

December 19, 2003

The special scheduled meeting of the Board of County Commissioners was called to order this 19th day of December, 2003, in the conference room of the County Office Building by Chairman Leroy Krohmer. Roll was called by Dorinda Harvey, County Clerk/Secretary and those present were:

Leroy Krohmer, Chairman
Bill Graves, Vice-Chairman
George Skinner, Member
Dorinda Harvey, Secretary

Others present were: Kerrie Hudson, Judge William Hetherington, Mike McDanel, Denise Heavner, Denise Ellison, Sandra DeSelms, Dwaine Rhodes, Tim Kuykendall, Rhonda Hall, Tammy Howard, Mike Kelly, and Ellie Sutter.

Chairman Krohmer began the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Krohmer called for discussion, consideration, and/or action on Work Session concerning Cleveland County Courthouse and Cleveland County Office Building Renovations.

Dwaine Rhodes stated that he understands this is a work session and that no decisions will be made at this time. Ms. Rhodes gave the sequences for the project, which is to bid the project, sometimes have a work session which is what is being done, enter into a contract award, have a pre-construction meeting with the contractor and his subs, establish a date of groundbreaking, give the contractor written notice to proceed and then have a construction time line. Last week Mr. Rhodes began to get calls and early this week the discussion was to come to this meeting, bring the contractor, bring the sub-contractor, and lets have a work session to talk about phasing and schedule and shutting down the courthouse. Mr. Rhodes stated that really can't happen at this time. This is not to time to do it because we don't know. The contractor who is the successful bidder has to participate in the dialog with us and it is premature to do that. The project has been bid and we are having this work session. Mr. Rhodes stated that Mr. Kaighn received a phone called and on December 16, a letter was received from SGS who had bid on the project. Mr. Rhodes read the letter aloud. (A copy of the letter is attached and made a part of these minutes.)



December 16, 2003

Cleveland County Commissioners
Cleveland County Courthouse
201 South Jones
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

**RE: Addition and Renovation
Cleveland County Office Building and
Cleveland County Courthouse**

Gentlemen:

Regarding the referenced project, this is to advise that the bid offered by SGS, L.L.C. (SGS) contains a serious error, resulting in a significant understatement of SGS's accurate bid amount. SGS's base bid of \$5,810,650 was \$688,350 lower than the apparent next lowest bid, a difference of approximately eleven and eighty-five hundred percent (11.85%). This significance difference in SGS's bid amount as compared to the bid amount of the second lowest bidder, and well as when compared to the bid amounts of six other bidders, immediately triggered an audit of our estimate to determine its accuracy. Upon close examination of our estimate, SGS discovered the quoted amount of \$539,118 by an approved supplier for the dimensional stone (Alabama Stone) was inadvertently left out of our cost estimate and consequently the bid amount submitted by SGS to the Cleveland County Commissioners to complete the project. When the additional cost for the dimensional stone is correctly added to SGS's estimate and with the inclusion of additional bonds and insurance costs, SGS's actual bid amount for the project should have been accurately offered at Six Million Three Hundred Ninety Eight Thousand Two Hundred Fifty-Eight Dollars (\$6,398,258).

In light of this grave error, and understanding the severe consequences that would befall SGS if we were awarded the contract, SGS respectfully requests that our bid be withdrawn from further consideration for contract award. We regret the need to request this action, but given the financial burden that would be imposed on SGS if a contract were awarded to SGS, we simply have no other choice.

If you have any question, or if we can provide additional information, please advise. Your favorable consideration of this request would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
SGS, L.L.C.

Eddie Seott
President, CEO

Cc: Mike Kelly, AIA Kaighn Associates

SGS, L.L.C.

5555 North Grand Boulevard
Suite 200
Oklahoma City, OK 73112
Phone: 405.416.8400
Fax: 405.416.8410
E-Mail: sgs@sgs-llc.net
Website: www.sgs-llc.net

A Certified SDB Firm

After the letter was read Mr. Rhodes stated that the Public Competitive Bidding Act had been followed and in that it allows for the dismissal of a bid and Mr. Rhodes read from that document. "Nothing contained herein shall be construed so as to prevent the awarding public

agency or the courts from exonerating the bidder and other parties to the bid security document from liability upon a timely showing that the bidder committed what the courts have determined under the common law to be an excusable bidder error and for that reason it would not be equitable to enforce the bid security. (61-107)". So in a timely manner SGS has notified us that they made an honest mistake. Mr. Rhodes stated that the County Commissioners has the option to withdraw their bid and to not take action against their bid bond. The Commissioners have before them today a request from SGS to withdraw their bid and as a result of that there are two choices, to withdraw SGS's bid and go to the seconded lowest bidder and the seconded lowest bidder being Nashert Construction or to reject all bids and re-bid the project. Mr. Rhodes thinks that if the Board rejects the bids, because of bidding irregularities and re-bids the project the Board stand to risk that, all of the sub-numbers have been divulged, all the contractors numbers have been divulged, interest in bidding will be lost for bidders, and since we don't know the outcome he thinks the potential is there for the cost to go up. So he is not recommending that the Board do that. It is the Board's decision he doesn't practice law. He can't make that kind of recommendation to the Board. Mr. Rhodes continued saying that is where we are and we are here at this work session and somehow we have to decide what direction we are going to go. The decision as he sees it, is what does the County want to do, how do we deal with contract award, and what if there is a contract award what base bid and what alternates do you enter into. Also what does the Board want to do as a date of formal action, does the Board want to address this in the public meeting Monday.

Mr. Krohmer stated it was not on the agenda for Monday.

Tammy Howard, Purchasing Agent, stated that the bid was tabled until Monday.

Mr. Rhodes stated that he thinks the Board has that opinion or the Board has the opinion of extending it a week and try to decide what to do. The Board will have to identify groundbreaking date once the contract is awarded. Mr. Rhodes had a bid tabulation sheet that he had typed up that shows the bid alternates 1 through 10 that are listed and the amounts. Also is a copy of his letter of November 14, which deals with timelines and point of contact for the daily construction and asbestos abatement and several other issues. At some point in the process the Board Members have to decide what you are going to do for your contract with the alternates. In the phone dialog the question was asked, do we accept all of the alternates? His thinking has been that you consider alternates #2 and #10 as a contract option. If you take the base bid and alternates and consider #2 and #10 as a contract option you can include that, and you have 90 days per the terms of the bidding documents to accept those options. The benefit of doing that is they don't count against the ultimate change order amount, the limits of the change order amounts, if the Board was to add that as a change order item. So there is some benefit. Item "2" is the Courthouse Renovation and Item "10" is the Furnishing of the Security Hardware. Mr. Rhodes has had dialog with Judge Hetherington and once a contract is awarded try to establish a schedule timeline and a consideration of what is going to be done. Mr. Rhodes asked at that time if he could have meetings with the Judges and the Commissioners to clarify alternate #10. Your options for the base bid include the capability to have locksets for the building and a few doors, a very limited number of doors that have card capability at that lockset. If you go with alternate "10" the Furnishing of Security Hardware that brings it to a whole new level, by accepting alternate "10" that is not the end of it there still has to be a computer system, cabling, and

monitoring. Once item “10” is accepted and a very sophisticated card system, you are bound, there is not an easy way to go back from lockset to a simpler system. You have to way the cost involved in that. He believes there needs to be some time spent on Item “10” and probably Item “2” developing the sequencing with a bidder or contractor, the Judges and the Commissioners. The Board might want to say to accept all of the alternates, but he thinks it would be in the Board’s best interest if the Board chooses to accept the alternates and to take “2” and “10” as options and have 90 days to work with the lower bidder and try to identify what the issues are. Mr. Rhodes thinks if the Board takes “10” there is still another \$150,000.00 to \$200,000.00 cost associated with taking the system.

Mike Kelly stated that it would also be an on going commitment of everybody here to maintain it in manpower. Those systems are so complicated you would have to have one or two Sheriff’s deputies or some person that is trained to monitor that whole system. You have to have a comprehensive and long term nature of accepting a high level security like that. What they would propose in that 90 day period would be to interview and secure the service of a security consultant that can really advise you as to the level of security you want for this facility. Mr. Kelly thinks the Commissioners need to know what level of commit they want to see, what package they are buying into. He would hope to get come local security consultants and meet with them to determine really what the Board wants in the security process. And that is why they would like to have that 90 day period to advise you so you are comfortable with what you are ultimately buying in the long term. The Board has it by contract that it can exercise that option with 90 days to secure that and there will be a change order to include that in the contract and commit the contractors side to do that. The same thing on Item “2” when they wrote addenda item that the contractor has to sit down with the Commissioners and any party interested in moving people around the building and develop a schedule for the chambers (Judges)are going to remain in place, when are going to move people over, shut down electrical and he has to commit within that 90 day period a schedule that works with the Board to make sure that this is an easy transition. There is not a comprehensive schedule set up in the bid documents to accomplish that.

Judge Hetherington stated that was the rational for the delay in not accepting all alternates. Mr. Kelly stated that he (the contractor) has to commit to a schedule usually acceptable schedule. It gives a 90 day period to workout the complexities of the modifications of the courthouse.

Mr. Rhodes stated that they might have a feel of what needs to be done, but he’ll (the contractor) come in and go okay this is my crew and this is my subs.

Mr. Kelly continued saying that this is what we need to do in a timely matter. The whole point is that the work of the courthouse stays in operation and they have to understand and will be informed of that in a walk through. We just have to set out a hard timeline. Mr. Kelly stated that the acceptance of Alternate “2” also commits an extra 200 days of time period for construction. Not of the County Office Facility because 600 days is fixed for this facility and they don’t get an extension on that only by the acceptance of that alternate if you accept alternate “2” there will be a 200 day time extension granted to complete that work. Now the Contractor can be working on that for the full 800 days and hopefully he will get it done well before that, but the Contractor said that if we can’t move over say the Judges chambers, if it can’t be moved over how can it be worked around and on day 600 be done with it. That was the concession made with the extension of time.

Judge Hetherington stated that puts us over two years that is 800 days.

Mr. Kelly stated that what they are trying to workout for the project will be that that is an on going process and can well be made beneath the total of 200 days. They (Contractors) would never bid this if they had to put 600 days and do all of this work at one time and knowing that they could not move out until the fourth floor was done. All they will do is start adding days to their bid contract and then it is just a war on time delays.

Mr. Krohmer stated that he understood that the County Office Building was going to be done first and then start on the Court Building so the Judges could move over.

Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Kelly stated they are.

Mr. Krohmer had another question and stated that when they had the pre-bid conference some of the contractor said it might be 90 to 120 days on the heat and air and that is something that needs to be discussed.

Mr. Kelly stated that is clearly what they intend to discuss in this 90 day period about establishing time lines. Where they (the courts) can shut down and where they can't. You just don't shut down a building for 90 or 120 days, that's not one of the options they have in establishing this.

Judge Hetherington stated that he hoped this was in the spring not next spring but the spring after. Judge Hetherington asked what was the best estimate of how long it is going to have to be shut down.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the Judge was asking about a portion of the courthouse or all of the courthouse.

Judge Hetherington asked if it was a portion or all and Mr. Kelly stated that they didn't know.

Mr. Kelly stated that is why they wanted to interact with the Contractors and say these are the parameters you have to shut down lets make it work and talk to the sub-contractors, they don't even know who the sub-contractors are, if it is people who he is familiar with they will work with him much more closely on establishing that. He doesn't even have a sub-contractor list yet.

Judge Hetherington asked Mr. Kelly if he does anticipate that there will be some period of time that at least portions of the building will have no heat and air and Mr. Kelly replied yes.

Mr. Kelly stated that they (Contractors) have to understand that it is in the documents that it has to be in operation and has to be assessable.

Bill Graves stated that a lot of this that is being talked about is after the contract has been awarded to whomever, then sit down and have a pre-construction for over there.

Mr. Kelly stated that his concern is that if the Commissioners just sit there and award it to a contractor then there is not much leverage in this 90 day period. They want this leverage period and say were not going to award the contractor this contract if we can't work this out.

He thinks the contractor is going to look kindly, because they are getting an award of a contract and they are the seconded bidder and they want the project, Nashert really wants it.

Mr. Rhodes stated that the pre-construction meeting happens on every project, so it would happen for the total project, but the 90 day period, the working out of the options would be after that pre-construction meeting takes place and the contractor assemble their subs and we have on going meetings and its not like you are not going to be involved.

Mr. Kelly stated that you have to be involved to establish when you can move into different areas, when you can move off the floor, different floors, when the Judges are going to move

over, the elevator that can't shut down, how they are going to work around that and that is the purpose of that 90 day period. To establish a time line that everyone is comfortable with.

Chairman Krohmer asked Judge Hetherington, if the Commissioners do not award Items "2" and "10" for 90 days will that affect his funding and he replied that he is still lock in.

Judge Hetherington stated that he is real pleased that it appears the bids have fallen within the range of the estimate that Mr. Rhodes and his people have given and that the Courts were approved for.

Mr. Rhodes stated that this was court related here because we are building a whole court floor. So if the project were awarded, you would still be moving forward, we would be doing the passageway to get out through the south so we are going to be doing some work. The Sheriff will have to be moved out for a period of time to get the passageway out the south end and a ramp to satisfy the fire marshal. That will be something that will have to be developed, which will be a little bit of an inconvenience for the law library. Here again that is an issue that can be worked out.

Judge Hetherington stated that was discussed at the Law Library Trustees Meeting this morning. He got the impression that making that access there it would not affect the law library that you would have to move the books and shelves.

Mr. Rhodes stated that you don't have to, but be sure and block off that door with construction going on.

Chairman Krohmer wanted to know how long after the awarding of the bid will the construction start.

Mr. Rhodes stated that the bid is awarded then the contractor comes and gets their insurance and bonds which is a week to ten days and a list of their subs and a groundbreaking date is decided and notice to proceed is established. The clock is not started until they have the notice to proceed.

Mr. Kelly stated that there are some issues that they want to make sure that we don't give them a notice to proceed and the Commissioners are not ready to move out.

Mr. Rhodes stated that is protection for the Commissioners.

Mr. Kelly stated that if we tell the Contractors that they have the building and we are all sitting around this room having discussions, at that point it is their building to take over. Now the Contractors will give us some slack in moving but basically at that time it has to be there facility, because that is what the contract says.

Chairman Krohmer stated that a lot of time has been spent getting ready to move and he would hate to see another 90 days get by after we have moved and nothing happening.

Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Kelly if he thought two weeks and Mr. Kelly stated he would set up their bonds, contracts, and we will get them to the Commissioners within 30 days of that he suspects and will have the pre-construction meetings ready to go.

George Skinner asked if the Contractor is allowed 400 days say to do the project and the contractor does not get it done is there a penalty? Mr. Skinner stated he just arbitrarily used the 400 days.

Mr. Rhodes stated there is 600 days by contract.

Mr. Kelly stated that there is a liquidated damage clause of \$150.00 per day and sometimes it goes a lot higher on liquidated damages, and actually on a project of this size \$150.00 is probably nominal.

Chairman Krohmer stated that was awful low for this big of a project.

Mr. Rhodes stated that was discussed and Chairman Krohmer stated that he did not remember hearing that figure himself or he does not remember it, he stated that was pretty low and it was peanuts.

Mr. Kelly stated that the Commissioners could take it from the other side and filed in a \$1,000.00 a day as liquidated damages, you set up a war right off the bat because the Contractors want to protect themselves from expending a \$1,000.00 a day.

Mr. Rhodes stated that \$150.00, \$200.00 and \$250.00 was discussed and the dialog was that more then \$250.00 the contractor would put it in their bid and you would pay for that.

Mr. Rhodes stated that in his letter of November 14, he recommended that Bob Wood be the designated point of contact just because he understand construction, he is available, he calls, we can call him, he can get into the building, and Mr. Rhodes thinks he would be a good choice to represent the Commissioners on a daily basis. There are going to be times that work is going on and a decision will need to be made immediately. Someone needs to act on behalf of the Commissioners.

Chairman Krohmer stated he thinks this needs to be an elected official and asked Assistant District Attorney, Mike McDanel about it and Mr. McDanel stated that someone can be designated to act in that capacity.

Mr. Kelly explained that the Contractor does not need to develop a pattern of talking to a bunch of different people.

Chairman Krohmer stated that is something that needed to be worked out.

Judge Hetherington asked if Mr. Rhodes was comfortable when he get over into the Court building with Mr. Wood being the contract person?

Mr. Rhodes stated that in the past year and a half Mr. Wood has been in effect a liaison for him. Mr. Wood understands the mechanical and electrical systems, and he gets Mr. Rhodes in when he needs to get in somewhere. If it is related to a function Mr. Rhodes stated that he calls the Judge, the Court Clerk or the District Attorney etc.

Mr. Kelly would start making those contacts with the various parties and he will start taking it over for the next 900 days. He will conduct the contact with whoever, he just doesn't want the contractor to start bugging anybody just to get answers.

Bill Graves stated that he thinks Mr. Wood has the intelligents that if there is something else that he needs to go to someone else he will do it.

Mr. Rhodes stated that he has found that Mr. Wood is so honest and trustworthy.

Chairman Krohmer stated that Mr. Wood is not used to construction on electric and mechanical and all of that stuff. His thinking is that the Board needs to find a retired building superintendent (commercial).

Mr. Rhodes stated that he has found Mr. Wood to be very good and knows the Courthouse. Chairman Krohmer doesn't think Mr. Wood has ever been a builder and Chairman Krohmer stated that Mr. Wood stated that he was not qualified himself.

Mr. Kelly stated that he did not see where an extra party needed to be thrown into this to represent the Commissioners. They are going to represent the Commissioners on a day-to-day basis.

Chairman Krohmer stated that a lot of contractors make their money on change orders and that the Commissioners ran into that on the Juvenile Detention Center.

Mr. Kelly stated that he is very used to it and will find out early what the contractors intensions are.

Mr. Rhodes stated that Mr. Kelly is a very good architect and makes good decisions and the proof is the buildings on the campus of the University are a credit to that. We are going to be your eyes and ears on this project but we need someone we are comfortable working with who is a liaison and can get us in and get us access.

Mr. Kelly stated that they would not let Mr. Wood be put on the spot with a major decision. Judge Hetherington asked if in this 90 day period we will work out things like when Mr. Kelly gives notice to all County Officials that have stuff stored on the third floor of the courthouse that it has to be removed by 'x' date and then the Commissioners will have told us where everybody is going to move stuff to and that is one of the first things that we are going to have to deal with over there is the moving of the stuff out of the third floor.

Mr. Rhodes stated the jail floor and Judge Hetherington added and the attic.

Mr. Kelly stated that is where they want the contractor to tell us what works with him in lieu of what you need and say well I need this out of here after consulting with the sub-contractors, electrical needs to get up here and that is how the 90 day process is going to be used. That is after contract award. He needs to see what you need first because we were not able to elaborate all the conditions in that facility in a walk through.

Judge Hetherington stated that he thought it was very simply really, the earlier stages of it are probably more complicated then any of them and that is how to get all the stuff out that everybody has over there and where does it go.

Mr. Rhodes stated he expressed to the Court Clerk and to the Judge that an asbestoses abatement contract is a separate contract, which you enter into. The state law, the environmental protection agency and, all of the requirement required per state review those design documents have to be develop by someone who does asbestoses abatement design. That package still have to be developed and that is probably a 30 day time line, it has to be bid by competent asbestoses abatement people that he has talked to. They tell him that the asbestoses will probably be removed, so if it is bid over a three-week time line you have 30 days to prepare those documents. That actual work would be accomplished over a two or three Friday evening, Saturday, Sunday, long weekends. A place has to be set up for decontamination, a place to take the asbestoses out, its in nine chases of those pipe chases and they have to get rid of that and they have to air monitor tests so that the building is okay for the following Monday so when people come back. They think it can be done over two to three weekends. If you started today and got that done and got the design over 30 days and bid it over three weeks and then did the work over three weeks you are talking a 60 day time line. Based on getting that started and then visiting with the awarding contractor to coordinate the work on that floor his best guess it that you are still 60 days out before you would have to have that stuff out maybe 90 days.

Mr. Kelly stated that the asbestoses abatement contractor will have to say what has to move, also. Mr. Kelly asked if the abatement contractor going to be set up to where he is on an on call basis also or how is that contract set up? Mr. Kelly continued saying what will happen is that someplace in the building there is going to be asbestoses that nobody anticipated and it will basically shut the project down in that area temporarily unless he can be on call and he comes out that weekend or that night and cleans it up so the project is not slowed down waiting for a separate contract and asked Mr. Rhodes if that is how it is going to be set up? Mr. Rhodes stated that he thinks it needs to. Whoever does the pipe cleaning or the pipe chase cleaning, and you enter into that contract, the Board needs to have an understanding

with that contractor that any additional asbestoses that is discovered would be handled on an hourly basis or something like that.

Mr. Kelly continued saying kind of an established rate so Mr. Wood could call and asked him to come and get the asbestoses out of the way because they are going to start in this area Tuesday or Wednesday and this was just found say Monday.

Mr. Krohmer stated that the contractor would be calling the asbestoses people and Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Kelly both stated that Mr. Wood needed to be told and he would call whoever the asbestoses people are and tell them to come out and get this stuff out of the way because they are going into this area next week and we can't wait for the time period to have another contract let just to abate a small area like that.

Rhonda Hall, Court Clerk, asked if Mr. Kelly is saying that the 3rd floor may not have to have everything taken out it, maybe just certain areas.

Mr. Rhodes stated that he did not know that yet.

Ms. Hall continued saying so whoever is awarded that contract would tell us.

Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Kelly both stated that the abatement contractor would tell have to that.

Ms. Hall stated then it is possible that not everything on that floor would have to be moved.

Mr. Rhodes stated that when the construction is done and everything is torn out then it has to be out.

Mr. Kelly stated that the first step might be to get certain items out of the way so they can do their work and we don't know what that will be.

Judge Hetherington asked if Mr. Kelly anticipated the steel being removed before moving over there? If it states where the contractor moves over there an actually...because at one point it had been discussed and the Judge thought that Mr. Rhodes had mentioned that the steel had to be removed earlier on in the project, than when the 4th floor is completed over in the County Office Building and the Judges can partially move over.

Mr. Rhodes stated that they were talking about how to go into that building and one of the earlier phases was to do asbestoses abatement and the jail floor in the courthouse, but beyond that in the courthouse except for the passageway on the bottom floor there is no place to move Judges until the 4th floor is finished.

Judge Hetherington stated that his point is that the steel is going to have to be done early then the whole 3rd floor is going to have to be vacated anyway, so its not going to be a little bit here first and then everything later.

Mr. Kelly asked if for the abatement contractor does the steel have to come out before he performs his work?

Mr. Rhodes stated that they don't know that and we don't know until the meeting with the successful contractor to discuss the 3rd floor.

Judge Hetherington stated that it makes more sense to take the steel out later, he thinks, when the contractor is ready to move over there, it that is possible.

Mr. Rhodes stated that he thinks it probably is.

Mr. Rhodes asked what would be the action Monday and Chairman Krohmer stated the Board probably would not do anything until Mr. Rhodes give the Board a recommendation on the contractor.

Mr. Rhodes stated that it will be tabled for another week and Chairman Krohmer said probably so if Mr. Rhodes is not ready.

Mr. Kelly stated that they have received a list of project that Nashert Constructors had completed in the past and Ms. Howard stated it came off of the bidders website.

Ms. Howard also called Oklahoma County as Nashert had done work for them and stated that Nashert had built Oklahoma County's Annex back in '67 or '69.

Mr. Kelly stated that Nashert needed to be asked to give a current contractor qualification statement listing those contact for project within the last five years on a similar scale because we would like to talk to them. We want to take to the architect and the owner on the project just to see and if we find out that they all had problems with him, at that time the Commissioners need to be told and maybe this isn't the right contractor and then maybe you have some rational not to accept him, but Mr. Kelly doesn't have that information right now. Mr. Rhodes stated that getting a pre-qualification statement is normal in the industry it has been done for years, he asks contractors to provide that and if that is acceptable he will do that.

Chairman Krohmer stated that if he is bonded?

Mr. Rhodes stated every bidder had to bond.

Mike McDanel, Assistant District Attorney, stated that one action that probably needs to be taken Monday on the tabled item is to go ahead and consider the withdrawal of the SGS bid so that is done formally.

Dorinda Harvey, County Clerk, asked if the agenda item would cover it and he replied in the affirmative.

Chairman Krohmer asked if Mr. Rhodes would be here Monday and he replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Howard stated that she would submit the letter.

Chairman Krohmer stated that the plans are to work on both building at the same time.

Mr. Kelly stated that will be done and what is anticipated that in the 800 day period certainly for the first 600 he will be working on those elements that he can and Mr. Kelly stated those elements.

Chairman Krohmer asked about the air-conditioning all figured out and Mr. Rhodes stated that if the Board accepts the alternate which is #7 replacement of Office Building Mechanical Chillers and #8 replacement of Mechanical Controls.

Mr. Rhodes stated that Mr. Bob Wood urges that be done.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Bill Graves moved that the meeting be adjourned. George Skinner seconded the motion.

The vote was: Leroy Krohmer, yes; Bill Graves, yes; George Skinner, yes.

Motion carried.