

## WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: DECEMBER 2, 2014

---

---

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

SUPERVISORS GIRARD  
WOOD  
WESTCOTT  
MONROE  
STROUGH

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

ROSS DUBARRY, AIRPORT MANAGER  
JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
KEVIN HAJOS, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS  
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
MARTIN AUFFREDOU, COUNTY ATTORNEY  
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD  
FRANK E. THOMAS, BUDGET OFFICER  
SUPERVISORS BEATY  
BROCK  
MERLINO  
SEEBER  
TAYLOR  
AMY CLUTE, SELF-INSURANCE ADMINISTRATOR  
SHAWN LAMOUREE, UNDERSHERIFF  
MICHAEL SWAN, COUNTY TREASURER  
MICHAEL COLVIN, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DIRECTOR  
SCOTT MCLAUGHLIN, TELECOMMUNICATION ANALYST  
TRAVIS WHITEHEAD, WARREN COUNTY RESIDENT  
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*  
CHARLENE DIRESTA, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

---

---

Mr. Girard called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 10:30 a.m.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

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

Commencing the agenda review, Mr. Dubarry requested authorization for out-of-State travel to allow him to attend the 2015 Airports Conference in Hershey, Pennsylvania on March 2-4, 2015 using a County vehicle.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough, seconded by Ms. Wood and carried unanimously to authorize out-of-State travel as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the December 19, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Mr. Dubarry requested a transfer of funds in the amount of \$87,000 to transfer programmed local matching funds for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants to the Airport Reserve for anticipated 2015 projects.

Motion was made by Mr. Monroe, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to approve the request for a transfer of funds as outlined above and to forward same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the Request for Transfer of Funds form is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Dubarry informed that a new website for the Floyd Bennett Memorial Airport was almost completed and was anticipated to be active by the end of the week. He said he would be happy to hear any feedback from the Committee members on the new website.

Mr. Dubarry pointed out a letter from Steve Abbott, General Manager of Rich Air, to Carol Twiss, owner of Carol's Airport Café, was included in the agenda packet and acknowledged Ms. Twiss' decision to decline the opportunity to operate the new stand-alone restaurant currently being constructed on Airport property. He stated Ms. Twiss had operated Carol's Airport Café since July of 2008 and had provided great food and outstanding customer service. He said Ms. Twiss had been a great asset to the Airport and had attracted customers from great distances. He informed Ms. Twiss would pursue a new business opportunity on Main Street in Hudson Falls and he wished her the best of luck at her new location. Mr. Strough asked when Ms. Twiss would cease operations at Carol's Airport Café and Mr. Dubarry replied this would be her last week and there would be no café at the Airport until the new stand-alone restaurant was constructed. Mr. Girard asked when the new restaurant was anticipated to be completed and Mr. Dubarry responded that Rich Schermerhorn, owner of Rich Air, had indicated an opening in late spring to early summer. Mr. Girard asked if construction would proceed in the winter months and Mr. Dubarry replied Mr. Schermerhorn would commence as soon as he could break ground in the spring.

Mr. Westcott said he had recently had breakfast at Carol's Airport Café with six pilots and he had spoken with Ms. Twiss to thank her for her service. He stated Ms. Twiss had declined the offer to manage the stand-alone restaurant because she did not want to obtain a liquor license. He advised the pilots had concerns there would no longer be a breakfast service at the new restaurant and he asked if a breakfast service was anticipated. Mr. Dubarry responded he was unsure and the decision would most likely be made by the new operator of the restaurant. He informed the lease agreement was for a ground lease and did not stipulate which meals would be served. He commented the existing Fixed Base Operator (FBO) agreement with Rich Air indicated a breakfast service would be provided and he was unsure if this applied to the new ground lease. Mr. Westcott said he wanted to ensure this issue was addressed with the pilots at some point because the breakfast service was important to them.

Mr. Westcott mentioned the original agreement with the FBO contained a clause pertaining to a dining facility in the main terminal building and he asked if the new ground lease superceded the FBO agreement. As far as superceding, Martin Auffredou, County Attorney, opined the contracts would be read in concert and it was understood the restaurant would be relocated in a separate structure. He commented it would not make sense to have a separate restaurant within the main terminal building in addition to the stand-alone restaurant. He stated there may be a need to make some revisions to the existing FBO agreement based on the ground leases for the stand-alone restaurant and office building. Mr. Westcott reiterated the concern of the pilots due to a possible lack of breakfast service and he suggested Mr. Dubarry speak to these pilots to alleviate their concerns. Mr. Dubarry responded he had spoken to the Pilots Association at their last monthly meeting; however, he added, at that point in time Ms. Twiss had not made a decision on the possibility of operating the new restaurant. He stated he would be happy to speak with the pilots again to receive their feedback and he would speak to Mr. Schermerhorn to determine his intentions for the restaurant.

Jeffery Tennyson, Superintendent of the Department of Public Works (DPW), acknowledged it would be necessary to make modifications to the existing FBO agreement. He added they were awaiting information from Rich Air on the re-purposing of the current café area. He anticipated requesting a representative of Rich Air to attend a future Committee Meeting to present their proposal for the current café area and the terminal building. At that time, he continued, Rich Air could address

concerns with the operation of the new restaurant. Mr. Monroe opined breakfast service at the new restaurant would be important. He said pilots often flew to a familiar airport to have breakfast and purchase fuel. Mr. Dubarry remarked breakfast service had always been a large part of Ms. Twiss' business and he hoped the new restaurant would include a breakfast service, as well.

Travis Whitehead, Warren County Resident, stated he had originally been in favor of the new stand-alone restaurant on Airport property but at that time there had been no mention of a liquor license. He voiced his concern with a restaurant operating with a liquor license on County property and serving pilots. He said the concept of a liquor license for this restaurant might be popular but did not make a lot of sense to him. With respect to the new restaurant lease, Mr. Auffredou commented that proposed in the schedule of insurances was the possibility of including a liquor license with clauses pertaining to the tavern keeper's liability. He said it did not surprise him that if someone wanted to have a successful restaurant patronized by people in the community then the restaurant would require a liquor license. Mr. Dubarry commented liquor licenses at restaurants on airport property were common and he pointed out that customers were not just pilots but also passengers and members of the general public. Mr. Strough opined the intent of the restaurant was to attract a more diversified clientele and a liquor license would help achieve that goal. Addressing Mr. Whitehead's concerns, Mr. Strough stated that pilots did not drink and fly even when the alcohol was readily available.

Mr. Beaty noted the agenda included an announcement on the date of the Public Hearing. Mr. Girard formally announced the Public Hearing for the Floyd Bennett Memorial Airport Runway Extension (1,000 feet) and Obstruction Removal Environmental Assessment (EA) was scheduled for January 8, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. at the Town of Queensbury Activity Center.

Mr. Beaty recalled that C&S Engineers had failed to properly inform the public of the previous Public Hearing for the Floyd Bennett Memorial Airport Runway Extension (1,000 feet) and Obstruction Removal EA which had been held on October 23, 2014. Because of this, he asked if it would be possible to request that C&S Engineers place a larger, more prominent public notice in the newspaper to run for three consecutive days in order to ensure members of the public were properly informed of this Public Hearing. Paul Dusek, County Administrator, asked if this request would be in addition to the small technical legal notice which was required and Mr. Beaty replied affirmatively. Mr. Dusek responded it was up to the Committee to determine if they were willing to fund the cost of the larger public notice and if so, a resolution would be required to authorize the expenditure. Mr. Beaty suggested C&S Engineers should be required to cover the cost of the larger public notice and Mr. Dusek countered the request was over and above the legal requirements. Mr. Beaty opined C&S Engineers had failed to meet this requirement for the first Public Hearing and the County should request they place a larger, more prominent public notice in the newspaper to run for three consecutive days. Mr. Dusek responded the County could make the request. Mr. Girard asked if Mr. Beaty would be satisfied with Mr. Dubarry making the request directly to C&S Engineers and Mr. Beaty replied affirmatively. Mr. Beaty opined C&S Engineers were a fair firm and he felt they would do the right thing and comply with this request. Mr. Westcott stated he would be in favor of this request and he noted that because the first Public Hearing was not properly advertised, the County was now in a position to have a "do over" Public Hearing at their expense and time and he felt this would be a nice gesture on the part of C&S Engineers.

Motion was made by Mr. Westcott, seconded by Mr. Monroe and carried unanimously to request C&S Engineers, Inc. to place a larger, more prominent public notice for the January 8, 2015 Public Hearing for the Floyd Bennett Memorial Airport Runway 1 Extension (1,000 feet) and Obstruction Removal Environmental Assessment to run for three consecutive days at their expense due to their failure to properly advertise the October 23, 2014 Public Hearing.

Mr. Auffredou pointed out that although the County was holding a second Public Hearing for the Floyd Bennet Memorial Airport Runway Extension (1,000 feet) and Obstruction Removal EA, any comments received at the previous Public Hearing held on October 23, 2014 would be accepted and made part of the official record and Mr. Dubarry agreed. Mr. Dubarry advised arrangements had already been made for the legal ad pertaining to the January 8, 2015 Public Hearing to be placed in the *Post Star* and the *North Creek News Enterprise* and the legal ad would state that any comments made at the previous Public Hearing would be incorporated into the final documents. Mr. Auffredou commented the public notice was also on the County website and the report would be available for viewing at various locations. Mr. Dubarry apprised the report was available at Crandall Library, the Queensbury Town Clerk's Office, the Warren County Clerk of the Board's Office and at a fourth location which he believed was the City of Glens Falls. Mr. Tennyson commented the legal ads had already been submitted, as there was a requirement on lead time. He noted if C&S Engineers agreed to comply with the aforementioned request, there would be a second round of public notices which would not meet the legal minimum notice. Mr. Girard pointed out the County would meet the legal requirements with the public notice already submitted and if C&S Engineers complied with the request there would merely be additional notices. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Whitehead recalled there had been a Public Hearing pertaining to the EA for Runways 12, 19 and 30 held on September 10, 2014 and he, along with many other people had submitted questions at that time. He stated that even though this Public Hearing had been over 10 weeks ago, no responses to these questions had been received. He said he had asked Mr. Tennyson and had submitted a FOIL (Freedom of Information Law) request for the responses. He indicated that Mr. Tennyson took full advantage of the 5 days to respond to a FOIL request and a 20-day time frame to comply, which would expire on December 19, 2014. He recalled Mr. Dubarry had just indicated the responses for the October 23, 2014 Public Hearing would be available for viewing at four locations and he asked if these would be available prior to the January 8, 2014 Public Hearing. Mr. Dubarry responded the approval process for the responses was currently in the hands of the FAA and once they completed their internal review of the comments and responses, they would be made available. Mr. Auffredou mentioned he did not mean to suggest the responses to the comments would be available at the four locations and he clarified that he meant the EA which was the subject matter of the Public Hearing would be available at those locations. Mr. Tennyson said he anticipated there would be one response to public comments derived from both the October 23, 2014 and January 8, 2015 Public Hearings for the Floyd Bennett Memorial Airport Runway Extension (1,000 feet) and Obstruction Removal EA. Regarding the September 10<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing, he continued, he had responded to the FOIL request indicating the responses would be made public once they were ready for distribution. He stated the responses were not currently ready and he pointed out there was no minimum or maximum time line for the release of the responses to comments. He stated his only concern was that the responses to comments be complete and accurate. He said his response to Mr. Whitehead's FOIL request was that the request would be addressed as soon as possible and he anticipated the document would be ready in the coming weeks.

Mr. Whitehead said the first responses had been prepared by McFarland Johnson, Inc. and he anticipated the second set of responses would be prepared by C&S Engineers, Inc. He stated these were public documents and were subject to FOIL requests. He commented he had asked for the McFarland Johnson responses and would ask for the C&S Engineers responses and he expected to receive the documents in the time frame required by the FOIL process. He asked if McFarland Johnson, Inc. had submitted responses from the September 10<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing. Mr. Tennyson responded he would meet the legal requirements of the FOIL request. Mr. Whitehead reiterated his previous question and Mr. Tennyson replied there had been some interagency communication which had been part of the FOIL request. Mr. Tennyson said the requested documents would be compiled

and reviewed with the County Attorney to determine the appropriate response. He explained the documents were in draft form and were not currently complete and at this point were not public information. Mr. Whitehead stated he had correspondence from Robert Freeman, Executive Director of the Committee on Open Government, which indicated that draft documents did not change the public status and if a document was to be released at a future meeting, it should be available at the time that it was received. He commented he would involve Mr. Freeman again in this matter if it was necessary. Mr. Girard asked Mr. Auffredou to address Mr. Whitehead's concerns. Mr. Auffredou responded the County would get back to Mr. Whitehead pertaining to his FOIL request. He mentioned that as he was listening to the conversation what came to mind was interagency privileges under FOIL. He said he had not reviewed the documents but he would be happy to speak with Mr. Tennyson and provide a response, as always. He commented he was not in a position to agree that the documents were ready for release as he had not looked at the matter from a legal standpoint.

Mr. Whitehead remarked the County Facilities Committee held a discussion after the July 1<sup>st</sup> Public Hearing on the Off-Airport Avigation Easement/Land Acquisition Project, where it appeared the officials conducting the Public Hearing refused to answer any questions. Mr. Girard interrupted to ask if Mr. Whitehead had a direct question. Mr. Whitehead continued it was stated that it was not a good idea to answer direct questions until the official responses were released. He said he did not believe it had been the intention of the Committee to drag the issue out for 10 to 12 weeks. Mr. Girard commented he had not heard a direct question; he said he had heard Mr. Whitehead's opinion and his statements and he added if Mr. Whitehead had a direct question the Committee would attempt to provide an answer. Mr. Whitehead mentioned the Office of Parks & Recreation had recently sent a letter to Mr. Tennyson inquiring about the possible destruction of historical sites during the work completed on Runway 1 and he asked if there had been a response to this letter to explain the actions. Mr. Tennyson responded a letter had been received from the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYS OPRHP) which referred to a matter brought to their attention by Mr. Whitehead indicating there had been issues with the Obstruction Removal Project. He added the NYS OPRHP had requested a response so that they could in turn respond to Mr. Whitehead's concerns. Mr. Whitehead asked if he could have a copy of the response submitted to the NYS OPRHP and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively.

Pertaining to Mr. Whitehead's comments and questions, Mr. Westcott stated he had two comments, the first of which was that he understood the need to be conscientious of the time but he did not feel that Mr. Whitehead was wasting any of the Committee's time. Mr. Westcott asked respectfully that the Committee listen to what Mr. Whitehead had to say, as he worked very hard and was generally correct in his statements. The second comment, Mr. Westcott continued, was the point was that of transparency and openness and a desire to have questions answered. He stated those in opposition of the plans for the Airport wanted nothing more than to be treated with respect and to have their questions answered. He said when they attended a Public Hearing and questions were not directly answered, they attempted to move forward in a positive manner. He indicated Mr. Dusek had organized informal meetings pertaining to Airport related public hearings and had agreed that for the next Public Hearing the questions which could be answered pertinent to the subject matter, would be answered. Mr. Westcott asked that the Committee allow Mr. Whitehead to speak and address his questions accordingly.

This concluded the Airport portion of the Committee Meeting and the Buildings & Grounds portion of the meeting commenced at 10:54 a.m.

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

Commencing the agenda review, Mr. Tennyson advised the first item was a follow up to the discussion held at the previous Committee Meeting pertaining to Municipal Center Security. He said Amy Clute, Self-Insurance Administrator, had worked with Needham Risk Management in the past on a proposal to improve security at the Municipal Center. He commented that Shawn Lamouree, Undersheriff, was also present and would have valuable input to contribute towards the discussion.

Ms. Clute provided a Power Point Presentation entitled "Warren County Municipal Center Security Proposal" which she reviewed in detail; *a copy of the Power Point Presentation is on file with the minutes.* She informed that Resolution No. 521 of 2014 was approved at the November 21, 2014 Board Meeting and had authorized the development of an action plan to improve security at the Municipal Center. She pointed out she had requested Michael Needham, of Needham Risk Management, to attend the Committee Meeting but a scheduling conflict had prevented him from doing so. She said she had worked in conjunction with Undersheriff Lamouree, Information Technology (IT) Department staff members, Mr. Morehouse and Mr. Tennyson on the development of the proposal. She added she had also discussed the proposal with Lee Pollack, of Rose and Kiernan, Inc., the County's liability insurance carrier, and he was in favor.

Ms. Clute stated over the last several years the County's Safety Committee had developed and implemented Emergency Action Plans for the Municipal Center and Human Services Building (HSB) and had conducted emergency exercises and drills to increase the awareness of potential emergencies. She noted the HSB was a secured building with a 5 year success record and she added 333 weapons had been confiscated thus far in 2014 including one handgun.

Ms. Clute highlighted the recommendations of the Warren County Municipal Center Security Proposal, as follows:

- ▶ reduce the total number of public access points to the Municipal Center from 9 doors to 2 doors (the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) entrance and the Probation Department entrance) with a keyed entrance for the Mail Room and 6 entrances which would be accessible by employees via FOB's;
- ▶ activate the existing FOB readers to restrict access to the non-public areas of the basement;
- ▶ issue FOB's to employees who do not already have one for the copier/printer system;
- ▶ upgrade software for the FOB reader system (\$5,084);
- ▶ install security cameras at entrances and in the main hallways (\$3,000 for equipment with the installation being completed in-house);
- ▶ modify the DMV entrance (\$4,000) and install a magnetometer (\$3,846.50);
- ▶ upgrade the magnetometer at the Probation Department entrance (\$3,846.50); and
- ▶ increase security officer presence at the DMV entrance (\$38,900).

Ms. Clute commented the benefits to the proposal included increased employee and visitor safety and an improved visitor experience. She noted currently visitors were often confused about where they needed to go and she added the current signage around the ring road added to this confusion. She mentioned the proposal would alleviate the need for the extra signage, as fewer signs would be needed. Upon entering the Municipal Center, she continued, the security guards could direct visitors to the correct office and she mentioned the possibility of a kiosk displaying a map of the Municipal Center. She pointed out the cost of the new equipment and upgrades was less than \$20,000 not including the additional security personnel. She advised this expense was minimal

compared to the possible costs associated with Worker's Compensation claims or the liability if a member of the public was injured at the Municipal Center. She mentioned there would be no cost associated with issuing FOB's to employees as they had already been purchased; however, she added, it would be necessary to upgrade the FOB reader system software, as it was purchased several years prior. Ms. Clute recommended the installation of cameras at the entrances and in the main hallways to allow security personnel the ability to monitor these areas. She expressed the proposed modifications to the DMV entrance involved the relocation of a glass wall/doorway and she noted glass work could not be completed in-house. She advised the New York State Contract cost of a Garrett Walk Through Metal Detector (magnetometer) was \$3,846.50 and the proposal included magnetometers at the DMV and Probation Department entrances. She mentioned the existing magnetometer at the Probation Department entrance was antiquated and did not function properly. She stated all of the aforementioned were one time costs; however, she added, the \$38,900 necessary for increased security officer coverage would be an annual cost, subject to salary increases. She noted an additional security officer would be necessary for the DMV entrance for a total of two and she pointed out these were part-time positions with no benefits.

Ms. Clute reported the first step in implementing the Warren County Municipal Center Security Proposal would be to establish a capital project in the amount of \$20,000 and to determine a source of funding for the additional security personnel. She mentioned Phase 1 of the plan would include the issuance and activation of FOB's; the activation of the magnetic locks and FOB readers on the exterior and basement doors; and the installation of security cameras at the entrances and in the main hallways. She commented Phase 1 could commence immediately or in the beginning of 2015. She stated Phase 2 of the plan would include the modification of the DMV entrance; the installation of magnetometers; and the additional security personnel. She estimated Phase 2 would commence in the winter of 2015.

Mr. Tennyson displayed a FOB for the Committee members and commented this was the same FOB used by employees for the copier/printer system. He advised one advantage of the FOB system for entry into the Municipal Center was that FOB's could be easily deactivated when an employee resigned or was terminated. He said the costs reviewed by Ms. Clute included some hardware to equip the front entrance of the Municipal Center with a FOB reader and magnetic lock, as well as the software needed to activate the FOB readers. He noted the current software did not support the necessary number of FOB readers. He commented it would take some time to program the FOB's because not all employees would be granted the same access rights. He anticipated Department Heads and key personnel would likely have access to the Municipal Center 24 hours per day, 7 days per week while many employees would have access 5 days per week during normal business hours.

Mr. Strough commented some institutions incorporated the FOB access into the existing employee identification badges. Undersheriff Lamouree responded the Sheriff's Office had used the same system for about 10 years and had originally built FOB access into the employee identification badges; however, he continued, it was determined these badges wore down over time and were costly to replace. Mr. Strough mentioned he had thought this would be a good means of encouraging employees to wear their identification badges. Mr. Brock asked if the \$38,900 for security personnel was a new cost to the County and Undersheriff Lamouree explained the County had requested the presence of a security officer in front of the DMV Office in December of 2013. Undersheriff Lamouree said this was not just one employee but several part-time employees who worked different days of the week and the post was manned a total of 45 hours per week. He added the cost of this security presence had been covered in the Sheriff's Office budget; however, he continued, the funding for an additional 45 hours per week was not currently budgeted.

Mr. Tennyson informed he had asked Ms. Clute the number of employees in the Municipal Center who worked in the unsecured areas and her reply had been 173 employees. He advised the cost per employee for the additional security personnel was approximately \$225 per year per employee. Mr. Tennyson asked if the security personnel for the HSB was covered in the Sheriff's Office budget and Undersheriff Lamouree responded the cost was reimbursed by the Department of Social Services (DSS). Mr. Tennyson suggested the cost of the additional security personnel could be divided among the Departments within the Municipal Center. He asked if there would be an adjustment to the maintenance in lieu of rent rate and Mr. Morehouse replied affirmatively and added maintenance in lieu of rent only applied to the Public Health and WIC (Women, Infants and Children) Departments.

Mr. Girard commented there was a request to establish a capital project in the amount of \$20,000 and he asked if this was just for the one time costs. Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively and said this included the cost to have Linstar install and activate a couple of additional FOB readers, as well as to install the software upgrade. He added this amount would also include the purchase of two new magnetometers, security cameras and the modifications to the DMV entrance. Pertaining to the security camera system, Mr. Tennyson advised this would include exterior entrance monitors, interior corridor monitors for both floors and would allow security personnel to monitor those areas. Mr. Girard mentioned the one time costs were approximately \$20,000 and the additional security personnel cost was approximately \$39,000 and both items would need to be forwarded to the Finance Committee. He asked if the \$20,000 would be allocated from the Fund Balance and Mr. Dusek replied the requests would be forwarded to the Finance Committee to determine a source of funding unless Mr. Tennyson had the available funds within his Departmental budget. Mr. Tennyson responded there were some funds remaining in the Departmental budget even though it had been a tough budget year. He added there were some funds remaining in an electricity code which could be transferred but he would have additional information before the Finance Committee Meeting. He anticipated he would be able to cover a large portion of the \$20,000 necessary to implement this plan.

Mr. Strough asked if there was any value to the existing magnetometer at the Probation Department entrance and Undersheriff Lamouree responded he had spoken with the company which had provided the County with the magnetometer for the HSB and they had indicated they had no interest in the old magnetometer, as it was antiquated. Undersheriff Lamouree explained the existing magnetometer set off an alarm if it was merely tapped. He explained the magnetometer installed at the HSB had pinpoint technology and displayed a diagram for the security officer detailing where the metal was detected. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Westcott asked if there would be one or two security guards posted at the DMV entrance and Undersheriff Lamouree responded the Security Supervisor would ideally prefer three security officers as the entrance was anticipated to be busy following the implementation of this plan. Undersheriff Lamouree continued by saying they had decided two security officers would be sufficient. He commented one security officer would operate the magnetometer allowing the second security officer the ability to respond to any issues that arose in the building. Mr. Westcott asked the entity that would be responsible for monitoring the security cameras and Undersheriff Lamouree responded the proposal was that the cameras would be monitored by the security personnel at the DMV entrance with a mirror image of the monitor screens available at the Probation Department entrance. He added Michael Colvin, Director of the IT Department, had indicated the Sheriff's Office would have the ability to access the security camera system remotely, if necessary. Mr. Westcott asked if there would be additional expenses and Undersheriff Lamouree replied in the negative and he added the Sheriff's Office had looked at a company to install a security camera system and the option offered by Mr. Colvin was substantially cheaper as the estimate received for the Sheriff's

Office was approximately \$89,000. Undersheriff Lamouree said he had this company look at the Municipal Center last week and they had not supplied an estimate yet but he anticipated it would be much more than \$3,000.

Mr. Tennyson stated he had brought the matter of the Municipal Center Security Proposal up at the last Department Head Meeting because if the plan was implemented it would be necessary for the Department Heads to provide input. He said he wanted Department Heads to designate the access needed for their employees to ensure there was no operational impact to implementing the plan. He commented he had asked Department Heads to come to him with any concerns regarding the plan and the only person who had approached him was Kate Johnson, Tourism Director. He explained Ms. Johnson's concern pertained to public access to the brochure rack outside her Office and he mentioned the possibility of relocating this to the modified DMV entrance. He indicated the County Clerk's Office was amenable to the concept of modifying the DMV entrance. He commented the directional signage on the ring road would be changed to direct members of the public to the DMV or HSB parking lots. He noted he anticipated developing some type of facility map/kiosk indicating the location of offices in the Municipal Center. He mentioned the security guards at the HSB were accustomed to directing members of the public to the appropriate office and he anticipated the security guards at the DMV entrance would follow suit; however, he added, if the security guards were busy they could refer members of the public to the facility map/kiosk.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough and seconded by Mr. Westcott to establish Capital Project No. H335.9550 280, Municipal Center Security Renovations, in the amount of \$20,000 with a source of funding to be determined and to forward same to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Monroe voiced his concern pertaining to creating a "fortress" in the Municipal Center and he commented local government buildings had always been open to the public. He mentioned the County had other facilities, such as the DPW Shop in Warrensburg which would not be secured. Although it made sense to restrict access to some of the entrances of the Municipal Center, he continued, the magnetometer was excessive and provided a false sense of security. He expressed he was in favor of restricting access to some of the entrances but was not in favor of the magnetometers. Mr. Monroe stated he had worked in the Court system in secured buildings and always had the sense that if someone intended to do him harm, they would do so in the morning before he entered the building or at night as he exited.

Mr. Westcott informed he had emailed a representative from NYSAC (New York State Association of Counties) pertaining to secured facilities and had received a reply indicating that NYSAC was not asking Counties to install magnetometers. He indicated the representative had indicated he would canvas the Counties and determine the number that currently used magnetometers in their facilities. He opined in this society it was not possible to protect people enough and he commented this was a sign of the times. He stated Mr. Monroe had made a valid point and he questioned if the magnetometer would really provide the Municipal Center with security. Mr. Westcott said he had asked NYSAC if they had a policy statement to Counties and he asked the same question of Mr. Dusek. Mr. Dusek replied he was unsure but would look into the matter.

Mr. Beaty agreed with Mr. Monroe in that he also did not want to create a "fortress" in the Municipal Center. He mentioned he had Googled justice statistics from 2002 through 2009 which indicated that workplace violence incidents had decreased by 35%. He pointed out workplace violence incidents received a lot of publicity and were sensationalized when they occurred but the statistics indicated something different than what the public was led to believe. Warren County should be open and engaging, he continued, and not placing more barriers on the public's interaction with County staff.

He stated a magnetometer and two security officers at the DMV entrance would be excessive and he opined the Municipal Center Security Proposal should be scaled back a little.

Ms. Wood said she understood the concerns but she recalled her experiences entering the HSB which had a magnetometer and security guards. She commented there were many members of the public who entered the HSB to visit the Office for the Aging, Board of Elections, DSS or Veterans' Services Offices. She stated she saw members of the public come and go from the building and she did not feel the magnetometer and security guards deterred people from entering. She mentioned people seemed to take the additional security in stride as it was becoming more commonplace. She commented she did not feel the additional security would deter people from visiting the DMV and she acknowledged it was necessary to encourage transactions at the DMV as opposed to online in order to receive the County's portion of the revenues.

Mr. Strough apprised he had assumed the magnetometer would be placed further down the hallway after the entrances to the DMV and County Clerk's Offices similar to the current location of the security desk. He commented this would ensure members of the public did not access the hallway and other County Offices unless they had a reason to do so. He pointed out County employees expected some kind of security, at least in the DMV portion of the Municipal Center.

Mr. Girard recalled that during a previous Committee Meeting, Court staff had reported the number of weapons confiscated via the magnetometer at the entrance to the Court System and he asked Undersheriff Lamouree if he knew the amount. Undersheriff Lamouree replied he was unsure of the exact number but he remembered it had been significant. He continued the security guards at the HSB had confiscated 333 weapons so far this year. He explained these weapons were mostly box cutters and knives, although there had been one handgun. He noted the person in possession of the handgun had a permit and was carrying it legally and had merely forgotten it was inside his briefcase. Undersheriff Lamouree asked if he lined up five people who were dressed normally would anyone be able to tell which person was in possession of a weapon. He expressed the intention was not to treat people like criminals but to enhance the safety of the people who worked in and visited the Municipal Center. He apprised it took a number of tragedies before changes had been made to security of the school systems.

Mr. Monroe stated County Supervisors and employees worked to serve the public and it sent a bad message to say they needed to be protected from the public. He explained the Court System was different because they dealt with emotional issues and it made sense to ensure that weapons were not brought into the Courts. He opined most of the services offered by the County did not rise to that level of emotion. He questioned the intentions for securing other County facilities and commented those employees deserved the same kind of protection as employees of the Municipal Center. He reiterated he did not want to convey the message that County Supervisors and employees needed to be protected from the public.

Mr. Tennyson advised the working group that developed the security proposal had discussed the possible inconvenience and what could be done to alleviate it. He noted there was some inconvenience in the fact that members of the public would all park in the HSB or DMV parking lots. He added there would also be some inconvenience in the fact that County Supervisors and employees would need to ensure they carried their FOB in order to access the building. Mr. Tennyson stated the HSB had been operational for 5 years and everyone who entered the Building did so through the main entrance with the magnetometer and security guards or by using a FOB. He pointed out there had been no issues or complaints in the 5 years the HSB had been operational. At the DMV entrance, he continued, they wanted to ensure there would be sufficient space to allow

a proper flow of people entering and exiting the building. He added the solution had been to relocate the entrance to the County Clerk's Office back a few feet to allow sufficient space for the magnetometer and security guards. Mr. Tennyson apprised neither he nor Mr. Morehouse had received any complaints in the 5 years the HSB had been opened and he asked Undersheriff Lamouree if the Sheriff's Office had received any complaints. Undersheriff Lamouree responded in the negative and noted prior to the opening of the HSB, the Sheriff's Office had provided security at the Municipal Center Annex where the DSS had previously been housed. Mr. Brock stated he understood Mr. Monroe's point and he recalled the public school system used to be easily accessible but now it was very different. He commented there were people with mental or emotional problems and people who just wanted to become famous by causing the harm or death of others. He said he did not like the fact that it was necessary to secure the Municipal Center but he would hate to regret not doing so if a tragedy were to occur.

Mr. Girard commented the proposal of better securing the Municipal Center had first been presented a few years prior and similar points had been made at that time and he said he understood everyone's point of view. He mentioned it seemed the Committee was in favor of limiting the access points to the Municipal Center and activating the FOB reader system. He pointed out the question seemed to be if the Committee was in favor of the installation of a magnetometer and the increased security personnel. He said the Committee would need to decide if they wanted to forward the matter to the Finance Committee and he anticipated further discussion at the Finance Committee and the Board Meeting. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Girard called the question and the motion was carried by majority vote, with Mr. Monroe voting in opposition, to establish Capital Project No. H335.9550 280, Municipal Center Security Renovations, in the amount of \$20,000 with a source of funding to be determined and to forward same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes.*

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried by majority vote, with Mr. Monroe voting in opposition, that the matter of determining a source of funding for additional security personnel necessary to initiate the Municipal Center Security Proposal at a cost of approximately \$39,000 be referred to the Finance Committee.

Continuing the agenda review, Mr. Morehouse requested a contract with BPI Mechanical Service for HVAC (heating, ventilation and air conditioning) repairs, rehabilitation and installation (WC 74-14) for a term commencing upon execution of the contract and terminating December 31, 2015, with the option to renew for two additional one year terms. He noted these services were only utilized if they were unable to complete the work in-house and he added they had not used these services for the last five or six years.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Monroe and carried unanimously to authorize the contract with BPI Mechanical Service as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the December 19, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Mr. Morehouse requested a contract with Stericycle, Inc. for solid waste, medical waste and recycling collection and disposal services (WC 79-14) for a term commencing January 1, 2015 and terminating December 31, 2015 with the option to renew for an additional one year term. He noted Stericycle, Inc. had been the only company that included medical waste collection and disposal in their proposal.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood and seconded by Mr. Westcott to authorize the contract with Stericycle, Inc. as outlined above.

Mr. Strough noted both this contract and the next request included Westmount Health Facility and he questioned the implications of this following the sale of the Facility. Mr. Auffredou responded the County Attorney's Office was including provisions in the contracts which included Westmount Health Facility at the suggestion of Mr. Dusek. He said the provisions would either allow the County to terminate the contracts or modify them with respect to the services at Westmount Health Facility. He stated it was important to ensure the contractors were alerted to the fact that during the term of the contract the level of services provided may change depending on the sale of Westmount Health Facility.

Mr. Girard called the question and the motion was carried unanimously to authorize the contract with Stericycle, Inc. as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the December 19, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Mr. Morehouse requested a contract with County Waste & Recycling Service d/b/a Ace Carting for solid waste, medical waste and recycling collection and disposal services (WC 79-14) for a term commencing January 1, 2015 and terminating December 31, 2015 with the option to renew for an additional one year term.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Monroe and carried unanimously to authorize the contract with County Waste & Recycling Service d/b/a Ace Carting as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the December 19, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Mr. Morehouse requested a contract with Stone Industries, LLC for routine pumping, cleaning and disposal of septic systems (WC 77-14) for a term commencing upon execution of the contract and terminating December 31, 2015 with the option to renew for two additional one year terms. He noted this contract was not utilized often as it only pertained to facilities with septic systems.

Motion was made by Mr. Westcott, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to authorize the contract with Stone Industries, LLC as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the December 19, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Mr. Morehouse requested a contract with Barrier Free Elevator, Inc. for periodic elevator maintenance for Warren County facilities (WC 72-14) for a term commencing upon execution of the contract and terminating December 31, 2015 with the option to renew for two additional one year terms. He noted this contract was mainly for the elevator in the Municipal Center.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to authorize the contract with Barrier Free Elevator, Inc. as outlined above. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes and the necessary resolution was authorized for the December 19, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Mr. Tennyson requested a contract with Clark Patterson Lee (CPL) for periodic professional multi-discipline engineering services (WC 75-14) commencing January 1, 2015 and terminating December 31, 2015 with the option to renew for two additional one year terms. He explained this was an annual contract and CPL would act as standby engineers for services, such as architectural, HVAC,

electrical, etc. He commented there had been 7 proposals generated as a result of the RFP (Request for Proposals) and they were recommending the contract be awarded to CPL. Referring to the Bid Tabulation Sheets on pages 20 through 24 of the agenda, Mr. Tennyson informed this was a labor rate contract for on-call architectural engineering services.

Motion was made by Mr. Monroe and seconded by Ms. Wood to authorize the contract with CPL as outlined above.

Mr. Westcott asked if this was the annual contract which allowed CPL to be selected as the engineering firm for the Court Space Expansion Project and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively. Mr. Westcott asked if all 7 proposers were listed in the Bid Tabulation Sheets and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively. Mr. Westcott asked the rationale for selecting CPL over the 6 other firms and Mr. Tennyson responded this was a unit rate contract and they completed an analysis based on a typical project and the number of hours which were anticipated for same. Mr. Tennyson apprised each bidder was required to submit a qualification package to ensure they met the necessary specifications for the nature of this work. For this contract and other term engineering contracts, he continued, when a project arose, the DPW developed a scope of services wherein the firm detailed the exact number of hours per title necessary to complete the project. He added if the necessary funds to complete the project were available within the budget, the County approved a Letter of Authorization which was then reviewed by the DPW engineering staff.

In reference to the Bid Tabulation Sheets, Mr. Strough commented it appeared as if Fusco Engineering & Land Surveying, P.C. was less expensive than some of the other firms. Mr. Tennyson explained the analysis was complicated and when you considered the hourly rate of the Principals on projects, they charged minimal hours as the bulk of the work was completed by staff engineers, drafters, technicians, etc. He said an analysis was completed as part of the bid which balanced the hourly rates out in proportion to the number of hours expended on a typical engineering project. Mr. Strough asked if the analysis was included in the agenda packet and Mr. Tennyson replied in the negative.

Kevin Hajos, Deputy Superintendent of Engineering for the DPW, explained each firm submitted an hourly rate for each position and he noted the positions listed in the RFP were New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) industry standard positions. He commented the DPW conducted a rating system based on 100 points and the position of Principal for example might count as 2 points because Principals were not a large part of most projects. He stated the positions most often used for consulting engineers were Assistant Engineer and Project Engineer which were rated higher on the rating system. Based on the analysis conducted by the DPW, he continued, and historical data of County projects, CPL was the lowest responsible bidder derived from the RFP.

Mr. Westcott asked why some of the firms did not list hourly rates for some of the positions and Mr. Hajos responded during the analysis, if a firm did not list an hourly rate for a particular title, they used the hourly rate listed for the next available title. He presented the example of a Senior Engineer and commented if an hourly rate was not listed, they used the hourly rate listed for the Managing Engineer. Mr. Tennyson stated each firm used different titles for their employees which made it difficult to compare a unit based RFP. He said the DPW referred to the industry standard titles which had a standard experience and certification level, when completing their analysis. He explained when consultants submitted proposals for this RFP, they placed their employees and hourly rates into those industry standard titles to allow a comparable level of experience. Mr. Westcott commented The Chazen Companies was a local firm and their bid appeared to be competitive and he noted they had an outstanding reputation. Mr. Hajos responded based on the

analysis completed, The Chazen Companies had been competitive; however, he added, based on the criteria used for the analysis, they had not been the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. Westcott stated it would be helpful to review the analysis completed by the DPW to determine the lowest responsible bidder and he noted he was not prepared to vote on this request today. Mr. Strough agreed and said he was confused by the Bid Tabulation Sheets as it appeared several of the firms were less expensive than CPL. He mentioned if there was an analysis which justified the selection of CPL, he would like an opportunity to review it. He expressed that looking at the Bid Tabulation Sheets at face value, CPL appeared to be one of the more expensive firms. Mr. Girard suggested the request could be tabled until the Committee had the opportunity to review the analysis.

Mr. Tennyson stated he understood the Committee members' concerns and he noted the analysis was a weighted one based on a typical project. He said he would provide the weighted analysis and explain how it factored in to the evaluation of the lowest responsible bidder. Mr. Strough noted some of the firms were local and he asked if factors, such as travel expenses were included in the analysis and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively. Mr. Tennyson commented that nowadays a lot of engineering work was completed over the internet or in the office, other than the initial field work. Ms. Wood asked if Julie Pacyna, Purchasing Agent, participated in the weighted unit rate analysis conducted by the DPW and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively. Ms. Wood suggested it would be helpful to request Ms. Pacyna to attend the next Committee Meeting. Mr. Tennyson explained these were RFP's which were made quite flexible and when the firm was selected with the established rates, it was possible to engage the services of the selected firm when the Board directed the DPW to initiate a new project. He noted the DPW did not employ in-house architects or electrical engineers. He commented the contract would be for on-call services and the rates were established by contract to allow the DPW to immediately move to action, as needed.

Mr. Girard pointed out Mr. Tennyson and previous Superintendents of the DPW, William Remington and William Lamy, had all used the services of CPL over the course of his tenure on the Board of Supervisors. He noted CPL had been involved with many projects including the Old Jail, the Court Space Expansion Project and the Needs Assessment for same. Over the years, he continued, CPL had collected data on behalf of the County and he asked if CPL's experience, expertise and familiarity with County projects was considered during the weighted analysis. Mr. Tennyson replied in the negative and he mentioned the DPW looked at each firm to ensure they met the minimum standards and had the necessary expertise and staff to conduct the work. He stated CPL had met and exceeded the minimum standards but this RFP was a unit rate bid and was analyzed as such. As far as prior work product, Mr. Tennyson continued, any work, analysis, assessment, etc. paid for by the County in the past, was the property of the County.

Mr. Tennyson advised the existing contract with CPL would expire on December 31, 2014 and CPL was currently in the midst of working on the Court Space Expansion Project and the RFP for Solar Conversion. Normally, he continued, if there was ongoing work for an expiring contract there was a provision within the contract to extend, as needed. Mr. Auffredou stated sometimes the contracts included extension provisions when there was no agreement for a new contract to allow the contract to be extended for a period of time, for example three months. He suggested the Committee authorize a short term extension to the existing contract to allow time to review the weighted analysis completed by the DPW. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Monroe withdrew his motion and Ms. Wood withdrew her second to the motion. It was the consensus of the Committee to table the request for a contract with CPL for periodic multi-discipline

engineering services until they were able to review the weighted unit rate analysis conducted by the DPW to determine the lowest responsible bidder.

Motion was made by Mr. Monroe, seconded by Mr. Westcott and carried unanimously to extend the existing contract with CPL for periodic professional multi-discipline engineering services for an additional 90-day term. *The necessary resolution was authorized for the December 19, 2014 Board Meeting.*

Mr. Morehouse informed he had been contacted by Gary Finger, of D & G Recycling, LLC, who rented space at the former Ciba Geigy Property at Lower Warren Street in the Town of Queensbury, requesting authorization to install an outside wood boiler and a heat exchanger on the inside of the building to lower the heating costs. Mr. Morehouse explained Mr. Finger would burn the wood pallets that came into the recycling center as a means of heat. He noted the request would be subject to review by the Building Code Enforcement Office. Mr. Auffredou asked if there would be any City of Glens Falls ordinances which would apply or if permits from the City or the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation would be required. He commented some municipalities had restrictions pertaining to the location of outside wood boilers. Mr. Girard mentioned the location of the former Ciba Geigy Property was in the Town of Queensbury and he asked if the Town of Queensbury would address the request. Mr. Strough commented the Town of Queensbury Building Code Enforcement Office would be responsible for the review. Mr. Morehouse stated he believed Mr. Finger was looking for conceptual approval from the County before he pursued the necessary permits. Mr. Westcott asked if Mr. Finger wanted to know if the County was amenable to the concept subject to the necessary permits and Mr. Morehouse replied affirmatively. Mr. Girard asked if this request would require additional storage space for the boiler and wood. Mr. Tennyson replied Mr. Finger would need to develop a proposal and present it to the County. He said if the Committee was in favor of the concept, they would require Mr. Finger to provide detailed cut sheets on what was to be installed, a site plan, an installation plan and if additional space was necessary, it would need to be incorporated into a modified lease agreement. He mentioned the County would require that Mr. Finger meet all local, State and Federal codes and obtain the necessary permits. Mr. Tennyson advised all of the information would be reviewed by the DPW engineering staff and he would bring the request to a future Committee Meeting with a recommendation. He suggested the modified lease agreement could include a clause requiring the equipment to be removed and the property be restored to the original condition upon the termination of the lease. Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee to conceptually approve the installation of an outdoor wood boiler and heat exchanger inside the former Ciba Geigy Property subject to review by the County Attorney and DPW engineering staff and with the understanding that a formal proposal would be presented to the Committee at a future meeting for approval.

Mr. Tennyson stated they had been reviewing the Solar Conversion RFP's for Cornell Cooperative Extension, Countryside Adult Home and the Warrensburg Well Site. He said a range of proposals had been received and it was challenging to review them as it was not an "apples to apples" comparison. He informed they had developed a series of questions to ask the proposers to clarify the proposals. He said he hoped to have a recommendation for the Committee by the end of January and installation would not be until early spring.

Mr. Westcott requested the Solar Conversion proposals be sent to the Committee members 5 to 10 days prior to the Committee Meeting to allow time to properly review them. Mr. Girard said the concept of solar power was fairly new and the DPW engineers were completing the due diligence to ensure an appropriate decision was made. Mr. Tennyson stated he had already received requests for copies of the proposals and some of the firms considered portions of their proposals to be

confidential business documents. He said he could provide copies of the proposals to the Supervisors, as elected officials, but it would be necessary for them to keep these documents confidential. He noted he could also provide copies of any clarifications and the questions and answers posed to the proposers; however, he added, some of this information would also be confidential. Mr. Tennyson informed the proposals were vast and contained a range of assumptions and he presented some examples. He stated they were trying to evaluate the proposals on a comparable basis and achieve similar assumptions. He requested any Supervisors with questions pertaining to the proposals to consult with him or the DPW engineering staff for further explanation. Mr. Strough stated he informs proposers that any information submitted to him was subject to FOIL requests. He opined the Solar Conversion proposals would cause a lot of conversation and he noted some companies proposals depended on market rates and their projections and others used a fixed formula. He said he was inclined to select a proposal which guaranteed some kind of savings regardless of market rates. Mr. Monroe opined it should be based on the percentage of savings over the current utility rates. Mr. Tennyson stated the RFP had been quite broad because they did not want to pigeon hole the proposers into a certain type of system or agreement. Mr. Dusek asked if Mr. Westcott's request was to have the proposals sent out at least 5 days before the Committee Meeting in which the Solar Conversion presentation would be given. Mr. Tennyson responded that as soon as the information was ready, he would send it to the Committee members. Mr. Auffredou stated his understanding was that 5 proposals had been received and 2 of the proposers did not maintain any of the information contained in their proposals was confidential; however, he added, 3 of the proposers did consider their proposals to be confidential business documents and he had spent a considerable amount of time and legal research on these proposals. He said he had spent a large amount of time in communication with the proposers and/or their counsel. Mr. Auffredou mentioned he wanted to prepare the Committee members for the fact that it might be necessary to enter into an executive session to discuss portions of the proposals as they would be considered proprietary trade secrets and competitive information. He noted the presentation prepared by Mr. Tennyson would also be viewed as confidential until the Committee made an official decision.

Mr. Westcott exited the Committee Meeting at 12:19 p.m.

Mr. Brock stated he was not familiar with solar power but he was concerned that better technologies would be available in 5 to 10 years. He questioned if the County would be locking themselves into something which could be obsolete in 5 to 10 years. Mr. Strough responded that would depend on the contract with the solar power provider and he noted it was possible to have a clause in the contract which would allow renegotiation in 5 years. He noted it would be in the interest of both parties to have the best available technology because when the County made money, the solar company would, as well. He commented if the County purchased the solar cells, they would be locked in as they would own and have to maintain the equipment. Mr. Tennyson apprised the technology would continue to improve and solar panels would continue to become more efficient. He said the question was if the County wanted to wait for better technology or take the best available now.

Mr. Tennyson apprised the Warren County Historical Society was developing a proposal to lease space including the buildings on Gurney Lane. He said he had met with them briefly but the proposal was not ready for presentation at this time.

Ms. Wood pointed out there was a request for a transfer of funds listed on the agenda. Mr. Tennyson requested a transfer of funds between various codes totaling \$80,920 to adjust accounts as necessary due to changes in staffing within the Department.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to approve the request for a transfer of funds as outlined above and to forward same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the Request for Transfer of Funds form is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Tennyson stated he anticipated he would have additional requests for transfers of funds prior to the Finance Committee Meeting, as this had been a challenging year with a tight budget.

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Ms. Wood and seconded by Mr. Strough, Mr. Girard adjourned the meeting at 12:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charlene DiResta, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist