

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: COUNTY FACILITIES

DATE: SEPTEMBER 1, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS: GIRARD
WOOD
WESTCOTT
STROUGH
CONOVER
SEEBER

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR: MONROE

OTHERS PRESENT:

JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
FRANK MOREHOUSE, SUPERINTENDENT OF BUILDINGS
ROSS DUBARRY, AIRPORT MANAGER
KEVIN B. GERAGHTY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
MARTIN AUFFREDOU, COUNTY ATTORNEY
AMANDA ALLEN, CLERK OF THE BOARD
FRANK E. THOMAS, WARREN COUNTY BUDGET OFFICER
SUPERVISORS BEATY
BROCK
MCDEVITT
SIMPSON
TAYLOR
MICHAEL SWAN, COUNTY TREASURER
RICHARD SCHERMERHORN, SCHERMERHORN AVIATION, LLC.
TRAVIS WHITEHEAD, TOWN OF QUEENSBURY RESIDENT
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
SARAH MCLENITHAN, DEPUTY CLERK OF THE BOARD

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.*

Mr. Dubarry advised that Richard Schermerhorn, *Schermerhorn Aviation LLC.*, was in attendance to provide a status update with regards to whether he had secured an operator for the new restaurant, as well as a progress report in reference to the construction. Mr. Schermerhorn advised that the frame of the restaurant had been completed and they were currently working on digging the water line for it. In regards to the operator, he stated he had identified someone for the position; however, he noted, the official announcement would not be made until October 1, 2015. He assured the Committee that the majority of them would be aware of who this individual was, as they had worked locally in the restaurant business for over 25 years. He remarked he did not feel anyone would be disappointed, as the food prepared by this individual was incredible. He pointed out securing an operator for the restaurant had been the biggest obstacle he had to overcome thus far, as he wanted to ensure they were the appropriate fit for the location.

In regards to breakfast being served at the restaurant, Mr. Schermerhorn apprised as he had stated in the past that as of right now they were catering towards serving lunch and dinner; however, he noted, they were considering offering brunch. He noted the majority of the pilots that flew into the Airport did so during the afternoon hours when the weather conditions for flying were favorable. He continued,

these individuals were looking for a food service and that was why he felt offering lunch was essential. He stated he believed they would do well with their dinner service because the scenery at the Airport was so beautiful and it was an asset to the community. He noted they were in the process of obtaining their liquor license so they could offer beer, wine or liquor to the patrons of the restaurant. He pointed out individuals dining out in the evening often liked to enjoy a glass of wine or beer with their meals.

Mr. Schermerhorn informed that he was working with the NYS DOH (*New York State Department of Health*) to design the kitchen to meet their standards. He indicated his goal was to go above and beyond the standards set by the NYS DOH to design a state of the art kitchen. He said he had been dealing with a number of local vendors for the equipment. He informed he anticipated the restaurant would be opening sometime in January. In regards to the improvements he was making, he stated the parking lot was being expanded and the fence was being relocated. He said he had made concessions to address the concerns expressed by some of the County employees in regards to where the snow would be plowed to for the parking lot. He informed they would be repaving all of the surface area they dug up for water and sewer lines. Upon the suggestion of many of the patrons of the Airport, Mr. Schermerhorn advised he would like to propose consideration for him to install a 20 foot by 30 foot stamped concrete patio on the south side of the building with a security fence across it.

Moving along with the Agenda, Mr. Dubarry requested authorization to attend the New York Aviation Management 2016 Fall Conference in Rochester, New York from September 16-17, 2015 utilizing a county vehicle.

Motion was made by Mr. Conover, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to approve the request as presented. *A copy of the Authorization to Attend Meeting or Convention form is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Dubarry requested authorization for the Chairman of the Board to execute an updated FAA (*Federal Aviation Administration*) DBE (*Disadvantaged Business Enterprise*) Program in a form approved by the County Attorney. He explained the FAA's Office of Civil Rights had published some new guidance regarding DBE; therefore, he stated, the County was required to update their program, as well. He mentioned the last update was done in 2000. He informed the changes were very minor in nature.

Mr. Westcott asked Mr. Dubarry to elaborate what the DBE entailed. Mr. Dubarry reported that the DBE Program set goals for the County's contracts with the FAA. He said businesses awarded contracts at the Airport were expected to employ a certain percentage of DBEs such as minority or women owned business enterprises that fit into that category. Mr. Strough asked whether this was similar to MWBD (*Minority and Women's Owned Business Development*) and Mr. Dubarry replied affirmatively.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Westcott and carried unanimously to approve the request as presented and the necessary resolution was authorized for the September 18th Board meeting. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes.*

Mr. Dubarry requested to amend the existing land lease with Schermerhorn Aviation, LLC. to include additional area to accommodate an outdoor patio for a total square footage not to exceed 4,920 sq. ft. He stated the leased area was increasing from 3,600 sq. ft. to 4,920 sq. ft. which equated to an additional \$400 a year in revenue.

Martin Auffredou, *County Attorney*, interjected that the amendment to the lease agreement would require a public hearing under General Municipal Law; therefore, he stated, as part of the resolution the public hearing would need to be scheduled. He noted this publication would need to be published at least ten days prior to the Board Meeting at which the public hearing was to be held and he asked Amanda Allen, *Clerk of the Board*, whether there was a sufficient amount of time to meet these publication requirements for the September Board meeting and Mrs. Allen replied in the negative. Given this information, Mr. Auffredou informed that the public hearing would have to be held at the October 16th Board meeting. Mr. Dubarry stated he did not believe there was any urgency to move the matter forward because the proposed opening for the restaurant was not until January of 2016.

Mr. Strough asked when Mr. Schermerhorn planned on constructing the patio. Mr. Schermerhorn advised they were preparing to do the stonework that would be on the building. He said it would be beneficial to have the stamped concrete patio up the building because the stone would be within a few inches of it; therefore, he said, he would hold off on putting the stone on that side of the building until after the October Board meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough, seconded by Mr. Westcott and carried unanimously to schedule a public hearing to address this matter at the October 16th Board meeting, and the necessary resolution was authorized for the September 18th Board meeting. *A copy of the resolution request form is on file with the minutes.*

Continuing with the agenda review, Mr. Dubarry requested a transfer of funds between various codes totaling \$743.65 to pay for the gate next to the Schermerhorn Jet Hangars to be incorporated into the Airports access control system. He explained the gate currently had a key pad for access to that gate that tenants were providing to individuals that should not have access to the secure area. He continued, they would like to use the funding from the transfer to pay for the addition of access control to the gate which would incorporate it into the existing Airport access control system. Mr. Strough asked if this would be a card swipe system and Mr. Dubarry replied affirmatively.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough, seconded by Mr. Westcott and carried unanimously to approve the request as presented and refer same to the Finance Committee. *A copy of the Request for Transfer of Funds is on file with the minutes.*

In regards to the Items for Discussion or Review portion of the agenda, Mr. Dubarry apprised that the plans for this year's Adirondack Balloon Festival were moving forward adequately. He said the annual coordination meeting was scheduled for this Thursday, September 3rd, at the Municipal Center. He reported they were currently about \$650 ahead of last year for sales of premium parking and tour bus permits as of September 1st. He surmised they would meet their budgeted projection of \$5,000 in revenue for this year for the premium parking permit sales.

Ms. Seeber asked Mr. Dubarry if he would provide any updates on the application that was submitted to host the Northeast Regional AOPA (*Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association*) event, as there appeared to be an abundant amount of enthusiasm about the possibility of hosting this event. Mr. Dubarry advised he had not received a response from the AOPA regarding their application to host the Regional Fly in Event. He stated the materials he had read regarding the event indicated the AOPA would be announcing which airports were selected for their events in December.

This concluded the Airport portion of the meeting and the Buildings and Grounds portion of the meeting commenced at 10:44 a.m.

Privilege of the floor was extended 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.*

Jeffery Tennyson, *Superintendent of the Department of Public Works*, presented the following requests:

- 1) Request to Increase Capital Project No. H350, *Court Space Expansion*, to include \$16.5 million in serial bond funding ; and
- 2) Request to ratify the actions of the County Treasurer in authorizing the advance of funds from the General Fund on an as needed basis, up to \$1.2 million, for the Capital Project No. H350, *Court Space Expansion*.

He explained these requests were follow-ups to Resolution No. 275 of 2015, which authorized the issuance of a \$16.5 million bond for the Court Space Expansion Project. He stated they had originally anticipated the funding from the bond would be available by July; however, he noted, the projection had changed to October 1st. He reported the first request related to increasing the Capital Project to receive the funding when it became available on October 1st. The next resolution, he stated, related to authorizing the County Treasurer to advance funds ahead of October 1st, as he needed to pay CPL (*Clark Patterson Lee*) for their work which totaled about \$900,000. He added the modification work of the Law Library was also underway to accommodate the new Family Court Judge and staff. He apprised the bid for demolition work was due this Thursday and the contract would be awarded rather quickly. He said the demolition work was scheduled to commence on site on September 28th. He continued, immediately following the demolition work the reconstruction and establishment of the temporary Court space would begin as it needed to be completed by the end of the year. He advised this meant they required about \$1.2 million in funding before the serial bond funding was available.

Michael Swan, *County Treasurer*, advised it was necessary to have the funding budgeted before it could be spent. Mr. Girard questioned whether the issue with bonding had been taken care of and Mr. Swan responded that he and Paul Dusek, *County Administrator*, were participating in a ratings call this Friday with Standards and Poors which was the first step required. He said they were anticipating selling the bonds the week of September 14th; therefore, he said, the receipt of the funding was dependent upon how rapidly the legal counsel for the County prepared the closing documents. Mr. Girard queried whether Mr. Swan was concerned that the interest rates would be raising and Mr. Swan replied in the negative. He explained that interest rates had been holding steady thus far and the indications he received from the County's fiscal advisors was that interest rates would not be changing until closer to the end of the year.

Mr. Conover asked whether Mr. Tennyson could provide an estimate as to how much funding would be advanced between now and October 1st to which Mr. Tennyson responded the request was for up to \$1.2 million, of which about \$900,000 would be placed in the budget code for the project. He reiterated they would be encumbering expenses related to demolition, reconstruction and establishment of the temporary Court space for the new Family Court Judge. He remarked he believed \$1.2 million was a

sufficient amount of funding to carry them through until the funding from the serial bond was available in October. He said he would be working with the County Treasurer in regards to what was required in terms of cash flow, as they had about \$1.5 million worth of work to complete between now and the spring of next year including all of the engineering work. He stated the expansion project would go out to bid in the spring of 2016, which would encompass about half of the funding available through the bond. He continued, towards the end of 2016 they would be moving forward with the bidding for the interior renovations that would be going on for Phases 3-5.

Mr. Swan advised he had asked Mr. Tennyson to supply him with some figures so they had a better idea as to how much funding they needed to borrow, because he wanted to ensure they borrowed an ample amount of money to cover the expenses; however, he noted, he did not want to borrow more than was necessary. Mr. Girard advised that if these requests were approved, they would be referred to the Finance Committee for review and approval.

Motion was made by Mr. Conover, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to approve the requests as presented and forward same to the Finance Committee. *Copies of the resolution request forms are on file with the minutes.*

Proceeding with the Agenda review, Mr. Girard advised that Mr. Dusek would like to discuss the County Property Smoking Policy. Mr. Dusek informed there was an on-going issue concerning smoking on the County campus. He informed the current Smoking Policy indicated smoking and tobacco use was prohibited inside and within 50 feet of all County buildings; he added the Policy also indicated that cigarette butts shall be disposed of in areas where smoking is permitted. He stated this meant that smoking was permitted anywhere within 50 feet of the building and he noted the Buildings & Grounds staff had placed cigarette butt receptacles in various locations to comply with the Policy. He reported he was receiving complaints that cigarette butts were still being thrown on the ground in areas where the disposal containers were not located. As an example, he stated cigarette butts were being disposed of in the area of the gazebo which did not have a disposal container. He said he had also received complaints that individuals were smoking within the area of the gazebo, where others wanted to have lunch, which was creating conflicts. He apprised a suggestion had been made to him that the County designate smoking areas around the campus in an attempt to eliminate some of these conflicts. He said he was seeking input from the Committee as to whether they felt designating smoking areas within the campus was the correct course of action. He informed if they indicated to him they were in favor of this he would work with Mr. Morehouse to identify some locations for the designated smoking areas that could be discussed at the next Committee meeting. He apprised another option would be to leave the Policy as it was and do their best to enforce it.

Mr. Morehouse informed his issue was if a smoking area was designated would they be providing shelter for that area. He said the pavilion was considered a County building; therefore, he stated, no smoking should be permitted there. He remarked he believed regardless of the number of areas that were designated for smoking individuals would still smoke outside of them. He added it raised some concerns, as they had someone flick a cigarette butt into a pile of wood chips by the Courts which resulted in a small fire. He commented he was unsure of how to patrol or police the smoking areas.

Mr. Strough remarked if it was up to him he would ban smoking on the entire campus. Mr. Girard queried whether providing more signs would assist with taking care of the issue to which Mr. Morehouse responded they could certainly try this as a solution. He said they had placed lawn furniture in areas for smokers and in other areas for non-smokers. He apprised signs could be placed on pedestals designating certain areas for smoking and see if it helps. He informed he felt the cigarette butt issue related more to when individuals exited their vehicles and they disposed the cigarette butt wherever they were. He stated he was unsure of how to control this.

Mr. Westcott suggested banning smoking at the gazebo where individuals ate their lunch. Mr. Morehouse interjected that theoretically it was already banned at the gazebo. Mr. Westcott asked whether there were signs stating such by the gazebo and Mr. Morehouse replied affirmatively.

Mr. Strough stated he believed the easiest route would be to ban smoking all together on the campus. He pointed out the Town of Queensbury, all local school campuses and SUNY (*State University of New York*) Adirondack had all banned smoking on their grounds. He stated although there would always be individuals who violated the policy, banning it minimized the issues. He commented banning smoking would support the message that individuals should quit smoking

Mr. Morehouse advised one thought was if the County provided an area with shelter for smokers they would utilize it for smoking instead of other areas. He reiterated he did not feel this would stop the person that was getting out of their vehicle from flicking the cigarette butt when they exited the vehicle.

Mr. Westcott remarked he was supportive of Mr. Strough's suggestion of banning smoking on the entire campus.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough and seconded by Mr. Westcott to ban smoking on the entire County campus.

Ms. Wood commented she did not feel banning smoking on the campus would be successful, as they would not be able to stop individuals from smoking in their vehicles or flicking their cigarette butts on the ground when they exited them, even if smoking was prohibited. She said logistically she felt enforcing this would propose issues. She mentioned before she could determine whether she supported the ban or not she would need to know how they planned on implementing the ban, as she was concerned how it would impact employee breaks since employees who smoked would have to drive off of the campus in order to smoke.

Mr. Strough advised his response to Ms. Wood's concerns was that there were many municipalities that had successfully banned smoking on their campuses such as his own. He stated this was not ground breaking, as others had done it already. He added if it was not done now it would more than likely be done in the future.

Mr. Tennyson informed one of the concerns with a total ban was that it would result in crowds smoking on the sidewalk. He stated this had been a point in the discussion regarding whether smoking should be banned on the Festival Commons in Lake George wherein they decided to designate certain areas for

smoking rather than banning it altogether. He pointed out Angio Dynamics ban of smoking on their grounds had resulted in employees smoking on the edge of the road. He reiterated his concern that if smoking was banned on the County campus smokers would either smoke in their vehicles or line up on the sidewalks which could result in issues, as well.

Mr. Strough pointed out he did not feel the County taxpayers would be in favor of spending money to construct a pavilion to enable employees to smoke cigarettes. He added this would be wasteful use of funds since the likelihood of smoking being banned on the campus in the future was probable. Mr. Girard interjected that Mr. Morehouse was reluctant to construct shelters since they would become part of the campus where smoking was prohibited. Mr. Girard apprised he was comfortable with the smoking restriction remaining within 50 feet of the building; however, he said, he was unsure of how to go about with enforcing it. He remarked he was in favor of the policy remaining as is for now and working on enforcing it rather than forcing people off campus, as he believed this would create more issues. Mr. Strough informed he felt banning smoking on the campus would motivate employees to quit smoking.

Mr. Dusek advised that he felt clarification was needed in regards to smoking being prohibited at the gazebo, as he did not believe that employees were aware of this. He suggested that they include this in the current Smoking Policy to ensure everyone was aware that smoking was prohibited within 50 feet of the gazebo, as this would allow them to take action against anyone who violated the restriction.

Ms. Seeber questioned whether the County was providing any types of programs or services to the employees to assist them with quitting smoking, as she was aware of a number of programs that could be offered perhaps through the Human Resources Department. She stated she knew everyone was aware of how incredibly addictive and harmful smoking was to an individual's health; therefore, she wanted to ensure the County was going above and beyond to assist employees with quitting. She queried what the ramification was for employees who were caught violating the Smoking Policy, as she wondered how they were held accountable. Mr. Dusek advised if an employee violated a policy they had the ability to discipline them; however, he noted, the issue was determining who the violators were. He reiterated he felt having a clear and concise policy regarding where smoking was permitted and where it was prohibited was necessary in order to justify disciplining an employee who was found in violation. Ms. Seeber asked whether Mr. Dusek was indicating the current Policy was not clear and he replied affirmatively. She suggested before moving forward with banning smoking altogether they take the steps necessary to clearly identify where smoking was permitted and where it was prohibited.

Mr. Morehouse remarked he did not believe the problem smokers were employees, but rather public visitors to the campus. He pointed out smokers visiting the Human Service's Building (*HSB*) disposed of their cigarettes just before they entered the building. Mr. Westcott indicated this further supported banning cigarette smoking on the campus, as such measures would prevent this from occurring. He pointed out if individuals were aware a campus had a smoking ban they would not violate it; therefore, he supported Mr. Strough's suggestion on banning smoking altogether on the County campus. He suggested as an interim step they ensure employees were aware that smoking was prohibited at the gazebo.

Mr. Strough informed signage was placed on campuses that were smoke free so that individuals going there were aware of the policy. He said since there was no such signage on the County campus right now individuals assumed smoking was acceptable.

Mr. Conover questioned whether the inmates at the County Jail were allowed to smoke; Mr. Tennyson said he was unsure but advised he would exit the meeting and place a call to Sheriff York to inquire as to the smoking policy for inmates. Mr. Dusek pointed out there could be an issue at Westmount Health Facility, as well, since this was considered to be the home of the individuals who resided there. Mr. Conover commented if they moved forward with this they should ensure the ban was applied for all County facilities and not just on the Municipal Center and HSB campus.

Ms. Seeber indicated they needed to determine how they would enforce the policy if they were to move forward with banning smoking on the campus altogether. She said she felt guidelines were necessary to address what would occur if they observed a member of the public violating the policy.

Mr. Dusek interjected that although he did not necessarily disagree with the idea of a smoking ban on the campus, it had not been his intention when he brought forth the issues that were occurring in regards to smoking to the Committee's attention today. He suggested if their desire was to pursue banning smoking that they delay this discussion until the next Committee meeting to allow ample time for questions, such as whether inmates were permitted to smoke at the County Jail and how the policy change would impact the residents of Westmount and the Union contract, etc., to be answered so they could make a more informed decision. He said this would prevent them from having to make changes after they moved forward with it.

Mr. Brock noted that his wife had gone through a horrendous time when she quit smoking; therefore, he suggested they phase this change in over a specified timeframe to allow smokers time to adjust to the new policy and Mr. Strough concurred. Mr. Strough added he felt as part of the ban they could assist the employees with quitting by implementing a healthy employee program. Mr. Morehouse interjected that the newsletter transmitted by the Human Resources Department contained information regarding smoking cessation. Mr. Dusek added there were posters throughout the building that encouraged individuals to quit smoking, as well.

Mr. Conover informed he would feel more comfortable supporting the motion once more information was available regarding how the policy would impact the County Jail, Westmount, etc.

Mr. Strough announced he would like to withdraw his motion to ban smoking on the County campus and Mr. Westcott withdrew his second. Motion was made by Mr. Strough, seconded by Mr. Westcott to authorize investigating the impact of banning smoking on County property.

Ms. Seeber requested that Mr. Dusek solicit feedback from the County employees regarding their thoughts on banning smoking on the County campus. She said she felt it was necessary to gather input from the employees as to what they believed the best method was in moving forward to making the campus smoke free and how the Board could assist with making people healthier in Warren County. Mr.

Dusek advised he would send out an email and report on the feedback that was given at a future Committee meeting.

Mr. Swan pointed out that tobacco was considered contraband at the County Jail; therefore, he assumed the inmates were not permitted to smoke.

Following further discussion, Mr. Girard called the question and the aforementioned motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Moving along with the agenda review, Mr. Morehouse advised that the temporary Supreme Court Library was in place in the HSB. He said they had placed temporary signs on the doors in an attempt to address some of the concerns employees had expressed regarding individuals accessing areas of the building they were not permitted in. He advised he was awaiting quotes for FOB readers for the doors, as this would allow employees to pass through the doors but not patrons of the Supreme Court Library.

In regards to the existing Supreme Court Library, Mr. Morehouse informed the Buildings and Grounds crew had completed what demolition they could do. He said they had removed all of the shelving and lighting in the room and temporary lighting had been installed. He reported that he had walked through the area with a few demolition contractors that had expressed interest in submitting a bid for the work. Mr. Tennyson apprised that the bid for demolition work would be opened this Thursday.

Mr. Girard advised that CPL would be providing the Committee with an update on the project within the next few months. Mr. Tennyson said they could request that CPL attend a future meeting. He reported that CPL was finalizing the design if the temporary Court space they had to get underway to meeting the January 1st deadline. He informed CPL was also continuing to work on the final design work for the Court Expansion Project for the addition onto the north side of the building. He said CPL could provide an update to the Committee next month when the demolition work would be finishing up and the reconstruction of the establishment of the temporary Family Court space would be commencing or they could wait until that was underway. Mr. Girard commented he felt next month would be an appropriate time for CPL to provide an update on the status of the project as he would like them to show how they determined to proceed with it.

Mr. Tennyson reported there had been a few modifications to the plans for the temporary space for the new Family Court judge and their staff, as well as the final space for the District Attorney's Office. He reminded the Committee much of the work they were doing as part of the temporary Family Court space project would benefit the final space for the District Attorney's Office. He stated a number of discussions had occurred with the Courts and District Attorney's Office to ensure they were proceeding as efficiently as possible. He said although some changes had been made to the floor plan, none of them were of significance to the last floor plan he displayed to the Committee.

Mr. Girard queried whether approval had been granted from the New York State Office of Court Administration (NYS OCA) Facilities Capital Review Board on the plans to which Mr. Dusek replied in the negative. Mr. Tennyson reported the last approval that was granted was from the New York state Department of Corrections.

Mr. Tennyson interjected that according to Sheriff York it was not permissible for inmates to smoke in the County Jail. He said the Sheriff's Office staff adhered to the Smoking Policy currently in place for the County.

Mr. Conover reminded Mr. Tennyson that the sidewalk coming into the west side of the Municipal Center Building was in rather poor shape. He stated he hoped that as part of, or in coordination with, the Court Space Expansion Project improvements to this area would be made. He surmised due to the new entrance to the Courts it would decrease the emphasis as a major access which could result in decreasing the amount of concrete there. He reiterated he hoped this would be addressed as part of the Court Space Expansion Project. Mr. Tennyson apprised improvements in this area would be incorporated into the later stages of the project.

Concluding the agenda review, Mr. Tennyson advised he would like to provide an update to the Committee on the signage plan for the Municipal Center Building. He said the signage was part of the initiative to bring forth additional security by activating the FOB readers on all of the doors to the building with the exception of the Court, Probation and DMV entrances where security was present. He said it was necessary to clarify the signage around the campus to ensure the public was aware of where they had to go to get to certain departments. Mr. Tennyson reviewed photos displaying the proposed location and appearance of the signage for the campus, copies of which are one file with the minutes.

Mr. Tennyson apprised one of the issues with the current signage was that it backed up traffic at the entrance of the Municipal Center Campus when visitors stopped to look at the large sign out front to determine which direction they needed to go to reach their destination. He said he felt his proposal simplified the signage so that visitors went in the direction they needed to go. He noted all of the signs would be double sided so they were visible from both directions.

Mr. Tennyson mentioned as part of the Court Space Expansion Project they had some discussions concerning parking during the project, as they would be losing a significant amount of parking spaces once construction commenced. He stated to address this they were considering expanding the current parking lot for the Family Court to incorporate most of the lawn area. He stated they were also looking into moving the Park and Ride area that was currently part of the Family Court parking lot between the ring road and State Route 9. He explained the concept was to have a one way Park and Ride where there would be slant parking spaces. He informed this would free up additional parking that they felt was needed for the Courts due to the additional Family Court Judge and their staff, as well as the loss of the other parking area due to the building expansion. He stated this was something they were trying to work into the Court Expansion Project that would impact the signage, as well.

Mr. Tennyson apprised the thought was that they would commence producing these signs to try to make them more typical to public parking areas so that people could recognize where they needed to go to park. He said once the signs were installed they would activate the lock systems on the doors so that everyone would be directed to the parking lot they needed to go to.

Mr. Strough commented he was pleased with the idea for relocating the Park and Ride. He stated someday he would like to see a connection between the Park and Ride and the bike trails. He pointed

out visitors to the region were aware of the bike trails; however, he said, they were unsure of where they could park to access them. He mentioned the possibility of including this connection as part of the traffic study that was being completed from State Route 149 to the area of State Route 9 near the Great Escape Amusement Park.

Ms. Seeber questioned whether the current signage that was part of the Municipal Center would be removed or would the new signs be added. She pointed out a number of her constituents had complained that the Committee and Board meetings were scheduled during times when it was difficult for the public to attend. She said they had tried to address this by recording the meetings to be placed on YouTube for anyone to review at their convenience, as well as posting the minutes on the website. She indicated she did not see any reference to the Board of Supervisors or directing the public where to go if they wanted to come to one of the meetings. She informed she often overheard individuals seeking directions in the building to where the meetings were located, as it was not very clear. Mr. Tennyson interjected that he had inadvertently excluded signage for the Board of Supervisors, but said they could erect a sign referring the public to the meetings or the Board of Supervisors Offices. Mr. Morehouse remarked he felt they should direct individuals attending meetings to the public entrance since this was the entryway they would have to use to access the building.

Mr. Dusek confirmed clarification was required, as his Office handled a number of questions regarding the location of meetings. He pointed out another Department that had been left out was the County Administrator's Office. He remarked he thought the sign should emphasize the location of the meetings somehow to ensure the public knew where to go.

Ms. Seeber queried whether the signs would be the same color as those displayed on the Power Point presentation and Mr. Tennyson replied affirmatively. He said he tried to use the typical colors used for signs all over so people would recognize them. He pointed out the green P was standard for parking signs. Ms. Seeber asked whether the big sign in facing State Route 9 on the campus would remain in place and Mr. Tennyson replied his thought was to take it down, as it may cause more issues if it was not removed when the new signs were erected.

Mr. Swan suggested simplifying the signage facing State Route 9 to avoid the traffic jams that occurred when the public stopped to read the sign there. He stated they could have a sign directing visitors to the right for certain offices and to the left for others. He continued, the signs could be divided up around the parking lot to make it more comprehensive to visitors. He advised this would prevent individuals from having to stop their cars when they entered the Municipal Campus from State Route 9 to determine which sign they had to follow because if you included too much information of the signage the same problems would continue to occur.

Mr. Westcott commented that he believed this plan took care of that issue as long as Ms. Seeber and Mr. Dusek's concerns were addressed with regards to locations of the public meetings and the County Administration.

Mr. Conover remarked he was unsure whether this was leading into a more complicated issue of rethinking where public and employee parking should be located when the new entryway system was

implemented as this would require the public to use the entrance located by the DMV (*Department of Motor Vehicles*). He said there may be more examples of parking available on the east side of the perimeter road. He continued, the need may arise to shift some of the employee parking to customer parking, as he felt the current parking available for customers would be insufficient when meetings took place that included large attendance from the public. He informed he felt some real consideration needed to be given to the where people would park and what their walking distance would be, as he believed since the entrance by the DMV would be the main entrance for the public, the parking lot would need to be expanded to allow for sufficient amount of parking. He said they may need to change the area slated for employee parking located in front of the Real Property Tax Services Office to a public parking area to accommodate the parking needs of the public.

A discussion ensued.

Pursuant to further discussion motion was made by Mr. Westcott, seconded by Mr. Strough and carried unanimously to proceed with the signage as presented with the addition of signage for the public meetings, the Board of Supervisors Office and the County Administrators Office, and to make adjustments as necessary.

As there was no further business to come before the County Facilities Committee, on motion made by Mr. Conover and seconded by Mr. Westcott, Mr. Girard adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah McLenithan, Deputy Clerk of the Board