

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
COMMITTEE MINUTES

COUNTY FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Tuesday, April 7, 2009

John Dimit Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington St., Urbana

MEMBERS PRESENT: Beckett, Bensyl, James, Jay, Sapp, Smucker, Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT: Cowart, Richards

OTHERS PRESENT: Deb Busey, Alan Reinhart, Duane Northrup, Anna Hochhalter (City of Urbana), Mike Little (U-C Sanitary District)

AGENDA ITEM

Call to Order

Chair Beckett called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A roll call confirmed a quorum present.

Approval of Agenda/Addendum

MOTION by Jay to approve the agenda; seconded by James. There was no addendum. **Motion carried.**

Approval of Minutes – March 3, 2009

MOTION by James to approve the minutes of March 3, 2009; seconded by Smucker.

Mr. Smucker pointed out a typo on page 4 and questioned the wording used on page 2 in paragraph 3.

Motion carried to approve as amended.

Public Participation

There was no public participation

Courthouse Masonry/Bell Tower Project Project Spreadsheet

MOTION by Bensyl to receive and place on file the project spreadsheet; seconded by Weibel.

Ms. Busey explained this does not reflect the reporting that was discussed at the last meeting. The architect is supposed to be reporting which portion of the expense is County obligation and which portion is Citizen's Committee obligation; at this point we do not have a clear picture on that and her understanding is that it may be done at the end of the project. When asked about the estimated split, Ms. Busey explained that \$1.15 million was the Clock & Bell Tower Committee responsibility.

Mr. Beckett stated because of the type of project this is, we had significant contingencies and we then found savings with the foundation. The project is going smoothly so we may be under budget and he has asked Mr. Inman to talk to the architect about how that money will be allocated between the County and the committee. When asked if the committee has raised all the money, Mr. Beckett reported they have raised around \$920,000 so they are still short about \$200,000.

Motion carried.

Public Defender & South Corridor Remodel

Mr. Inman referred to the 11 x 17 drawing provided to the committee. The drawing shows the new egress and moving down you have the station where by the jurors check in for jury assembly. Existing was a store front and this will be relocated toward the main corridor additionally the door that is currently one of the entrances to Public Defender would be relocated to the new main entrance area. The Public Defender space would create a lobby, they would have three stations there for administrative staff and the area where they vacated from the main entrance could be used for storage or future expansion. The current south entrance to the old Courthouse would be reconfigured, with a security door. If you had an emergency and jury assembly was occupied those folks would emergency egress to the north, people coming from second and third floors would come down and egress to the south, also the clients and the Public Defender's office would egress to the south area.

They are building permanent walls and will use minority contractors to complete about half that work. They do not believe the out-of-pocket cost will be over \$20,000 and most of that will be in labor because they are re-using almost everything.

Mr. Beckett stated he understands they have to do the emergency egress in the north because it is a life safety issue but asked why they have to do all the others. Mr. Inman explained if this becomes the public defender space they need the changes, Mr. Rosenbaum needs the space.

Mr. Jay stated he assumed this met code previously. Mr. Inman reported this is all because of one wall that the Public Defender needs with the security to have people occupy the space. When asked why this wasn't done previously, he explained the Public Defender brought this up after the fact and the only way to do what is necessary is to create this wall in the corridor. Half of this work will be done by minority contractors and half will be done by Roessler construction.

MOTION by Sapp to approve the Public Defender and South Corridor Remodel; seconded by Smucker. **Motion carried** with a 6/1 roll call vote. Voting yes was Bensyl, James, Sapp, Smucker, Weibel, and Beckett. Voting no was Jay.

Roof Replacement

Mr. Inman stated there are two reasons for this. One is to upgrade the energy efficiency of the roof by replacing the current shingles with energy star rated shingles and applying a deflective coating on the rubber membrane to reduce the energy cost. The second reason is the existing shingles on that roof are experiencing drastic reduced life cycle in the fact that this is our third project affecting that roof. The proposed shingles have a 40 year warranty and meet energy star performance levels.

At the March meeting they discussed having Roessler put together and distribute a bid package, they did that and Advanced Roofing, Ed Cain Roofing and Nogle and Black all submitted bids. The original estimate to do just the shingle portion of the roof was \$92,000-\$98,000 and the rubber membrane was \$40,000-\$45,000 so the initial estimate was in the range of \$132,000-\$143,000. When bids came in the shingled roof with energy star shingles came in at \$75,615 and the rubber membrane overlay came in at \$20,286. In addition there is also the flag pole issue and he is proposing installation of a new 30 foot flag pole on the apex of the spire. The flag pole issue came about when they put a flag on the highest point of the project and received an extreme amount of positive comment from the public and other individuals about the fact that it was done and the question then came up if it was going to be permanent. As a result, they looked into cost.

Because one of the impressive features of the original flag was the size, one criterion for this to be considered was that all operations for the flag pole would have to be internal to make changing the flag easier and safer and there is a manufacturer that specifically crafts flag poles with internal operation. The recommendation before the committee tonight is to accept the shingle roof replacement, epdm coating and the flag pole bid in the amount of \$110,901. Accepting this change in work will be reflected in a change order to Roessler Construction in said amount and funds are currently available in the Masonry, Stabilization and Restoration Project Budget.

Mr. Beckett stated the flagpole is at cost and the steel workers would donate the labor. He referred to a memo provided from Bruce Hannon on the issue of the flag that points out that other buildings in our area and nationally typically do not have a flag on the tower suggesting that it detracts from the tower and the project. He was also copied on an email from Dennis Roberts, to the chair, expressing his concern that we would put a pole on top of the tower; in addition, he also received an email today from Karen Kummer, head of PACA, opposed to putting a pole on top of the tower. One of the themes of the criticism of this is that the Citizens Committee went out and raised money with the view of the Courthouse as it was originally constructed in 1901 and people committed to give money to the project that way and now the county is changing the project by putting a pole up there when it should have been in the original design.

Mr. Weibel stated this is not on the agenda so he doesn't believe the committee should take action on it.

MOTION by James to approve the bid for the replacement of the roof, \$75,615 for the shingle roof and \$20,286 for rubber membrane overlay; seconded by Smucker.

Mr. Inman explained there is a rubber membrane down now that will stay in place, it will be cleaned and the new product applied. This will be an owners cost under contingency and there is currently \$369,000 left in contingency.

Mr. Smucker asked Mr. Inman what he estimates the cost savings are for using the rubber membrane and the energy star shingles. Mr. Inman stated they believe it is between 9-11% cost savings. When asked about the completion of the overall project he reported the project is 75% done.

Mr. Jay stated they are replacing a roof that is only 14 years old and asked if it is something that needs to be done now. Mr. Inman explained they have looked at the roof and the contractors that had to go across it on the other projects did their best not to damage it but once you start doing any kind of work on it, it immediately starts to degrade.

The shingles are so brittle they can't be repaired and because of past projects and what is being done now, the next thing to happen would be leaks. We would be lucky to get three more years out of that roof and then there would be additional cost.

Mr. Sapp asked if there is any risk that the bids were put out at a time where one company got unfair advantage because they are already set up to do the work? Mr. Inman stated either firm could have gone to Kenny Roessler and made a proposal on using the existing scaffolding.

Motion carried.

Champaign County Nursing Home Raterman Group Report

MOTION by Bensyl to receive and place on file; seconded by Smucker.

Mr. Beckett reported we found the spot we had been looking for, that had been coming back in every report, and it has been treated. Mr. Reinhart stated the spot, which was 6-8 feet long, was on one corner of one two by four.

Motion carried.

ACEC Award

Item for information only.

Update Regarding Illinois Department of Public Health Life Safety Inspection Plan of Correction

Mr. Inman reported that on February 18th IDPH came to the Nursing Home for a life safety inspection. We were then notified of 9 issues they found.

Mr. Beckett stated he would like to defer this item to the next meeting to allow the committee time to review a list of the deficiencies ahead of time. When asked if anything needs immediate attention from the committee, Mr. Inman explained that what needed to be taken care of has been.

ILEAS

Recommendation for Amendment to ILEAS lease to exercise option re-opener for August 2010 – August 2011

Mr. Inman explained ILEAS has requested to pre-pay another year of the lease at a cost of \$300,000. This will include utility costs.

MOTION by Bensyl to recommend County Board approval of the recommendation for amendment of ILEAS lease to exercise option re-opener; seconded by Smucker.

When asked why ILEAS wants to do this, Mr. Inman explained it is the security of knowing they have an additional year and it gets them in the frame of mind that this is permanent. The utilities are approximately \$120,000 and the issues that would raise those costs we have no control over.

Motion carried.

Physical Plant

Monthly Reports

MOTION by Weibel to receive and place the monthly reports on file; seconded by James. **Motion carried.**

Ameren Reassignment Letters

Mr. Inman explained they received emails from Ameren in the intent to recoup the market share for those who have joined the consortium. Shortly thereafter, he received an email from the consortium indicating that it is not such a good deal because we would have to pay penalties for removing ourselves from the consortium. The City of Champaign was taking a look at this and after talking to them it looks like they are not going to remove themselves but will keep that option open if they are going to renew.

Ms. Busey stated we do not have an alternative to offer for not staying in the consortium over the next 12 months.

Ameren Hourly Supply Service Notification Requirements Letter

Addressed above.

Electricity Co-op Participation Email

Addressed above.

Chair's Report

Art on the Plaza

Proposed Intergovernmental Agreement

Memo

Drawing

Mr. Beckett explained they met last Thursday at the Courthouse and determined the news rack will run east to west and face out toward Main Street. The Sheriff approved of the location selected because he felt people would not just stop in the street but would pull in the parking lot. The secondary location discussed was running north and south adjacent to the planter area. Mr. Reinhart checked into it and the initial location will work well, they will bore into the concrete that is there and set it in place.

Ms. Hochhalter from the City of Urbana explained the project was initiated by the city when they identified concerns with the existing newspaper racks that are located on Elm and Broadway. They requested proposals from various artists have selected a design and now have worked out an intergovernmental agreement.

Mr. Beckett explained the Sheriff was present for the meeting and he is satisfied with the agreement. One of his concerns was being sued and the city has agreed to indemnify the County from any responsibility for that, if it were to happen. It is the city's project and they are putting up all the money to put the rack in and to maintain it over the time specified in the agreement. If for some reason we have to have it moved that is covered in the agreement as well. Our legal department has reviewed the agreement and agrees to everything.

MOTION by James to recommend County Board approval of the Proposed Intergovernmental Agreement placing a news rack at the county courthouse; seconded by Smucker.

When asked how many papers the rack will hold, Ms. Hochhalter explained it will hold 12 and they will look to see if they need to expand that. They are using a rack that is used in various cities, it has a uniform appearance and they have the option of offering both paying and free papers and they will be looking into that also. If there is any revenue it will belong to Urbana.

Mr. Beckett stated the assumption is that our Physical Plant Director will work with Urbana to make sure any complaints are addressed; there is no cost to the County.

Motion carried with a 6/1 roll call vote. Voting yes was Bensyl, James, Jay, Smucker, Weibel, and Beckett. Voting no was Sapp.

County Administrator

Energy Policy

Department Head Comments

Approval of Energy Policy

Mr. Inman explained this is the first go around trying to implement some of the things brought before the committee by the representative from SEDAC at the U of I. When this was last before the committee it was in draft form, he has included department head comments in the agenda and the policy has had changes made to it.

MOTION by Smucker to approve the energy policy; seconded by Bensyl.

Mr. James pointed to item 8 g where it states employees are encouraged to follow energy practices, he thinks it will be a nightmare if we keep using that wording.

Mr. Smucker stated there are certain things that use very little energy that make an office nice and he can understand why people would want that stuff but there needs to be a balance. These employees spend 8 hours a day in these rooms and he is not going to define what comfortable means to each person.

Mr. Jay stated at some point, as owners of the facilities, they need to draw a line on some of this stuff allowed, such as candles. Mr. Sapp stated the electric candles he is not opposed to it is the burning ones that are an issue, and all things need to be on a motion sensor and then there is the issue of who will pay for the sensor.

Mr. James stated he has suggested the county have a central supply office and if an employee wants something they will have to buy it or lease it from the County.

Mr. Beckett stated he doesn't feel like the wording included in the policy is where the committee asked it to be.

MOTION by Bensyl to defer the energy policy; seconded by James. **Motion carried**

**Proposed Easement for East Urbana Interceptor Sewer Project
Sanitary Sewer Easement
IDOT Appraisal Report
Memo**

Mike Little, from the Urbana-Champaign Sanitary District, provided the committee with various handouts regarding the project. He explained this project will reconstruct the existing Myra pump station located out on High Cross Road, move it to the south and deepen it for future capacity east of High Cross Road. To make that work, they will build a force main from that location all the way back to the districts north east treatment plant. It can't be located on the right of way so the district has proposed a route and permanent and temporary easements along that route.

One of the maps distributed showed the County property along east Main Street and the force main they would construct and the temporary and permanent easement lines that are necessary for that construction. The force main is being located immediately south of the existing right of way therefore on County property. The district has had all of these various easement requirements appraised and they have acquired 12 easements so far, both temporary and permanent, and the last one is the one on county property. They have had some discussions with Mr. Inman and the county engineer and have worked out some final language to be used in the document.

Mr. Little explained they have taken the easement document from the agenda and added some language to address the final comments in the memo distributed; the district is willing to agree to those final comments with 2 exceptions. There is a clause under paragraph C where the district would like to propose 5 years in place of ten years for the amount of time the grantee will return to the property to correct defects to utilities or other site features that were disturbed by the construction. Five years is longer than what is generally agreed to in these agreements but they are willing to accept that. The other change is regarding the response for emergency situations. They would reimburse the County for any out-of-pocket expense as a result of a response to the emergency during construction. The other item is changing total easement fee to total easement reimbursement fee.

Mr. Beckett stated he has an email from David DeThorne indicating he has reviewed the documents and he concurs with Denny's proposal indicating there were some policy decisions there that are not necessarily legal and any other issues we have for discussion are regarding cost, if we give it to them for \$1.00 or if they pay us \$23,000.

MOTION by Bensyl to approve the easement for East Urbana Interceptor Sewer Project; seconded by Weibel.

Mr. Little explained they have acquired 12 other easements in this process, the Park District and Urbana School District and the rest are private individuals or private corporations. The same appraiser determined the value for all. The Menards Corporation that owns property granted an easement at no cost. With the new pump station they are making it larger and deeper so it can serve further to the east, the areas off the west of High Cross Road are already served by the existing pump station. They will be going to Cottonwood Road almost from 74 south to Windsor and back west about a half mile.

Mr. Little explained the other component to this has to do with the reimbursement of expenses. The County has proposed \$18,800 out of pocket expenses associated with this easement; the appraisal which is the value of the land and the out of pocket that the County is claiming. They understand costs and are certainly willing to reimburse the county for any extra cost although the Park District did not take any compensation. The reimbursement costs the County has claimed include engineering consultant, on-site staff during construction and material costs with a total of \$18,800 which is separate from the \$23,000. When asked about their funding source, Mr. Little explained half will be out of the districts revenue and half from the City of Urbana. The project costs are financed through a state revolving loan, the district will borrow and pay it back over 20 years. That money to pay back the loan comes from fees the district assesses.

Mr. Beckett stated the motion on the floor approves the documents as they are currently written which means it has them paying \$1.00 plus the reimbursement costs.

Mr. Sapp asked if the project is being done by the Sanitary District why there is a \$15,000 engineering fee from the County. Mr. Inman explained during the time Mr. Little came to the county with a proposal we were doing the fleet building and using Berns Clancy for that project so they assisted us in our discussions with the Sanitary District and would help us as needed from this point on. We have held back bills until all the documents were approved and these are all the costs.

Mr. Little explained they will bore under driveways so they will not have to close any. The contract will restore the area and you will have a one year guarantee, beyond that the district has agreed for five years to correct defects. After five years the construction restoration would be the responsibility of the property owner but the main is always their responsibility.

Mr. Beckett stated the documents say ten years and they are proposing five.
MOTION by Bensyl to amend the motion on the floor to a five year warranty period; seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried** with Jay opposed.

Amended **motion carried** with a 6/1 roll call vote. Voting yes were Bensyl, James, Sapp, Smucker, Weibel, and Beckett. Voting no was Jay.

Conceptual Approval of the relocation of County Morgue and Coroner office operations to the Gill Building

Mr. Northrup explained he met with Mr. Inman expressing complications he is having in his office. They have had an increase in indigent cases, where there is no family member to contact. On average they do one to two cases like this per year, this year they have already done 4 and he expects that number to grow. When they have cases like this there are legal hoops they have to jump through and it takes between 30-60 days to get a case like that finalized and that is where he gets into storage or containment issues.

He explained that for years now they have had a 3 body refrigeration unit at a local funeral home where they would keep cases until either the autopsy or final disposition arrangements. Three times since January 1 they have been in the situation where they were trying to find people and had more than 3 bodies to store, when the weather was cold enough they could keep bodies outside of the refrigeration unit but as temperatures get warmer that will not be possible. The facility they use has no cooling except the refrigerator and the temperatures in the summer can surpass 90 degrees. When someone dies, if it is not a spouse, there is no legal obligation to pay for arrangements or handle them but there are some statutes that deal with abusing a corpse if we are not taking care of them. Mr. Inman suggested they look at the Gill building and possibly moving his operation to that facility. Along with that, Mr. Inman approached Carle Hospital about the plans for a multiple fatalities call for refrigerated trailers, he talked to Carle about using some grant money to purchase refrigerated units for the county and in turn we will help Carle with bodies in a mass issue. Carle was enthusiastic about the idea and willing to work with us.

Mr. Inman explained when they looked at other options; one was the morgue in the old nursing home. It is in the basement and there are flooding issues along with the height of the ceilings which would cost to fix. There will be no autopsies done in this location, just storage. All inquests and other meetings that take place in other areas would also be at the Gill building. After reviewing the site, the Gill building is the best plan of space available.

Mr. Northrup stated there is sufficient office space there along with enough room for all their files, reception area and storage. It has great potential to meet all their needs with the exception of autopsies.

When asked if the agreement with Carle is addressed in the recommendation Mr. Inman put before the committee, Mr. Beckett explained at this point they are just talking about the concept so they can move forward to develop plans and look at cost.

There will be the need for some work to be done but that will be completed by our physical plant staff and no architect will be needed. Mr. James reminded the committee that Ms. Frank wanted some storage in that building. Mr. Beckett stated she wants to move small claims closed files to that building and in approving this concept they will be looking at the overall building.

Mr. Inman explained that approval of the grant with Carle would be the end of April so details would come to the May meeting to let the committee know how much will be received and an itemized list of what needs to be done. They would need to do some phone work, paint, work on the front entry and locks and that is the extent right now.

Mr. Northrup stated one of the things about the building that is appealing to Carle are the multiple overhead doors, including one right where the refrigeration unit would be so they could back their vehicle in to load and unload. There are loading docks for semi trailers and in the event the county would have a catastrophe we would have the ability to bring the deceased into the facility and cycle them through.

Mr. Bensyl asked about power supply to the refrigeration units and Mr. Inman explained they believe it will be fine but they will sit down with the unit itself, he will also look at the roof and what the lease says about that.

When asked about autopsies being done in this facility, Mr. Northrup explained they now do them in Bloomington and currently don't have facilities set up to do them nor a pathologist to perform them if we did have the facility. He believes even if we did have the facility, we wouldn't have a pathologist to do them because they don't like to travel and unless we wanted to pay them their going rate it would be hard to find one to come here. He currently pays a fee to Bloomington to use their facility and their pathologist does our autopsies for us.

Mr. Inman explained currently the administrative area and small storage area is being used for County Clerk supplies which would be transferred to the south highway building. There is 2500 square feet for ILEAS and we also store two emergency response trailers for them. There is also some of the masonry project there as well as physical plant equipment but there is nothing that would need to be moved before this can happen. When asked about the current lease, he stated upon approval of this he will meet with Mr. Harrington to show him the plans, they way it is constructed he doesn't believe it will change anything.

Mr. Jay stated when we got the gill building we weren't sure we were going to have it permanently, he concurs that the Coroner needs more space but he is not sure if we want to make this commitment to this building that doesn't even belong to us and he doesn't feel it is very efficient use of the building. Ms. Busey stated the rent per year is \$70,000.

Mr. Beckett asked what he would suggest we do and Mr. Jay stated he isn't sure why we didn't provide a bay to the Coroner in the old highway building because now we are committing ourselves to another project.

Mr. Beckett explained at this point they are committing to looking at options. Since he has been chair of Facilities and Mr. Northrup has been Coroner he has come to them many times looking for help and he doesn't feel it is fair to his office, they have a responsibility to support him.

Mr. Northrup stated there are coolers they looked at that are made to sit outside, the complication with that is security but there is the possibility that if we were to move into that building and needed to move out the cooler could be moved. Some of the coolers he looked at stated they are energy efficient and Mr. Smucker encouraged him to look into that. Mr. Smucker asked if there is any other alternative, if we are paying \$70,000 per year how many years down the road will it be before we could have bought ourselves a building.

Ms. Busey stated we are at the point in the lease where we could get out of it if we needed to there is also an option to purchase the building with the lease. There is no money for capital projects. She believes they could talk about a lease purchase.

Mr. James stated they should look at other buildings within our county that would serve this need that could be inexpensive. He mentioned a nice cold storage building in Rantoul that could have been used for this and asked why we couldn't look outside of this area for something that suites the need.

MOTION by Bensyl to approve the concept of relocating the Coroners office to the Gill building with a report back in May to detail cost and options; seconded by James.

Mr. Smucker asked how much of a difficulty it would be to locate outside of the city. Mr. Northrup stated it would be pretty difficult because a large number of cases they handle are at Carle and Provena and in Champaign-Urbana, if they were located in Rantoul we would be driving back and forth on a daily basis at least once or twice. His opinion is that the operation should be somewhere in Champaign-Urbana because that is where their case load comes from. Mr. Smucker stated he has a preference to finding a permanent building to put the Coroner in as opposed to a rental and he would like to hear alternative possibilities.

Mr. Beckett stated he has been the chair since 2000 and has studied this issue three or four times and the same answer has come up every time, we don't have any money and no way of getting any money. He is open to suggestion.

Mr. Inman stated the next opportunity would be if there is an expansion of the satellite jail, it could be incorporated into that facility

Mr. Northrup stated they do pay \$2,400 to have their current cooler where it is located now plus the rental fee paid to the civic center.

Mr. Weibel asked Ms. Busey to research what a lease purchase might cost us.

Motion carried with a 5/1 roll call vote. Voting yes was Bensyl, James, Smucker, Weibel, and Beckett. Voting no was Jay. Sapp abstained.

De-lamping Plan for Courthouse

Mr. Inman explained, in attempting to reduce utility costs, he has come up with a de-lamping plan for the Courthouse complex. He went through and audited the number of fixtures currently in place in the Courthouse, identifying possible fixtures that could be de-lamped and identifying security fixtures and that is included with the information he distributed to the committee. In the plan there is a broad definition of de-lamping and can include removing one or more lamps from a fixture, replacing a total number of fixtures in an area, electrically disconnecting fixtures but leaving them in place, replacing existing lamps with lower wattage lamps, and replacing light fixtures not energy efficient with those that are upon failure and the last thing is adding occupancy sensors. He would meet with department heads to review the plan and they could only de-lamp when the department, Facilities Committee and administration are in agreement. There are quite a few number of offices that also have windows so those you could de-lamp more than an interior work space. He would make sure they are within all guidelines for lighting before de-lamping and after. The second phase would include our physical plant actually disconnecting electricity but that would not be done until everyone agrees that the plan would work. Once the energy issues are handled there is a tendency to go back and add in lights so when there is a request for that, the official would write a memo to Ms. Busey stating they need more lighting and it would come before County Facilities and everyone would have to agree before anything would be done.

Mr. Beckett stated this might include an amount of micro-managing that is a little beyond what he envisioned for this committee and asked if Mr. Reinhart could be appointed as the County Energy Officer. Mr. Inman stated they are talking about a significant amount of money savings and the committee would get a monthly report.

Mr. Beckett asked what the committee needs to do to the policy to appoint an administrative energy person and what the committee has to do to change what was presented to them. Mr. Inman stated it is done just by the committee's comments and they will see more information when it comes back.

Other Business

Semi-Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes

Mr. Beckett reported he heard from Dave De'Thorne and there is basis to keep all closed session minutes closed.

MOTION by Jay to maintain all closed session minutes as closed; seconded by James. **Motion carried.**

Mr. Beckett stated when he looked at the minutes they did discuss having Ms. Putman's picture in her meeting room and asked if anyone had strong opposition to doing that. He will include that item on the May agenda.

Designation of items to be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda

Item VI A will be placed on the consent agenda.

Adjournment

Chair Beckett declared the meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Talbott
Administrative Secretary