

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

SEN. MARK W. LAWRENCE
CHAIR

REP. G. STEVEN ROWE
VICE-CHAIR



119th MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SEN. CHELLIE PINGREE
SEN. JANE A. AMERO
SEN. ANNE M. RAND
SEN. RICHARD A. BENNETT
REP. MICHAEL V. SAXL
REP. THOMAS W. MURPHY, JR.
REP. DAVID C. SHIAH
REP. RICHARD H. CAMPBELL

SARAH C. TUBBESING
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**MEETING SUMMARY
SEPTEMBER 26, 2000
APPROVED OCTOBER 25, 2000**

CALL TO ORDER

The Vice-Chair, Speaker Rowe, called the Council meeting to order at 1:23 p.m. in Room 127, State House.

ROLL CALL

Senators: Sen. Pingree, Sen. Rand
Absent: President Lawrence, Sen. Amero, and Sen. Bennett

Representatives: Speaker Rowe, Rep. Saxl, Rep. Murphy, Rep. Shiah,
Rep. Campbell

Legislative Officers: Joy O'Brien, Secretary of the Senate
Joseph Mayo, Clerk of the House
Millicent MacFarland, Assistant Clerk
of the House
James Clair, Acting Executive Director of the Legislative
Council and Director, Office of Fiscal and Program Review
David Boulter, Director, Office of Policy and Legal Analysis
Margaret Matheson, Revisor of Statutes
Lynn Randall, State Law Librarian
Paul Mayotte, Director, Legislative Information Services

SUMMARY OF AUGUST 8, 2000 COUNCIL MEETING

Motion: That the Meeting Summary for August 8, 2000 be accepted and placed on file.
(Motion by Representative Campbell; second by Representative Shiah; unanimous).

REPORTS FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OFFICE DIRECTORS

Jim Clair, Acting Executive Director reminded members that upon his appointment there were a couple of big projects underway, including migration and renovations, and that he would be doing a risk assessment of those projects. This consisted of assessing their scope, schedule and budget. He directed them to the handouts before them. Jim asked that the Migration project status be taken up first, and turned the discussion over to Paul Mayotte, Director of Information Services.

- **Migration Project Status**

Paul reported that there were no significant issues as far as scope of the bill drafting project. Compaq has completed 2 of the contract milestones and expect to have the 3rd contract milestone done by the end of the week. No change orders have been requested or issued to date. By July, the project was two months behind schedule. Compaq has recovered one of those months, so are currently one month behind the original schedule. The original contract had us turning over core functionality of bill drafting system on Oct 1 of this year and that will not happen. Core functionality for the Revisors Office will be available in the month of November, which is too late to do the systems test, training and debugging to support the drafting of bills for the 1st session of the 120th. The recommendation is that the Legislature use the WANG system for the drafting of bills for the 1st session and formally convert over for the 2nd session of the 120th. Depending on the course we take, that will drive further discussions with Compaq on the impact to the full drafting system from the cost and schedule point of view. By extending the turnover date we would have contract implications to work out with Compaq.

Representative Campbell asked about the risk factor with using the WANG. Paul noted that there is a risk and that we have been living with it for several years. The WANG has physically been moved to a temporary location because of the construction, we would want to leave it where it is so as not to endanger it's form or function. We have a 7 day a week, 24-hour a day maintenance agreement with a vendor and are in process of preparing the WANG for this session, taking all the standard steps taken in the past to make sure it is viable. The reason the migration project is taking place is because WANG is at the end of its life and there is a risk.

Several questions were asked by Council members regarding earlier implementation. Paul noted that the system could be in use earlier but there was risk in training the Revisor's staff in the middle of the session. In that situation, testing would be during the production mode and not something you want to do. The Revisor of Statutes was asked about her comfort level with the project. Meg stated that she is comfortable with the proposal as it is today, much more so than going with an untested system. Representative Saxl asked about the cost of the project, which was higher than what the council approved. Paul Mayotte noted two things: one, Dick Sawyer is working on a complete analysis of where we are in terms of funding and cost for the migration project, and will report back to the council. Second, the Compaq contract being higher than authorized – in March 2000 the Council authorized \$4.2 million for the project and the actual contract was signed for \$4.5 million. Speaker Rowe asked Paul about the delay, which is in part due to Compaq, and if there were any renegotiations of that amount? Paul noted that the Compaq team was present and could be asked directly and also mentioned that he wanted to find out what path we were going to take. If it is the

WANG path, that will give us a base line to sit down and discuss cost and schedule implementation of their delay.

Speaker Rowe asked Paul if he would like to further speak to the delay or turn the discussion over to Compaq, noting that Gene Daly, Project Manager, is prepared to answer questions. Representative Campbell asked Paul for verification about the contract value being authorized at \$4.2 million and signed for \$4.5 million. Paul verified that is, in fact, what happened. Representative Saxl asked Jim Clair to explain why the contract was signed for an amount other than what the Council had approved. Jim referred to his September, 2000 "Migration" update, page 4, and that staying within the budgeted resources is a key component. The amount available is \$5.604 million for all aspects of the project. Not only for the Compaq effort but the IRC effort. Staff is currently going over the information with a fine level of detail and with all the reserve that was established, there's a way to get this down to a \$37,000 problem in aggregate based on what we know so far. That means we can't have any other overruns. Not sure that there's anything that can be done, except as the Speaker said, if there's a way to save money given where we were in delays. Representative Campbell asked for more clarification on how the contract was signed. Paul Mayotte stated that the Executive Director at the time signed the contract. Representative Campbell asked what the reason was for the increase, the \$300,000 difference. Paul replied that the increase was there because we were unable to negotiate with Compaq further at that time, \$4.5 million was the negotiated price. Senator Bennett's subcommittee came back with the recommendation of \$4.2 million for the drafting component. We were unable to negotiate further with compact so the Executive Director at the time went ahead and signed the contract. Representative Saxl asked if this was a knowing deviation of the approved contract amount or if it was a mistake. Paul noted that it had been communicated that the gap was there. Representative Campbell asked if it was the hope it would be renegotiated down and that Compaq had no room to move. Paul noted that they had gone back to renegotiate and they (Compaq) moved three times, this was the fourth and there was no room for further negotiations. Speaker Rowe inquired about the KPMG price and Paul reminded members that it was for a different scope of work, but in the \$7 million dollar range. Representative Saxl asked if there has to be some action by the Council to deal with the deviation of the contract price. Jim replied that it would be good form. Representative Saxl asked Jim if he had a recommended course of action for avoiding a situation like this in the future. Jim referred to the budget management system, and a letter he sent earlier regarding contracts.

Speaker Rowe noted that the Budget Management System was further down on the agenda, but that discussion could take place now. Jim explained that it is related to the Migration Project and that it is his recommendation that the LBMS could be delayed. The Executive Branch has contracted with Legacy Solutions. It would make sense to see what happens there and look at the project again in June 2001. The money will be reserved that was set aside by Council for the project. Speaker Rowe noted that the Council supports that action of the Executive Director and that the Council was ready to hear from the Compaq team.

Paul introduced Gene Daly and noted the other members of the Compaq management team were present and responsible for Bill drafting project. Mr. Daly noted the project will be 9 months in duration and gave an overview of strategy, noting the program management and ownership of company was changed. July 26 was the kick off meeting and informed the Council about the scope, functionality and time line of the project. Speaker Rowe questioned time line schedule. Gene replied that there were delays in signing the contract. Based on assumptions before the contract was signed the hope was to get the full drafting capability by October 1. The Speaker inquired about the time line in the contract and Mr. Daly noted that there was no mention in the contract. In the statement of work it states that reasonable efforts to provide scope of work on October 1 would be made. Speaker Rowe noted that it was the Council's assumption that we would have this new system by next session.

The delay in implementation is the right decision, but it seems that some of the reasons for the delay were caused by corporate issues with Compaq. Mr. Daly noted that it was known at the full kickoff meeting on July 26 that we would not have the full drafting capability by October 1st. Mr. Daly then discussed the open items, chamber requirements and the physical interface definition, which is being addressed by using LDR. The LDR is being developed by the Legislatures IS team as a means to address the interface with IRC and Legacy applications. There will be meetings to further define the requirements. Mr. Daly also noted that committee functionality has not been resolved and understands the Senior Management Group is working to define the committee requirements. He noted too, that Compaq has experience in providing committee functionality for LIS systems and this could be introduced into the new application.

Speaker Rowe stated that he feels that Compaq is in large part responsible for the delay, and will be talking to Jim Clair and Paul Mayotte to take a close look at the contract. Mr. Daly noted that drafting of sentiments will have full capability for first session and bill drafting functionality will be available January 5th.

Representative Saxl asked about the March Council minutes and if there was mention of the time frame in getting full drafting up by October 1. Jim Clair replied that he believed it was a more general motion, but would get a copy of the minutes to verify that. Representative Saxl hoped that Compaq will work with us to reach original goals. Senator Rand asked if there is added cost in having to rely on the WANG for the 1st session. Paul stated that there would be some cost in getting the WANG up and running. He noted that on June 5th the a letter of engagement with Compaq was approved, and it was with understanding we would do that prior to having a formal contract signed to get a jump-start and meet the October best effort date. It was our understanding we would make that October 1 date. The Speaker proposed to sit down and discuss the issue further, and to look at the contract.

Representative Campbell asked Mr. Daly about their workload and hours and if additional staff could be added. Mr. Daly stated they are already work 60 hours a week and that staff for the project have long histories in this legislative environment. Representative Campbell asked Compaq to work to achieve a goal of Oct 15.

Mr. Daly introduced the Compaq team. Jim Clair stated he, Paul and Dick Sawyer would be sending an update to the Council regarding the budget for this project.

Representative Saxl asked about the effect of the project delay on International Roll Call and chamber support.

Joy O'Brien, Secretary of the Senate, noted that IRC is here and 100 % on schedule. They are now entering the testing phase. She cautioned the Council that all work has been based on the premise that the new drafting system would be up and running by October 1. The delay may result in a cost increase by IRC for change of scope. All work has been done with that expectation and they no longer have programs to extract information from the WANG. Representative Saxl asked if there were implications regarding the cost of the IRC contract because of delay in drafting project. Ms. O'Brien stated she did not know. Paul Mayotte replied that OIS shares their concerns and are committed to providing information from WANG to IRC in the format they need. He noted that a technical meeting with IRC, Compaq and IS is needed and will be held in the future.

Speaker Rowe asked for a status report and cost following that meeting. No Council action was taken.

Speaker Rowe requested the Council move on to **New Business**, specifically Item #4, Submission of Work Plans and Proposed Budgets for Interim Studies.

NEW BUSINESS

Item #4: Submission of Work Plans and Proposed Budgets for Approval:

- Joint Select Committee on School-based Health Care Services;
- Commission to Study Child Abuse;
- Committee to Study Access to Public and Private Lands in Maine;
- Commission to Study the Most Effective Method of Providing Retail Rate Reimbursement for Parts and Labor;
- Task Force to Study Growth Management;
- Task Force to Study Market Power Issues Related to the Solid Waste Hauling and Disposal Industry;
- Study Committee on Gasoline and Fuel Prices
- Joint Select Committee to Study the Creation of a Public/Private Purchasing to Ensure Access to Health Care for All Maine Citizens
- Committee to Study Further Decriminalization of the Criminal Laws of Maine
- The Committee to Develop a Compensation Program for Victims of Abuse at the Governor Baxter School for the Deaf

David Boulter, Director, pointed out that by design studies created by joint order did not have budgets in them and were required to hold initial meetings to develop a plan and budgets associated with that for Council approval. The studies before you all represent that for varying amounts and work plans. Some specifically asked for public hearings. David asked the Council if they wanted to go through them individually or as a block. Speaker Rowe asked David if he had reviewed the requests and if he felt they were reasonable. David noted that the work plans were developed with staff and included more detail than normal and most budget requests were within budget guidelines adopted by the Council. Four were not within those guidelines, but could be absorbed by the Legislative account because of other studies that have not used all their funds. Jim Clair noted that they looked at the budgets for these studies to see if they jibed with the work they (OFPR) had done for the Council on joint order study estimates. These requests that totaled \$8,000 more than had been set aside, could be absorbed as the FY00 had a significant balance forward. David noted that the primary reason for the increased budget requests were due to public hearing advertising. Speaker Rowe noted that several groups needed to hold meetings in different areas of the state to get public input. Representative Murphy confirmed with Jim Clair that no additional funds were needed and that the balance forward would cover these requests. Representative Campbell asked Jim Clair if he had information on cost per publication of advertising, Jim did not have that information at hand.

Motion: That work plans and budgets for these studies be approved and to notify those five groups over budget that no additional requests will be considered. (Motion by Senator Rand; second by Senator Pingree; unanimous).

Item #5: Requests for Extension of Reporting Deadline:

- Commission to Study the Needs and Opportunities Associated With the Production of Salmonid Sport Fish in Maine
- Task Force to Study Growth Management
- Study Committee on Gasoline and Fuel Prices

David Boulter brought to the Council's attention the three study groups requesting reporting deadline extensions. All those deadlines are before the session starts and from staff perspective reports can be prepared in time for the Legislature to deal with them. Representative Campbell asked specifically about the Gasoline Fuel Price study, in terms of input from the Federal Government. Representative Goodwin, Chair of the Committee, was present and replied that they have heard from and will continue to hear from people at the Federal level. Representative Saxl asked if this was the first of any extension requests from these committees. David confirmed that it is. Speaker Rowe noted that the Growth Management and the Gas and Fuel Prices studies both had budget requests and the additional meetings covered in the extension requests would be covered in the budget requests already approved. Representative Saxl asked Meg Matheson, Revisor of Statutes, if these deadlines would create any drafting problems. Meg replied that it did not pose a real problem.

Motion: That the Commission to Study the Needs and Opportunities Associated with the Production of Salmonid Sport Fish in Maine be granted an extension to December 31, 2000 and that the Task Force to Study Growth Management and the Study Committee on Gasoline and Fuel Prices be granted extensions to December 15, 2000. (Motion by Representative Campbell; second by Representative Saxl; unanimous).

Item #1: Civilian Conservation Corps Memorial

Representative Duplessie reported that the statue for the CCC Memorial will be delivered in the next few days and put into storage, and that the architect has completed the rough plan. He noted that the legislation (see PL '99, ch. 747) states the project be completed by October 1st 2000. Even though the statue is complete, it will not be installed by that date. The legislation requires that a report be presented to the Council, as well as the Capital Planning Commission. A meeting has been scheduled for October 5 with the Capitol Planning Commission for final approval of the base for the statue. Current costs have been covered with public and private funds, but fund raising is still underway. Tentatively, dedication will take place in November. Speaker Rowe inquired if the concern was the October 1st date in the law. Representative Duplessie stated that he needed to know if the Council concurs with the location and project itself. Representative Duplessie was asked if a site plan was available and replied that the location was defined in law. He was also asked if the demolition of the Education Building would have any impact on it, and informed members it would not. Landscaping will be done next year and is part of the private fund raising still working on. CCC Alumni will be able to finance some of the landscaping. Speaker Rowe inquired of Jim Clair if the Council needed to take action regarding the October 1st date. Jim referred to the legislation and noted that subject to funding, the plan must be approved by October 1. The Council's role is approving the plan and location. Representative Duplessie also noted that BGS is sponsoring the project and the site plan is currently in their hands. Representative Campbell asked about the statue and the cost of the project.

Representative Duplessie responded that the statue is bronze, 6 ft tall, and the cost was \$16,700. \$10,000 was approved for the project and \$9,800 has been raised privately. He also noted that the dedication may be on Veterans Day, November 11.

Motion: To approve the plan for the Civilian Conservation Corps Memorial. (Motion by Representative Campbell; second by Representative Murphy; unanimous).

REPORTS FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OFFICE DIRECTORS (Con't)

- **Renovations**

Jim Clair referred to a hand out and reiterated that it was critical to do a risk assessment on this project as well, meaning the scope, schedule and financial implications on those decisions made already and those yet to come. There have been few changes within the scope; the hall of flags may be the exception. There has been some slippage with the schedule. A financial summary was included in the packet and Jim reminded members that the original project was financed with four different funding sources. Two are Maine Governmental Facilities Bond Issues, \$19.3 million for the State House proper and \$4 million for the connector. There is also a \$2 million ADA bond issue, which has been spent on previous projects. The fourth source is the \$7 million supplemental appropriation. Half the total amount has been spent and we are half way through the project. Currently invoices are being reviewed, and at this time it appears that with the completion of this phase of the project, \$6.3 million is available to complete the project. Bruce and Stan are looking at what can be saved in keeping with the vision and importance of building project. Speaker Rowe asked about the total estimated cost for the completion of the project (north wing). The estimate for the north wing and exterior is \$5.7 million; the \$6.3 million available is currently above the estimated cost. Jim noted that Bruce and Stan would be discussing the GMP included in the packet, but any necessary work on the floor in the Hall of Flags was not included as an estimate is not available at this time.

Bruce Hilfrank went over the GMP budget included in the packet for Council members. Items in the GMP include 2nd floor SOB, connector, and the West Wing. He noted that \$11.820 million is the total for this phase of the project. They currently have firm quotes on all of the work and are working on 75 supplemental instructions. These figures have been used in Jim's compilation. Representative Saxl asked if we have a memo of understanding with the Executive on the costs we are sharing. No memo of understanding has been done; Stan and Jim have met with the appropriate people and are trying to get to that point. This will help to alleviate some of the problems that have taken place thus far, with notification, communication, and change in scope and schedule. Representative Saxl inquired about the possibility of the Executive absorbing some of the costs in the SOB, and was told that it was not likely. Representative Campbell asked about some of the costs for the work in the SOB, specifically the electrical work. Bruce and Stan confirmed that most of the electrical work was to include the rooms in the SOB into the State House sound systems and security systems. The question of cost in the Press area was raised as well. Bruce noted that it was in the range of the original estimated cost which represents what is required to have the systems in the State House and SOB and to work as one system. Representative Campbell then asked about the floor in the Hall of Flags and Stan Fairservice explained that currently the floor has no structural strength and that a 4-inch slab will be installed from below to provide that strength. Representative Campbell reminded the group that the cost of the work has to be included in the \$6.3 million. Stan noted that costs are down from two months ago by \$850,000 and they continue to work to keep the cost down.

Members asked about the renovations in the Law Library and the scope of the work to be done there. It was noted that the Library's temporary location will be on Capitol Street and no changes have been made to the original plan in terms of the scope of work in the Library, they will be moving back into their present space. Representative Saxl asked about the time frame in occupying the SOB. Jim Clair noted that the basement 1st, 2nd and 5th floors of SOB are scheduled to open by December 1. Jim also pointed out that at some point the proposed date for demolition of the Education building was changed to January, but had worked with the DAFS and they now have committed to a later date and to access from the south entrance of the State House to the south entrance of the SOB to be available to us. The proposed demolition date is sometime in April, when the connector is complete. Speaker Rowe asked that a memo be sent to all members with an update on the project and building(s) access. Joy O'Brien asked about demolition and how blasting will affect the Senate windows and how disruptive noise to the Senate will be as they will be in session until July. Stan replied that the building would not be demolished by blasting.

Jim referred again to a handout and pointed out that he is still working to pin down data on renovations. Cost projections for the West Wing need to be finalized and preliminary costs identified for the North Wing. It is the hope to have the bid and review process for the North Wing complete by December 31st. Recommendations from the space committee would be needed by December 1st to adopt GMP early in the process.

The next action item is the Reserve Fund for State House Preservation and Maintenance. Some costs might not be renovation proper, but are related to renovations and have been paid for in past with this fund. The Statute requires 3 steps, one that there be Legislative allocation of the money, language in Title 3 requires that \$850,000 be transferred to that fund each year and this may be considered that allocation. Second, the State House and Capitol Park Commission needs to review and make recommendation on those expenditures, there is no evidence that this has taken place in the past and membership may not be complete for this group. Third, a majority vote of the council is required. Currently, it is believed that all furnishings were purchased with the Reserve Fund. Mr. Clair recommended the Council authorize the Executive Director to have access to the Fund and to report quarterly on the expenditures are that are being made.

Motion: That the Executive Director be authorized to have access to the Reserve Fund for the State House Preservation and Maintenance and report periodically to the Legislative Council on those expenditures made from the Fund. (Motion by Representative Campbell; second by Senator Rand; unanimous).

Jim Clair reminded the Council members that they needed to review and make a motion on the 2000 renovations proposed GMP.

Motion: That the Council approve the GMP at \$11,820,089 for the 2000 renovations (Motion by Senator Rand; second by Representative Murphy; unanimous.)

- **Fiscal Update**

Jim Clair reported that revenues are way up through the end of August and members are about to see a report from the Governor reflecting General Fund Revenues up \$21.4 million after 2 months into the fiscal year. Jim noted that it is not likely those numbers will hold and reminded members that FY 00 closed with timing issues on sales tax. He also reported that the Highway Fund is in good shape as well, up \$2.5 million in the 1st two months of the fiscal year. If that holds, it's very good news for the impending structural gap in the Highway Fund. The Revenue Forecasting Committee goes into high gear next week and meets with every agency to go over the data. The Consensus Economic

Forecasting Committee is trying to finalize their recommendations and the Revenue Forecasting Committee is dependent on that work. They will be reviewing their (CEFC) preliminary findings at the first meeting. Corporate income and sales tax results for this biennium and next will be built from this process.

- **Legislative Budget for the 2002-2003 Biennium**

Jim referred to the handout on the proposed Legislative Budget, thanked Rose Breton and Dick Sawyer for their work in preparing the budgets and credited Rose Breton for largely preparing the Part 1 Budget and said that this is the 3rd "big project" underway. Jim reminded members that Title 3 suggests that the Council can have the Executive Director submit the Part I on their behalf. Jim noted that the handouts show where the budget goes from one to the next. Jim explained that the \$7 million dollar increase is in large part due to health insurance costs and the fact that an inflation factor of 2.5 % was used. This was true for services that couldn't be documented as to where they were going. Those items that are included in the increase are collective bargaining - 20% of the increase, implementation of compensation study is roughly \$1 million, ongoing merit increases, position changes, legislative salary increase, health insurance, retirement, and other minor items for other benefits all contribute to the increase as well. This estimate of "Current Services" factors in statutory adjournment as well. Increased travel recommendations reflect things that are really taking place. In Fiscal Year 2000-2001 the base \$34 million is going to \$41.2 million for the reasons just listed. Speaker Rowe reminded members that Title 3 allows the Council to request the Executive Director to submit the Legislative Budget on their behalf.

Motion: That the Acting Executive Director is authorized to submit the current services request to the State Budget Officer no later than October 1, 2000, and is further directed to gather and analyze any new or expanded requests so that the Legislative Council may begin it's review of the Legislative Budget as soon as possible. (Motion by Representative Saxl; Second by Representative Shiah; unanimous)

REPORTS FROM COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Executive Director Search Committee

Martha Freeman reported to the Council the following: the position ads went out for publication with an application deadline of October, 12. 36 resumes were received yesterday, with a majority being from out-of-state. The Search Committee met this morning and discussed how to review applications and the interview process. All members of the Council are offered the opportunity to review applications and give feedback. Martha will also have a running list of applicants and brief info if members don't have time to look at every resume. From the list, members could request that the search committee look at a particular person that merits a review. It was decided that representatives of nonpartisan offices, the Clerk and Secretary and Martha would do the same. The morning before the next Council meeting, the Search Committee will meet to decide which resumes have risen to the top and to select the number of people to interview. They will discuss the parameters of the process itself and get it solidified. The Committee tentatively picked November 20 and 21 as interview days. The last week in November at the latest the Search Committee would make recommendation to the Council and an offer could go out to have an Executive Director in place by January 1, 2001. Martha will give guidelines for reviewing resumes, pointing out issues such as confidentiality.

NEW BUSINESS (Con't)

Item #3: Legislative Budget Development for 2002-2003 Biennium

Representative Murphy noted that Item #2 under New Business was covered in Jim Clair's discussion of the Legislative Budget.

Item #6: Request for One Time Stipend for Rose Breton

Speaker Rowe noted that in recognition of the work Rose Breton, Principal Analyst, Office of Fiscal and Program Review, has done and will continue to do in preparing budget information and serving as the Assistant for Administrative Services in the Executive Director's Office he would make the following motion.

Motion: That Rose Breton, Principal Analysis in OFPR, be authorized a one time stipend for \$1,500. (Motion by Speaker Rowe; second by Representative Saxl; unanimous).

Item #7: Stanley Fairservice's Contract

Speaker Rowe reminded Council members that Stan Fairservice, Owners Representative has been operating without a contract for sometime and recently has had increased responsibilities and would make the following motion to address this issue.

Motion: That the Interim Executive Director be authorized to negotiate a contract with the Owners Representative, Stan Fairservice, to cover the balance of the renovation project through January 31, 2002. (Motion by Speaker Rowe; second by Representative Saxl; unanimous).

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Representative Saxl pointed out the memo that was distributed to members from the Rules Committee notifying them of the Committees unanimous recommendation, in terms of next years budget, that committees be authorized to meet off session. (No Council action necessary)

Speaker Rowe pointed out that following the next Council meeting, probably October 25 or 26, the council will host an employee appreciation reception.

ADJOURNMENT

The Council meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.