

MINUTES OF TOWN OF HULL, COUNTY OF PORTAGE,  
BOARD MEETING HELD ON MONDAY FEBRUARY 10, 2014

- 1) Call to order by Chairperson John Holdridge at 7:30 a.m. at the Hull Municipal Building, 4550 Wojcik Memorial Drive, Stevens Point WI 54482.

Present: Chairperson Holdridge, Supervisors Melvin Bembenek, David Pederson, Dave Wilz and LaVerne Syens.

Others present: Clerk Janet Wolle, Treasurer Jim Kruziki, Secretary/Deputy Clerk Barbara Brilowski and Architect Bill Yudchitz.

- 2) Action on bid item changes to document for the Hull building addition

Chairperson Holdridge sees some real bench marks this morning. This project was started at least 3 or 4 years ago.

Town of Hull Addition Rebid options to Deduct from the Contract Amount presented by Bill Yudchitz

- First four items relate to the Pex pipe to nowhere
- Want the ability in the future to do energy efficient heat in the bathrooms plus having heat for the building and just radiant when no one is occupying it.
- It's a no brainer to get rid of the electric resistant heat - the boiler is nice because it is on demand, it modulates or has a variable amount of power to it

SCS No.

201	Remove the 4 foot of in-floor radiant Pex pipe from around the perimeter and the two washrooms.	\$2,829.00
202	Leave the Styrofoam for the Pex pipe in the contract and add two additional feet to create a larger area that will generate approximately 60,000 BTU's	\$371.00 (Add)
203	Change the forced air heating system for the new addition to two (2) zones from four (4) zones	\$1,393.00
204	Eliminate the electric heaters in the two washrooms	\$1,610.00

D Wilz – we are putting in Pex, prepping for it, possibly

Yudchitz – no we will actually make it active for the same amount of money.

Wilz – does red mean we are going to save?

Yudchitz – no, it is to save initially as we are taking it out of the contract and put it off to the side, and put it on the Town of Hull's to do. For this report the red is for savings.

With the above savings can install boiler to make in-floor radiant heating usable.

Motion Supervisor Pederson, second Supervisor Wilz, **approve first 4 items as presented.**  
Motion carried unanimously.

- 205 Change the light fixtures for the offices to parabolic instead of indirect as specified. This will give us three levels of lighting and still have a non-glare lighting fixture \$631.00
- 206 Change from emergency ballasts in seven fixtures and replace them with battery backup and wallpack flood heads to meet the code for egress lighting \$762.00
- 207 Relocate the new panel L3 to the mechanical room between the bathrooms. Run all the circuitry for the new addition out of it. Previously the panel was in the garage space and multiple panels were being used to wire the addition, causing confusion where breakers would be located. \$153.00

Motion Supervisor Wilz, second Supervisor Syens, **accept 205-207 changes**. Motion carried unanimously.

- 208 Remove the bullet proof glass from the reception window and replace with a plastic laminate counter and tempered locking sliding glass. Also remove all the Kevlar coated drywall from the project. \$11,542.00

This would be changing from bullet proof to tempered glass.

Holdridge – if somebody throws something at you does that shatter?

Yudchitz – just like a basketball backboard that breaks in to tiny chunks.

B Brilowski – because the slider is imbedded in to the counter, we are requesting the counter be a bit wider.

Yudchitz – Jerry Stodola has told me he will design to meet the needs. In the new price a drawer will be put in and wider counters are going in.

Holdridge – are we settled on the opening question? Have we reached a conclusion?

Pederson – we have talked quite a bit about it and one of the big downsides of the bulletproof and the speaker was being able to communicate with the people that come in. If you slide a window you can talk directly to them – that was seen as part of the openness and friendliness of the office.

Brilowski – we also talked about the heat, if it is cool out in the entry way we can close the windows, which are lockable as well. My concern about this is if this becomes a community room, we are wide open and people are walking in and out – right now when we have meetings we are all here, that won't be the case. While you want to trust people you have to be real about it.

Wilz – I'm inquiring of the folks who work here every day and work with the happy and some of the not so happy faces are you okay with this reduction of security?

Brilowski – I would really like to have the security on the outside. If someone is going to come in and be violent it is going to be a matter of response time. If we can have a camera outside seeing somebody come in – if somebody gets in here and it is after the fact, and they plan on doing damage, I don't know that even bullet proof glass, or whatever would help us. It is more important to be proactive and see who is coming in the door.

Holdridge – do you have a way to tell if we had a camera outside by the desk so you could lock the door?

Yudchitz – I think it depends on some of the options that are in Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E), right?

Wolle – yes.

Yudchitz – my reaction to what she (Barb) is saying is yes maybe there are some things we look at at the front door, if anything, probably should be one where she can see the cameras and the front door might be one she would be able to lock. We talked also about having the main door to the office we want to lock. By controlling those two doors would make sense to have security for the staff.

Motion Supervisor Pederson, second Supervisor Syens, **make the change as per items 208 as presented.** Motion carried unanimously.

- |     |   |            |
|-----|---|------------|
| 209 | Install 12 foot wide direct glue down carpet in lieu of carpet squares as bid   | \$3,481.00 |
| 212 | Install a different manufacture's carpet squares, similar quality as specified. | \$1,404.00 |

Architects are recommending the \$1,404 deduct based on bringing in samples and making sure it is what we want including carpet squares as in item 212.

Motion Supervisor Wilz, second Supervisor Pederson, **reject the recommendation for 209 and replace with item 212 carpet squares that may be a little bit less expensive.**

Carpet squares are for the new addition and provide more cushion, replace ability plus less seam problems.

Motion carried unanimously.

- |     |  |          |
|-----|--|----------|
| 210 | Change to 12 inch by 12 inch tiles throughout the lobby and the bathrooms, instead of using two sizes 18 inch and 12 inch tiles. | \$447.00 |
|-----|--|----------|

Motion Supervisor Syens, second Supervisor Pederson, **approve item 210 as presented.** Motion carried unanimously.

211 We had specified cove molded tile for the base in the lobby and washrooms. It creates an easy corner to clean, tends to take up the movement in the building without causing a future crack and works between with water around. We have a price to cut a tile in half and use the cut tile as the base in lieu of a molded tile. \$653.00

The architects suggest specifying the molded tile in the washrooms with cut tile in the lobby.

Motion Supervisor Wilz, second Supervisor Pederson, **approve item 211 changes for in lobby only (cove molded tiles will remain in the restrooms)**. Motion carried unanimously.

Total deductions \$21,053.00

Yudchitz - you look at the rest of the list and it is mechanical – we have mechanical ideas to save money with the way the plumbing was done, but at this point we are not bringing this to the board. I have to talk with Mel because Mel was saying he didn't know if that was the right way to go. We were talking about why we are running pipes overhead instead of running pipes right from the well into our new addition. Mel what was your reason why not to do that?

Mel – feel the water pipes should go above. You would run another line from the well and that could be a problem having a line coming this way and that way underground. And besides that when you put the line underground you have to go down 6' or 7' because of frost and if you do have a problem underground, a leak or something, you have to dig it up again.

Yudchitz – I tend to say that once it is done underground you won't have a leak and we would do just like we did here, put Styrofoam with insulation over the top. At this point the plumber is low and he's only willing to move up if we ask him to do anything different.

Mel – both ways will work. You have to have it insulated and if there is a problem with the pipe underground you have a problem.

Yudchitz – the point I'm making is plumbing, heating, electrical I made a suggestion, we know what we want him to do, and it went nowhere. I think at this point Jerry Stodola has been very open to any suggestion made, he wants to work with us, and he is used to working in a situation where it is give and take. We are going with what was specified. The pipes will be going across and the water heater and pressure tank is still going to stay in the bay. Everything is as per the engineer's design.

Note, when we asked the contractor to take out the radiant floor from his bid, it was only to achieve a better result with Town of Hull staff and the Architect. Approximately \$5,938.00 of the savings would be used to install a 98 percent efficient gas, on demand, modulating boiler and more Pex pipe than was originally specified. This would eliminate the electric resistance heating of the bathrooms and make the Pex pipe in the office area operational. Which it was not in the bid. It was just installed for future use. (No boiler)

-----  
Yudchitz – have one firm bid for the boiler and all the materials to put the boiler together of \$3,820, but that doesn't include plumbing fittings, etc. I think we probably will have \$200 for the electrician to hook it up to the gas pipe, in this bid we also brought the gas pipe to that

location, so the gas is already there. This type of boiler vents with pvc pipe, it is 98% efficient. If we drop the others out, we do need some sort of heat in the restrooms. I propose we put \$5,938 back in and that would be used to provide the type of heating that would hold the building when no one is in to a temperature of 62° to 66° or whatever we decide and make the pex pipe active and working. I ask you put the money back in the budget and then that would make the deduction **\$17,192.00**.

Yudchitz - it takes 2 people to put pipes in.

Pederson - have a neighbor who has also indicated he would help with the pex piping.

Yudchitz- Stodola is still putting down and leveling the Styrofoam to his happiness.

J Kruziki – the actual savings then is **\$15,115**.

Pederson – on domestic hot water for the restrooms will that be piped from the bay and will we have a circulator to keep it warm or is it going to have to wait until it finds its way across from the shop?

Yudchitz – I think it will have to wait at this point but will double check. That is a reason why I wanted to put a little on demand water heater over there. Once Jerry is going to offer the contract to do the plumbing, he has a lot more leverage over the guys to say maybe this design does not make as much sense as we thought – Will you work with us to get the other design? The plumbing might be something that I (Bill) will come back to as I think absolutely great point – that is one reason why Mel that I have been against the pipes across is that you wash your hands you are only using a hand full of water – you will never get the hot water there.

Holdridge – is there a state law that you must have hot water in a public restroom?

Yudchitz – I would think so.

Wilz – it is not a state law that food service workers have to wash their hands with hot water. The law is “you have to wash your hands”.

Yudchitz – there is no law on designing the recirculation pump or making sure hot water is there when you want it. You probably have to have hot water to the sink. We will have hot water to the sink but it will never get there under normal use. We will talk a little more on how we will solve that problem as we move along with Jerry.

Supervisor Pederson, **move to approve the installation of boiler and the necessary plumbing**, second Supervisor Syens. Motion carried unanimously.

Pederson – are these considered change orders at this point or is that after we sign the contract?

Yudchitz – this will allow us to prepare the contract with real numbers. Putting a contract out before the board acted was going to be presumptuous.

Wolle – didn't you (Bill) explain to me these changes had to be in the contract?

Yudchitz - we will use a regular contract. As I understand the \$537,445 will be the contract but there will be a change order prepared on that contract to deduct the correct amount. The change order will be \$21,053 but we are only saving the \$15,115. The money is going back on our side until we buy the equipment to put the boiler together.

Wolle – but these are things that are changes in the contract where the boiler was never in the contract.

Yudchitz – it was never in the contract. And when I say changes to the contract, the document that is used in conjunction with the main contract references... American Institute of Architects document. I don't think your attorney will have any problem with them. We are going to present you with the contract while the next part of the process will be Jerry will be getting his bonding company to approve the contract Hull is offering him and during this next week we should be able to try to sign that contract once the bonding and the certificate of insurance are brought back.

3) Letter of Intent with SCS for Hull's building addition– Action

Wolle – the contract is not on the agenda. Bill indicated to me we needed to have a Letter of Intent.

Yudchitz – correct. That vote was on the building addition cost.

Wolle – Mel has a good question, he is wondering if the Letter of Intent is actually voting on the \$537,445.

Yudchitz – it is, along with the change order of \$15,115. You are voting to enter in to a contract with the changes approved by the board.

Bembenek – to act we are acting on the building addition contract of \$537,000, right?

Yudchitz – correct.

**Costs and funding source report as prepared by Jim Kruziki as follows:**

**TOWN OF HULL 2014 PROJECTED BUILDING PROJECT COSTS AND FUNDING**

**COSTS**

Building Addition	521,931
Remodel Meeting Room	60,250
Design Fees	60,000
Other related costs	<u>12,186</u>
Total costs	654,367
Less costs paid in 2013	<u>-37,706</u>
Balance of estimated costs for Building/Remodel	616,661

**F.F. & E**

Structured cabling	9,040
Telephone System	14,000 *
Computer network server	13,482
Furniture	9,486
AV/PA System	34,445 *
CATV system	3,867 *
Security CCTV	<u>21,341 ?</u>
Total FF&E	105,661

**Total Project Cost** **722,322**

**FUNDING SOURCES**

Loan	600,000
Building Reserve Fund	70,010
PEG Fund	<u>52,312 *</u>
	<u><b>722,322</b></u>

Bembenek – if I'm going to act on the \$537,000 and later on, by looking at projected costs with other monies involved, the cost comes to \$722,000. I'm not for spending \$722,000, so how can I vote on the \$537,000? To vote, I'd like to know what is going to cost us \$722,000, the board votes on. If all it is going to cost us is \$537,000 Mel Bembenek will vote on it, but that is not what it is going to cost the Town of Hull.

Yudchitz – On the total Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) is that set in stone and approved? The problem with the other part of this is I think we have a good job of projecting costs but I think

Holdridge – let's go to the budget – revenues and expenditures – I appreciate this.

Bembenek – to vote on the \$537,000, I can't explain to constituents tonight that I voted for \$537,000 but it will really cost \$722,000. Another thing, the report shows less costs paid in 2013 (\$37,706). That \$37,700 actually would be added on to the \$722,000.

Yudchitz – no. Most of it is architectural fees

Bembenek – you subtract the \$37,706 off of the \$654,000

Wilz – Mel is right

Kruziki – yes, he is right.

Bembenek - \$760,028 is the total cost of the project with everything.

Pederson – as a starting point.

Wilz – vs where we thought we would be

Bembenek – to me under \$600,000.

Wilz – around \$600,000

Bembenek – we are about \$160,000 over our original

Wilz – what we asked the people to vote on.

Holdridge – do you want to explain the 54 to 6 vote?

Wolle – the motion at the July meeting was to authorize the board to borrow \$600,000 for the project/the second was to allow the board to expend the funds for the addition and the remodeling of the town hall.

Bembenek – I'm not saying by us taking another \$160,000 to do this that the board is violating something with the people, I'm just saying the people were here and we said the cost would be around \$600,000 that's not bad. People will say they (Hull) are going to spend \$600,000 and all of a sudden they are going to spend \$760,000 that isn't what we thought it would cost. I'm not saying it is illegal to take money out of the reserve or whatever. Furthermore I don't want to spend \$760,000, I'm a taxpayer. I figured \$600,000 was enough. I am voting against the Letter of Intent because it isn't \$537,000 it's \$760,000 for the whole package.

Wilz – then that is what you need to do.

Syens – if you feel comfortable, vote that way.

Bembenek – I'm just explaining why. I want everybody to know why I am not for the \$537,000.

Wilz – you are right Mel, what we are voting on is only part of it, there are other things to follow and that's part of your consideration.

Holdridge – does the \$600,000 include the remodeling?

Wolle – that's what the action was, as at that time we thought that was the amount \$600,000.

Holdridge – my reaction is I wouldn't have a problem calling the good citizens in here and say here are our steps and at this point we probably will not be able to do the addition for less than \$537,000. This is a drop from where we started. Call the people in say this is what we need to complete this project.

J Kruziki - the budget reserve for building project is \$102,000

Holdridge - We are considering using \$70,000 of that to complete the project and through some good research by LaVerne Syens we plan on spending about \$52,000 out of the PEG funds to complete the project. We are not adding to the tax levy.

Bembenek – I understand that but what I am saying is I can't see spending \$760,000. We started out, Dave and I, with this building project we figured 400,000 maybe 500,000. When Bill came in he figured maybe \$480,000 for the addition and maybe get up to \$600,000 at the most for the whole project. It isn't that we don't have \$160,000 that we can do it. We can use that \$160,000 for something else. I know we have the money. \$760,000 for this, the way times are going, we need money for other things too.

Holdridge – if you want to cut this why don't you make a motion?

Bembenek – I can't make a motion to cut anything. Everybody has been doing a good job trying to cut. I'm not saying no one is trying to cut but, the cost is way out from what we were talking about and the way the people voted for \$600,000 for the total project. Now you are going to ask them for another amount of money and say the total project is way over the \$600,000 that you voted on before. You have to explain to the people, you have to be honest with them.

Holdridge – we don't have to ask them, it's already in the reserve.

Bembenek – I know you don't have to ask them, I know it's in the reserve, I just think we are giving the people the shaft if we don't have to ask them anything.

Yudchitz – I think a good half of that is my fault. When we did our first design we said we were going from the upper story, we took that off to come down and tried to get in to the lower cost bracket. Somewhere in the middle of the process we went to furniture, fixtures for \$25,000. Mel when we presented it, it was \$25,000. At that time we also didn't know everything we do today but if you take and say there is \$100,000 in all of the things that really make the building operational, we were like \$75,000 short rather than....I think the other thing is we made changes to the building, we added some square footage as people said we are only doing this once. The hard cost of the building is like \$580,000. You have about \$63,000 in soft costs: \$60,000 for the architect and all the testing (between soil, hazardous and septic design). Besides the fact that the building is more expensive than we would like I think the soft costs are the things that are hitting us. The first thing when I was hired in June or July no one told me at that point the phone system was dead, nobody told me the computer system was dead. We were talking about what this building was going to look like and how is it going to be designed.

Bembenek – I can see there were some mistakes made but I can't see because mistakes were made, why make another mistake as far as I am concerned. And I know

being on the board, if I had said I think we should go up to \$700,000, I don't think anyone on this board would have listened to Mel Bembenek.

Yudchitz – I'm saying if we don't do anything tomorrow, you are going to need a telephone system tomorrow, you are going to need a computer system maybe the day after that and there are a lot of things that are still going to be expenditures, maybe it's not \$75,000 but you could be spending \$30,000 to \$50,000 without building a building and putting those systems into a 1970's building.

Bembenek – instead of putting an addition on, we could just remodel what we have and that would take care of what you are talking about.

Wilz – remodel everything that is here, make it better, fix the windows, paint the walls.

Holdridge – set up a separate private room where people could meet?

Wilz – no, well if we could remodel it we could put it in maybe.

Holdridge – how much capacity could our citizens have?

Bembenek – you definitely would not have what you want John, but for big meetings we would go back to SPASH. We have most of our meetings here, not out.

Wilz – so what you are saying Mel is the final number here is so much larger than what the people voted on that you don't feel comfortable recommending this unless we bring it back to them, is that what you are saying?

Bembenek - \$760,000 is way out of line

Holdridge – what do you recommend we do about it?

Bembenek – I recommend we fix what we have.

Holdridge – and the 56 to 4 vote and they knew what we were going to do basically; the first time we went out for bid we were way over and the second time we got more realistic bids.

Bembenek – I know it is less

Pederson – we have added things in that were not in the original concept; the telephone system; cable, etc.

Bembenek – if you want to go back to the people John, have a meeting and tell them we need more money, that it is going to cost \$160,000 (or whatever figure it comes up to) have a meeting and ask them. Let them vote on it. Then it is up to the people. Even if the people would vote for it I would still be against it because....

Holdridge – even if the people support it?

Bembenek – yes in my mind it's too much money. If they support it fine, but that doesn't mean I feel the same way they do. I am also a voter and taxpayer.

Holdridge – but you are representing the people.

Bembenek – I know I am. I'm just saying \$760,000 now is just out of the area. There are other things we have going on. That is \$160,000 more we could use for something else. All we have to do is look at our budget.

Yudchitz – I'm not an expert on the PEG funds but from the discussions we have had so far if you don't have a good use for those funds, what would you guys ever use that for?

Pederson – that has been the problem figuring out how to use the funds.

Bembenek – there is probably \$350,000 to \$400,000 we could use on road equipment if you are talking about the money we have in reserves.

Yudchitz – I'm just talking about PEG funds. I just took the \$52,312 off the \$760,000 and I think the true thing we would be talking about is between \$600,000 to \$700,000. We would never be able to afford to do those things without the PEG funds. I think that's the way the committee had been talking about. Jim Gerisch had always promoted use of PEG fees and then Attorney Konkol said we can't use it on anything.

Bembenek – if we would have gotten the bid as we had figured \$480,000 we would have had \$120,000 to go with, up to \$600,000, and the \$100,000 we could have even used from the PEG funds and would still have been under \$600,000.

Yudchitz – I'm not disagreeing with what you are saying that \$100,000-\$150,000 is a considerable amount but I'm also saying you will have a fund that is going to sit there and not do anything while this would create a much more user friendly situation for the people.

Holdridge – where does the \$480,000 come from?

Yudchitz – that was a number we threw out a long time ago.

Bembenek – that was a number thrown out at the very beginning that would cost the town. Bill figured \$600,000 would be enough, actually \$593,000 to take to the people and I said let's make it an even \$600,000.

Holdridge – as I recall we have \$700,000 in a reserve account. Our operational budget is about 1.5 million. This notion that we don't have money if we wanted it and needed it for other things is not accurate. I'd be very concerned if we had to go back to the taxpayer indicating we were going to raise the taxes. We are not asking them to raise taxes, in fact over the years we have taxed them to build up a reserve account. It is unrealistic for any government to have 50% of their operation budget in reserves. We have money if we want to buy another truck; we have already ordered a V-Box for one of the trucks. At the last meeting Dave Wilz asked Pete Kaminski if the truck we spent a lot of money on can get through this winter. Pete said yes. There is not any evidence I know of, Dave worked through that budget, and at some point we have to get back into the budget and look at the needs out there (garage) – I don't

know if we have done anything with the roof business, where that comes in. We have resources to take care of that stuff. Anybody disagree?

Wilz – we are flush in reserves, but Mel is right in that the way we left the budget last time we have to get back to it, if we don't slash out budget by huge amounts, hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, or if we don't increase the tax rate to the people so we can start putting money away, we will dwindle our reserves down in a year or two and we will be operating in a deficit at that point. We are in good shape now but we have big work ahead of us. We are probably going to have to go back to the taxpayer saying you know what; we need to start saving a hundred grand a year for vehicle replacement and all of the things we don't do now because we were always flush and could put money in to the reserves where we could borrow against it. That has changed. Whatever we take out of the reserve fund, is not going to be put back – we are operating in a deficit.

Holdridge – what do you mean we are operating in a deficit?

Wilz – if we actually run our budget without making a decision **not** to spend something, or defer to later, we lose money every year. We made a little money in 2013 because we didn't do the salt slab, we eliminated \$100,000 of things that we put off or we would have lost 40 to 50 grand. Jim, did we force balance the 2014 budget by what?

Kruziki – about \$90,000

Wilz – to balance 2014 we have to take \$90,000 off of this based on our spending. I'm not happy with where we are vs how we started. We gave people money to come up with a good number and to think about everything that needed to be thought about so we could go to the taxpayer to ask permission and to have a good solid number. Where we are now is quite significantly different than that for all the reasons. So I understand where Mel is coming from but on the other hand if we remodeled this one and did maintenance on this one/updated this one I think we would drop a hundred grand very quickly and I don't know what we would have afterwards other than a newer building that doesn't function real well.

Kruziki – in addition to that Dave if we did nothing it will cost us \$80,000 to do nothing. If you reject this we've spent \$80,000 and we still have work to do.

Holdridge – with citizens coming in, seeing this is not very satisfactory and not very operable.

Wilz – I'm with you on this Mel. We blew it on the number big time, but I'm a realist too and we are going to have to fix our budgetary problems moving forward regardless of what we do here today. I'm about getting this done and making some decisions today.

Pederson – I think our budget is a work in progress yet.

Holdridge – from my standpoint we've got reserve funds that we have set aside for building and we have PEG funds that we can only use for certain functions and there is no increase on the tax levy. I do think though that we raised some cans of worm last time and we have to get on to this budget evaluation.

Wilz – a totally new approach to do things right

Yudchitz – the Letter of Intent gets the contract moving and getting the ball to the bonding company, having the architects draw up a contract that will go to Hull’s attorney. In an ideal world we would have had the meeting on the deductions a month ago and then make this motion knowing a number - we’re doing this at the same time so the best way was to put together a Letter of Intent.

Holdridge – it looks like from the general contractor’s standpoint we are going to come in less than \$537,000.

Yudchitz – correct. We have the \$15,000 savings and the reality is the general contractor is going to be deducted \$20,000 of that. I don’t want to say we are going to save \$20,000; we are going to save \$15,000 based on everything we have put together so far.

Motion Supervisor Wilz, **board accept the Letter of Intent and authorize our town Chairperson to sign the Letter of Intent to Mr. Stodola (SCS)**, second Supervisor Pederson.

Voice vote: Aye – 4  
Nay – 1

Motion carried

4) Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment – action on bid items received

Yudchitz – a lot of hard work has gone in to this. They have evaluated the phone system and come up with a different phone system.

Wolle – the ShorTell is the phone system bid on by Affiliated Communications. The other phone system is called Avaya. Jim, Barb and I had a conference call with Kevin Judd, whose company sells both ShorTel and Avaya. We found the ShorTel system a much more user friendly system than the Avaya. We looked at some of the items that had been bid and asked them to remove from the package to enable us to get the price of the ShorTel system lowered. We would recommend the ShorTel phone system.

Holdridge – on a spreadsheet shows Option A, Option B, Option C

Yudchitz – Jim G. put that together suggesting these items might be grouped together so that the board could better look at packages, but I think looking at each item and deciding what is necessary like they have done on the phone system is the way to go. Have we done that on the computer system also?

Wolle – when Bill talks about the computer system it is the **server**, we are not getting new computers.

Yudchitz – I know I am kind of taking a beating today and I can take it because we started out not knowing all the things we needed to make this building functional. We didn’t really discuss it. If you really look at those things, one is I have had informal conversations on the structured cabling. People who have been working on the project have offered, the electrician, has said if that was rebid we could do better. Right now the board has to say this is too much money and reject the bid and then rebid the item. What it boils down to is possibly some of these

things could be...Janet has also worked on negotiating the furniture. We had \$11,000 some in the furniture and she adjusted some of the scope of the specifications and saved money. I think that as much as we have done on the regular building, I firmly believe each one of these things...as the architect I'm not sure how many cameras we have.

Wilz – this is for security. What Bill is saying is this should be analyzed and broken down because we don't know what this is.

Yudchitz – I'm saying as the architect I'm not sure I know what it is but realistically you still are going to have \$75,000 worth of expenses so you can do a good job, or \$80,000 or \$90,000, I don't think Janet and Jim K were suggesting the board would vote on these things today, right?

Wolle – if we need to rebid on some of these things I would think you would want the board to vote on these like you did the others (building) and do a rejection – right?

Holdridge – who is going to fight the battle on these costs?

Yudchitz – I think this would go back to more of an in-house thing like we did with the Kevlar and bullet proof glass. That everybody sits down and discusses what is necessary, do a good job and make a recommendation.

Kruziki – I think the FF&E is maybe Janet more with advise from you (Bill).

Wolle – no, we need Jim and Barb also – we all need to be involved.

Yudchitz – yes all and I think it is one of those things we have to look at each one and make sure that....I think Barb has made a great point on the cameras and I just want to reiterate that in the discussions we have had is that we need a camera on the brush, we need a camera on the fuel back there, we need a camera here and maybe what is going on in the back – but maybe we don't need 16. I know they come in 4- 8-12-16 packages – we just have to try and get a better handle on that.

Pederson – so we need to vote to reject these bids currently or did we do that already?

Yudchitz – you have not voted on

Wolle – you have not. At the last meeting you tabled action until February 6<sup>th</sup> however that meeting was canceled. Nothing has been done. As Bill said we've talked with some of the bidders on the phone system and the furniture.

Holdridge – you have resolved the telephone, right?

Wolle – Yes

Holdridge - I would think we would reject and then rebid and direct Bill and probably Janet to do some research and go back and rebid. Maybe we need a time line on it. When do we need this?

Yudchitz – I would think if you would give Janet a month to look this over, or a little bit more, that would be fine. I don't think we need anything that is in here for 2 months.

Wolle – I think we should go with a month so that we get this done.

Yudchitz – the only reason I was a little bit hesitant that I am gone for one week in that month.

Holdridge – as it stands now the costs are \$105,000

Yudchitz – it is and if you notice Jim K did a good job – he has the star he brings down and that is the \$52,000 and basically half of that that is the \$105,661 was proposed to be paid out of the PEG funds.

**Clerk's note – review data on page 7 relating FF&E cost discussion**

Wolle – the question mark by the CCTV could it be out of the PEG funds or are you not sure?

Kruziki – I wasn't sure if we even needed that

Motion Supervisor Wilz, **we reject all the items under FF&E section of the project costs and funding and direct Janet, Bill and others who want to get involved to see if we can refine and define what we need better and reduce the costs and to give them 1 month do to it**, second by Supervisor Syens.

Holdridge – what is the one month?

Wilz – March 15<sup>th</sup>.

Motion carried unanimously.

5) Remodel of Meeting Room

Wolle – the only other thing is about the remodel which was also tabled at the last meeting and which I would suggest you table again

Wilz – nothing has changed.

Yudchitz – I think the \$60,000 Jim K is using in these numbers is within \$1,000 one way or the other.

Holdridge – my only comment would be if you have a question about Barb's memo would you please talk with Barb. I have some comments on it. We need some resolution on that.

Wilz – I would like to talk with you (Barb) about that. I wanted to bring that up today but I am running out of time.

Motion Supervisor Pederson, second Supervisor Syens, **table action on the remodeling of the meeting room**. Motion carries unanimously.

- 6) Adjournment: Motion Supervisor Wilz, second Supervisor Pederson **adjourn the meeting.**  
Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:10 am.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Janet Wolle, Clerk