

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: OCTOBER 30, 2007

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS HASKELL
O'CONNOR
F. THOMAS
VANNESS
GERAGHTY
GIRARD

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR CHAMPAGNE

OTHERS PRESENT:

FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS
WILLIAM LAMY, DPW SUPERINTENDENT
WILLIAM THOMAS, CHAIRMAN
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ATTORNEY
HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL
SERVICES
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SUPERVISORS BELDEN
CAIMANO
GABRIELS
KENNY
MERLINO
SOKOL
STEC
TESSIER
BARBARA TAGGART - ADMINISTRATOR, WESTMOUNT
HEALTH FACILITY
SKIP BEESAW, WESTMOUNT HEALTH FACILITY
JULIE PACYNA, PURCHASING AGENT
TODD LUNT, HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR
FRED AUSTIN, BUILDING PROJECT COORDINATOR
JOHN J. MARTIN, CLARK PATTERSON ASSOCIATES
JON NORRIS, CLARK PATTERSON ASSOCIATES
JOHN HORGAN, BOVIS LEND LEASE LMB, INC.
WAYNE ALLISON, RIST FROST ASSOCIATES
DAN BRUNO, RIST FROST ASSOCIATES
CONNIE HARRIS FARRINGTON, WARREN COUNTY RESIDENT
DAVID CEDERSTROM, *THE CHRONICLE*
CHARLES FIEGL, *THE POST STAR*
AMANDA ALLEN, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Haskell called the meeting of the County Facilities Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty, seconded by Mr. F. Thomas and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the August 21, 2007 Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

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

Mr. Morehouse stated that he preferred to begin with the New Business portion of the agenda and the first item listed under this heading referred to the annex generator. He explained that at a prior Committee meeting it had been determined that the generator currently housed at the Westmount Health Facility would

be transferred for use at the Countryside Adult Home; however, he said, he had since discovered that if power was lost on co-generation engine five, power would be lost at the Westmount Health Facility, the Detention Home and the WIC (Women, Infants and Children) buildings. Mr. Morehouse stated that it had been their original intent to transfer the generator upon completion of the proposed Health and Human Services Building as a new generator would be incorporated in the plans for that building. He noted that it was his opinion that the generator should be left at its current location in light of possible issues with the co-generation engines. Mr. Morehouse added that the generator currently in place at the Countryside Adult Home had been reviewed and it was his understanding that it would handle the full electrical needs of the heating system but not the cooling system. Mr. Morehouse asked the Committee how they wished to proceed in this matter, in light of these new facts.

Mr. Haskell asked Mr. Morehouse to determine the full capabilities of the generator in place at the Countryside Adult Home for discussion at the next Committee meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to leave the generator at the Westmount Health Facility location pending further discussion.

Mr. Morehouse pointed out that New Business item B referred to a contract amendment with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. which had been added as per the request of Paul Dusek, County Attorney. He advised that because Mr. Dusek was not currently present, this item would be discussed upon his arrival.

Proceeding, Mr. Morehouse apprised that the third New Business item pertained to a request for a transfer of funds which had already been approved at the DPW Committee meeting held earlier that day. He explained that the transfer had been necessary to facilitate the purchase of a new computer system for the employee identification card system and also to reimburse his Department for the microphones purchased for the Committee table in the Board Room. Mr. Morehouse added that the transfer would also allow for the purchase of a new copier. He explained that the lease for their current copier would expire in December and, at the suggestion of Julie Pacyna, Purchasing Agent, they were requesting funds to purchase a new copier because their low rate of usage was not supportive of leasing terms for a new machine. Mr. Haskell asked if funds were available within the existing Budget to support the transfer of funds and Mr. Morehouse replied affirmatively, reiterating that the transfer had already been approved in a prior meeting and this item was only being presented for the Committee's edification. William Lamy, DPW Superintendent, added that transfers had also been approved at the DPW Committee meeting to cover shortfalls in salary codes.

Mr. Haskell pointed out that representatives Wayne Allison and Dan Bruno, of Rist Frost Associates were present and they were granted privilege of the floor to address the Committee. Mr. Allison explained that two air handling units had been ordered for the Westmount Health Facility and were due to arrive on November 17th. He stated that the RFP (Request for Proposal) for installation of the air handling units had not yet been completed; however, he said, they anticipated that it should be ready by October 31st for issuance on November 5th. Mr. Allison added that the RFP deadline was November 26th and the contract would be awarded on December 3rd. He noted that although the weather would be cold by this time, he felt it would be possible for the project to proceed. Mr. Allison said that the only issue with respect to the matter was the inability to change the delivery date for the air handling units. He apprised that because a contract would not be awarded for the project by the delivery date, alternative arrangements would have to be made to unload the units.

Mr. Haskell asked how much the air handling units weighed and Mr. Allison replied that they weighted

approximately 12,000 lbs. each. Mr. Haskell asked if there was any way that the RFP process could be expedited and Mrs. Pacyna replied that it could, although the turnaround time would be very short. Mr. Haskell asked if it was possible for Mr. Allison and his staff to complete their portion of the RFP earlier than the date indicated for delivery to Mrs. Pacyna and Mr. Allison replied affirmatively, assuming that they could agree upon the appropriate dates for installation.

Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, stated that as the former Administrator of the Westmount Health Facility, he was concerned with the possibility of damage to the building's rubber roof that might be caused by working on it during sub-zero temperatures. He asked if such damage was likely and if the roof's warranty would cover the damage if it did occur. Dan Bruno, of Rist Frost Associates, advised that he would suggest consulting with the provider and guarantor of the roof to determine the specifications of the roof's warranty prior to beginning installation of the air handling units.

Skip Beesaw, employee of the Westmount Health Facility, stated that the roof in place in the area of the building intended for work was comprised of a Carlisle roof system, installed by Firestone, and he estimated that the roof still carried a warranty of five to seven years. He added that during installation of the co-generation project, sheets of plywood had been used to form a work pad to avoid any damage to the roof. Mr. Payne advised that this was not comparable because the work related to the co-generation project was not done during the winter months and Mr. Beesaw countered that some of the work had been completed in sub-zero temperatures with no damage to the roof.

Mr. Payne asked if the air-handling units could be unloaded and stored for installation in the spring and Mr. Bruno replied affirmatively, adding that the units could be stored outside. Barbara Taggart, Administrator of the Westmount Health Facility, stated that she would prefer for the installation to be completed as quickly as possible, rather than waiting until the Spring.

Mr. Haskell stated that he agreed with Mr. Payne's concern with respect to possibly causing damage to the roof or voiding its warranty and he asked Mr. Beesaw to inquire with the appropriate parties to determine if these concerns were valid. Mr. Beesaw replied that he would contact the Firestone representatives, but noted they would most likely advise that the work could be completed as long as precautions were taken to avoid damage to the roof.

Mr. Haskell asked if the contractor installing the air-handling units would be responsible for any damage to the roof resulting from the installation and Mr. Bruno replied affirmatively, noting that this had been spelled out in the RFP. He added that the contractor would also be required to maintain a weather tight surrounding for the roof while completing the project, regardless of the weather. He noted that he had been involved in many similar projects performed during winter months and, in his experience, as long as the proper precautions were taken to preserve the roof there had been no issues. Mr. Bruno inquired as to the main intention of the air handling units and Mr. Beesaw advised that they were intended for the heating and cooling of the building. Mr. Beesaw added that these units were primarily for climate control in large areas and hallways, as well as serving as the exhaust for the building, while each resident room benefitted from a separate heat source.

In response to Mr. Girard's request for clarification, Mr. Bruno apprised that a contractor would be needed to unload the air-handling units upon their arrival on November 19th. He noted that they had intended to include the off loading along with the installation contract, but that was impossible because the units would be arriving prior to the award of the contract. Mr. Haskell asked what type of equipment would be needed to unload the air-handlers and Mr. Bruno replied that either a large lift or a crane would be required due to the weight of the units.

Mr. Caimano asked if an RFP was necessary to contract with a company able to unload the units and Mrs. Pacyna stated that an RFP was necessary for any DPW project costing more than \$20,000. Mr. Bruno apprised that the cost would be far less than this limit, therefore, an RFP would not be necessary.

Mr. VanNess pointed out that DPW might have a piece of equipment able to unload the air handling units and Mr. Lamy advised that he would investigate further to determine if a piece of equipment was available to meet this need. Mr. Haskell asked Mr. Beesaw to determine exactly what was needed to unload the units then to coordinate with Mr. Lamy to determine if appropriate equipment was available.

Mr. O'Connor asked where the units would be stored when unloaded and Mr. Beesaw stated that the units would be stored in available space in the parking lot, then moved to the roof via crane for installation. Mr. Beesaw noted that there was plenty of space to store the units without disruption, as had been done when the co-generation project was being installed.

Mrs. Pacyna reminded the Committee of Mr. Allison's earlier statement that the contract would be awarded on December 3rd and she asked at what Board meeting the resolution authorizing the contract would be introduced. Mr. Lamy suggested that the motion be made to forward the resolution to accept the lowest acceptable bid, based on the project engineer's recommendation, for acceptance at the November 16th Board meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. F. Thomas and carried unanimously to accept the lowest qualified bid for installation of the air handling units at the Westmount Health Facility, based on the project engineer's recommendation, subsequent to the bid opening on December 3rd and the necessary resolution was authorized for the November 16th Board meeting.

Mr. Lamy apprised that as the Committee was aware, the changeover to new equipment for the electrical entrance to the Municipal Center had not been completed. He noted that funds had been included in the 2008 Budget for completion of the project and in the meantime it had been suggested by Hour Electric, the company working on the project, that the integrity of the existing electrical panel be reviewed, as well as the incoming wires, at a cost of \$650. Mr. Lamy advised that this work would be done on a Saturday so as not to interrupt the business conducted at the Municipal Center. He added that because of the low cost an RFP was not necessary and he was presenting the item as an update to the Committee.

Returning to the agenda review, Mr. Morehouse advised that he had received a call from Energy Curtailment Specialists (ECS) with respect to a program that would pay the County to generate its own power. Mr. Morehouse explained that a fee would be paid to the County for signing up to participate in the program which would require the County to generate electricity for up to eight hours during certain times of the year. He noted that the County would be compensated for generating the electricity, as well as for the fuel used in the process. Mr. Morehouse advised that the purpose of the program was to prevent black outs and brown outs in the New York City and Long Island areas during peak energy times. He pointed out that he did see some issues with the program and he wanted to make sure the terms of the program would not affect contracts with either Siemens Building Technologies or NYSERDA (New York State Energy Research and Development Authority). Mr. Morehouse noted that it had the potential to generate revenues upwards of \$10,000 annually and he did not take issue with exercising the generators.

Mr. VanNess stated that he felt this program might be a good opportunity because it would save funds while generating revenues and determining if the generators were sufficient. He added that he thought Mr. Morehouse should continue to research the program and return to the Committee with his findings.

Mr. Payne asked if the generator in place at Municipal Center would power the entire facility and Mr.

Morehouse replied affirmatively.

Returning to agenda item number two, old business, Mr. Haskell began an update of the status of the proposed Health and Human Services Building. Referring to documentation developed by Bovis Lend Lease LMB, Inc., *a copy of which is on file with the minutes*, Mr. Haskell explained that two options were now available for the proposed building, one at the current Department of Social Services site and the other on the Municipal Center campus. He noted that option two referred to the proposal to construct a three story building on the Municipal Center campus at a cost of \$11,562,000; however, he noted, this building would include no room for future growth.

Mr. Kenny pointed out that contrary to Mr. Haskell's statement, the building proposal did seem to include room for growth as indicated in the figures representing "Future Staff", as detailed in the documentation developed by CPA (Clark Patterson Associates) and distributed at the October 19th Board meeting. *A copy of this documentation is on file with the minutes.* For example, he said, under the Office for the Aging portion, the existing staff was listed as 11 and accounted for one future staff member; this was the case with all Departments listed, he added. Mr. Haskell replied that Mr. Kenny was forgetting about the POE (Point of Entry) program that was mandated by the State of New York subsequent to the start of the building project, which would require additional staff in the Office for the Aging. Mr. Kenny advised that this was not the case because every Department listed in the packet included a figure for future staff, therefore it was incorrect to state that the building proposal did not include any room for future growth.

Jon Norris, CPA, stated that the charts had been developed to include existing and future staff for all of the Departments intended to house the new building. He noted that the 10,000 sq. ft. initially included for expansion had been removed, so technically there was no room for future growth; however, he said, they had included allowances for anticipated staff. Mr. Haskell apologized for the misunderstanding.

John Martin, CPA, apprised that the lack of room for future growth was defined by the inability to include additional Departments, other than those listed in the building proposal, rather than the expansion of existing Departments.

Mr. Kenny stated that the GSA (Government Services Administration) study had recommended 200 sq. ft. of usable area per person, while the building proposal included 247 sq. ft. per person. He apprised that if the additional space over and above the GSA recommendation was multiplied by the anticipated staff, a large sum, in the range of \$2.5 million in additional costs, was derived. Mr. Kenny stated that the 200 sq. ft. recommended by GSA was the result of a Government study which established that the figure and supported a safe, healthy and comfortable working environment. He noted that in the past he had been present at meetings where the same Supervisors present had debated over the expense of \$500 and he said that he was unable to justify such a great expense due to the additional space and he did not know how the other Supervisors present could do so either.

Fred Austin, Building Project Coordinator, stated that the Committee should keep in mind that Government office buildings were generally large open spaces broken down by cubicles. He noted that the building proposed would be visited by a wide variety of citizens and required concessions for needs such as interview rooms. Mr. Austin added that Government buildings were not comparable to the proposed building because they were not as frequently visited by the public. Furthermore, he cited, the building proposal had already been reduced to include only one of the two break rooms originally intended, which he did not feel was sufficient for the number of employees intended for the building. Mr. Austin stated that it was his opinion that the proposal did not include any wasted space and the square footage could not be reduced any further. Mr. Austin stated that the building would eventually be outgrown, leaving the next group of Supervisors to wonder why this one had not included space for future growth.

Mr. Kenny stated that he respectfully disagreed with Mr. Austin, noting that the GSA figure was sufficient for the Department of the Defense, Internal Revenue Services and Federal Bureau of Investigation; therefore, he said, how could they reasonably state that Warren County employees required more square footage than these other entities.

Mr. Haskell agreed with Mr. Austin's statement, noting that not many citizens visited the offices of the Governmental entities listed by Mr. Kenny, while approximately one quarter of the population of Warren County would be visiting the Health and Human Services Building to obtain assistance. Mr. Kenny countered that not all of these citizens would be visiting at the same time, therefore the GSA recommended amount of space would be sufficient.

Mr. Kenny stated that space for the NYSDOL (New York State Department of Labor) had also been included in the building proposal as part of the Workforce Development/One-Stop Department and he asked if they were absolutely certain that NYSDOL would move from their current location to the new building and Mr. Haskell replied that William Resse, Director of the Employment & Training Administration, had confirmed this. Mr. Kenny asked if they had received some type of commitment from NYSDOL verifying their intent to occupy the new building and if they had advised of their current leasing status. Mr. Haskell advised that a commitment had not been received because the new building had not been approved yet. Mr. Haskell added that NYSDOL had advised of their current leasing status but he did not have that information with him for presentation. Mr. VanNess recalled that a letter was received from NYSDOL stating that if the building came to fruition they would move into it along with the Employment & Training Administration. Mr. Kenny pointed out that approximately 4,000 sq. ft. had been reserved for NYSDOL at a cost of \$274.95 per sq. ft., which added up to a significant cost, especially if they decided against moving into the new building.

Mr. VanNess asked how many employees were intended to occupy the proposed Health and Human Services building and Mr. Kenny replied that the documentation provided by CPA reflected that 161 existing staff members would occupy the new space.

Mr. Kenny asked why the CASA (Community Alternative Systems Agency) unit had been removed from the plans and Mr. Norris replied that they had been removed due to their relation to the Health Services Department, which had been removed completely from the plans; however, he said, they could be added back in. Mr. Payne apprised that the CASA unit was required as part of their relation to the POE (Point of Entry).

Mr. Kenny noted that 2300 sq. ft. had been included for the IT (Information Technology) satellite office intended for the new building with only one staff member. Mr. Haskell apprised that this was intended for a computer lab to allow for proper training on new software and such, in an effort to train employees in a more efficient manner. Mr. Kenny reminded the Committee that currently there was no computer lab in place and the training rooms within the Municipal Center were used to facilitate training. He stated that they needed to review the plans to determine what was actually needed versus what was desired.

Mr. Girard asked for clarification on the difference in cost per square foot between building proposal options one and two. John Horgan, Bovis Lend Lease LMB, explained that option one was for the construction of the Health and Human Services Building on the site currently occupied by the Department of Social Services while option two was for construction on the Municipal Center campus. He added that option one included a larger building and required additional excavation to properly prepare the site for the new building, as well as costs to demolish the current building and extend sewer and fiberoptic facilities beneath the Northway. Option two, Mr. Horgan advised, would include the construction of a three story building on flat ground, which was less costly.

Mr. Girard noted that the cost comparisons between the two options included an item entitled "Trade Contingency" and he asked what this meant. Mr. Horgan explained that this was a percentage of dollars of project costs at the moment and was necessary because they were dealing with only a set of schematics for the building. He added that in order to develop a real budget, a series of estimates, including schematic estimates and design development estimates, were used to determine the construction documents and the trade contingency served as the unknown costs of the project. He added that the escalation figures included in the comparison reflected the increase in construction prices over time.

Mr. Girard pointed out that there was a difference of about 40,000 sq. ft. between the two building options and he asked what this space had been intended for. Mr. Norris replied that the Health Services, Youth Bureau and WIC Departments had been removed from the plans to reduce square footage. In addition, he noted, shipping and receiving facilities were removed, as they were available at the Municipal Center, and other areas, such as the employee break rooms, were reduced to decrease the size of the building.

Mr. Payne pointed out that currently, they were seeking 6,000 sq. ft. of office space for the Medicaid program to move them out of their current location at the Social Services building and relieve some of the crowding issues there. He said that they anticipated moving both the Medicaid and CASA Departments to the CNA Building in the City of Glens Falls, where the Office for the Aging was currently located, at an estimated cost of \$90,000 per year. Mr. Payne stated that if the move was made, the POE would be established and in place at the CNA building for the time being. He added that the costs incurred for renting an alternate facility to house the Medicaid Department were 100% reimbursable from the State of New York.

Mr. Dusek entered the meeting at 2:15 p.m.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Girard estimated that if the space rates indicated by the GSA study were used, as proposed by Mr. Kenny, the Health and Human Services Building could be reduced from 60,000 sq. ft. to approximately 33,000 sq. ft. Mr. Norris apprised that the handouts distributed at the October 19th Board meeting included not only the area intended for each Department but also the amount by which each would have to be reduced to meet the GSA specified rate of 200 sq. ft. per employee. For example, he stated, the Workforce Development/One Stop would have to be reduced by 5,400 sq. ft. to meet the GSA rate. Mr. Girard stated that in light of this information, the Committee now needed to justify the costs incurred by the inclusion of approximately 20,000 sq. ft. over and above the GSA recommended rate. Mr. Norris stated that if the Committee wished to further reduce the size of the building that they would have to begin by minimizing storage and public spaces.

Mr. Kenny pointed out that under the Veterans' Services area figures, the usable square footage per person was 316.75 which was much higher than the GSA standard of 200 sq. ft. and was based on a total staff of four, when there were actually only two people employed in the Department. Mr. Payne explained that there was one State employee, in addition to the two County employees, that worked in the office two days per week and required a private office to perform interviews.

Mr. VanNess asked what the overall square footage for the bathrooms, break rooms, hallways and common areas was and Mr. Norris replied that it was approximately 10,780 sq. ft. Mr. VanNess reminded the Committee that in a prior meeting it had been determined that they would be comfortable with allowing each employee 250 sq. ft. and when this figure was multiplied by the number of employees and added to the 10,780 sq. ft. for common areas, the building would be a total of approximately 50,000 sq. ft. leaving an overage of 10,000 sq. ft. that could reasonably be reduced.

Mr. F. Thomas stated that he did not feel the building should be reduced further as each Department serviced

the public and required space to do so. He added that they were forgetting the spaces required to house copiers and other such office equipment. Mr. Kenny countered that public areas, rest rooms, hallways, lunch rooms and such were all considered in the GSA rate. He apprised that in 2000 the State of Texas had passed a law mandating the use of 153 sq. ft. of usable space per person for any building. Mr. Kenny stated that it was obvious that no employee required 200 sq. ft. for their working space and by including figures higher than this amount they were simply wasting County dollars.

Mr. Haskell stated that he felt there was some confusion in reviewing the schematics and need for space. For example, he noted, on the first floor two visitation rooms, with observations rooms attached to each, were required for visitation in child abuse cases. Mr. Haskell stated that items such as this were not accounted for in the GSA average and were being missed in the schematic review. In addition, he reviewed, the number of break rooms and copy rooms had been reduced; however, the building would require special needs such as the interview rooms and separate entrances for employees and clients, due to security needs, all of which required additional space not included in normal building projects.

Mr. Girard stated that he certainly respected the amount of time Mr. Haskell had spent in working with the design team to develop the project schematics but it might be necessary to hold a more detailed meeting to review the specific needs of each Department and their inclusion in the schematics to make a unified decision. He said that they were trying to reduce the size of the building without really knowing what was being lost in the process. Mr. Haskell apprised that a meeting of the Core Group had been held for such purpose and all of the Supervisors had been invited, although only Messrs. O'Connor and Merlino attended, and both had been content with the explanation of the schematics and the area needed.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. W. Thomas recapped that during the meeting there had been discussion with regard to reducing the square footage of the proposed building to 250 sq. ft. per person and even further to 200 sq. ft. per person as per the GSA study. He asked if there was some sort of compromise that the Committee would be willing to agree to in order to move the proposal to the full Board of Supervisors.

Mr. O'Connor apprised that he was a staunch believer in compromise but he felt that in reviewing the current proposal schematics it seemed that there was no room to spare and he wondered if it was wise to reduce the area further. He added that it seemed that the space included was necessary and anything extra would likely be required for future growth. Mr. O'Connor stated that although he was respectful of Mr. Kenny's opinion he was not in favor of reducing the Building proposal any further.

Motion was made by Mr. Geraghty, seconded to Mr. Girard and carried unanimously to forward proposal option two for the Health and Human Services Building to the full Board of Supervisors at their meeting on November 16th with the square footage to remain as stated in the proposal, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the November 16th Board meeting.

Mr. Dusek advised the Committee that the vote of the full Board on November 16th would only be to approve the concept of the Health and Human Services Building as presented. He noted that, if approved, the resolution would only authorize the professionals involved to proceed with a particular concept.

Returning to New Business item B, Mr. Dusek apprised that Siemens Building Technologies Inc. had pointed out a minor error in their contract for the Municipal Center Building. He explained that the problem was with respect to the portion of the contract describing the geo thermal heat pump system, wherein it listed that they would replace the existing water source heat pump system, install a full geo thermal pump system, eliminate the existing cooling tower and retain the existing boiler system as a back up. Mr. Dusek stated that

the contract amendment would clarify that a geo thermal heat pump system would be installed, 159 existing water source heat pumps would be replaced, the cooling tower would be eliminated and a new condensing boiler would be installed to supplement the heat pump loop temperature. In addition, he noted, Siemens had requested an amendment to the contract to note that the existing triad boiler system would be kept as a backup, or redundant, system to add heat to the heat loop when needed. Mr. Dusek stated that this had been the intention of the program all along, but as noted, there was a difference in the description of the contract. Also, he said, there was a difference in the verification of savings in that the current contract stated that the verification would be done through the monitoring of the existing boilers, which was not true, but rather through the new and existing boilers together. Mr. Dusek stated that as the County's Attorney he had no issue with the changes because the intent of the project remained the same.

Mr. Morehouse noted that only two of the three triads in place were operational and he questioned whether or not they would be sufficient for the supplementation, as originally they had discussed implementing a new system with the triads being used as a backup system only. He added that if the third triad was needed, repairs would be required at a cost of approximately \$85,000. Mr. Dusek replied that it was confirmed that a new condensing boiler was being installed as a supplement to the heat pump system but he would add Mr. Morehouse's concern as a point of clarification. Secondly, Mr. Morehouse stated, if they were replacing 159 heat pumps the large pump that serviced the Supreme Court and the one that serviced the Board Room would not be included. Mr. Dusek countered that both pumps would be replaced and he noted that originally the contract had included the replacement of 157 pumps and upon defining the issue they had clarified that the total should be changed to 159 pumps, to include the ones cited by Mr. Morehouse, were going to be replaced.

With respect to the heat pumps, Mr. Payne noted that the pumps were scheduled to be delivered within the following two months and Mr. Morehouse apprised that they would make room in their storage area for these items.

Mr. Dusek confirmed that he would contact Siemens to determine whether or not the two functioning triads would be sufficient for use as a backup system. Mr. Morehouse noted that the repair of the third triad unit might be something that Siemens could review because it was his feeling that repairs could be made as they had in the past.

Motion was made by Mr. VanNess, seconded by Mr. F. Thomas and carried unanimously to approve the amendment to the Siemens Building Technologies Inc. contract as outlined above and the necessary resolution was authorized for the November 16th Board meeting.

Mr. Kenny asked Mr. W. Thomas, as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, to hold the vote on the proposed Health and Human Services Building at the November 2nd Adjourned Board meeting rather than delaying it until the regular meeting scheduled for November 16th. He stated that it was his feeling that the voters of Warren County should be knowledgeable of their elected officials intentions with respect to the proposal prior to the November 6th elections.

Mr. W. Thomas stated that he did not disagree with Mr. Kenny's suggestion, while Mr. Haskell said he did not feel there was enough time to answer any Supervisors questions with respect to the project prior to the vote. Mr. Caimano apprised that although he had no issue with moving the vote to the November 2nd meeting, he did not think that there was time to give sufficient notice that the item would be presented.

Mr. Dusek stated that the November 2nd meeting was advertised as an adjourned meeting intended for approval of the 2008 Tentative Budget and if they wished to vote on this item they would have to advertise for it, meaning that the notice would have to be sent immediately to meet the requirement for two days notice

of the meeting agenda.

Mr. Belden stated that he preferred to vote on the proposal after an additional 10,000 sq. ft. had been removed, as per Mr. VanNess' proposal, to determine what savings might be gained by further reducing the building.

Mr. W. Thomas advised that because it seemed more discussion was necessary with respect to the project, the vote would be held at the November 16th meeting as previously stated.

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, on motion made by Mr. Geraghty and seconded by Mr. F. Thomas, Mr. Haskell adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Allen, Legislative Office Specialist