Mr. Lamy to secure a proposal from Hour Electric Co., Inc., for the replacement of the remaining out-dated electrical breakers at the Municipal Center for presentation to the Committee at a future meeting.

Mr. Girard asked if an insurance claim would be placed for the costs incurred during the March 27<sup>th</sup> fire and Mr. Haskell replied affirmatively.

Mr. Lamy commented that there were a number of Departments and employees that responded magnificently to the fire and a debt of gratitude was owed to all of them. In particular, he advised, the Buildings and Grounds crews had worked in shifts around the clock to help restore the building, and in doing so, minimized the time that the Municipal Center was closed.

Mr. Caimano added that Mr. Lamy and Amy Manney, of the Office of Natural Disaster and Civil Defense, had done a wonderful job in responding to the situation.

Mr. Haskell noted that written procedures in place for such situations were quickly and efficiently fine tuned during the recent fire. He commended the County staff for their response to the emergency, especially Mr. Lamy and Mr. Morehouse who had remained throughout the ordeal and had done an excellent job in the face of this emergency.

Mr. Kenny stated that he complimented Mr. Haskell's patience in dealing with the issues presented for the Health and Human Services Building. He said that as for the evening public hearing held, he felt that there was value to that meeting in that it presented the fact that the Board of Supervisors were interested in the public's perception and acceptance of the project. Mr. Kenny added that he did not want anyone to feel that they were diminishing the importance of the 62 person crowd that attended the meeting, as it was probably one of the largest gatherings of taxpayers at a County meeting. Mr. Haskell replied that he had not intended to downplay the importance of the gathering; he simply felt that the number of attendees compared to the number of Warren County residents reflected that the taxpayers were pleased with the decisions being made upon their behalf.

Mr. Dusek stated that he had received responses to the RFP authorized for lease space and copies were available for the Committee's review. Mr. Haskell added that the RFP's could be reviewed at the special County Facilities meeting that would be scheduled to discuss the newest Schermerhorn proposal in April.

Mr. Austin reported that he had received a letter from the architect dated March 5<sup>th</sup> showing the breakdown of fees amongst schematic design construction bidding. He said that he had reviewed the letter and found that everything was in order.

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Mr. Champagne and seconded by Mr. VanNess, Mr. Haskell adjourned the meeting at 10:56 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Amanda Allen, Legislative Office Specialist