TIMBERLAND REGIONAL LIBRARY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES SPECIAL MEETING
1006 Sleater-Kinney S.E.
Lacey, WA 98503

August 11, 1976

# M I N U T E S

Board Members Present:

Elmer F. Keiski, Chairman - Thurston County
William H. Lawrence, Ph.D. - Member-at-Large
Rita H. McArthur - Mason County
Donald M. Cox - Pacific County
Ruth K. Schmidt - Member-at-Large

Board Members Excused:

Robert M. Baker - Lewis County
Mary Beth Mayr - Grays Harbor County

Staff Present:

Louise E. Morrison, Library Director
Virginia Barton, Assistant Director, Western Area
Mary Stough, Assistant Director, Eastern Area
Judy Green, Community Librarian, Hoquiam
Jay Windisch, Community Librarian, Raymond
Sue Allison, Public Information Assistant
Linda Hansford, Community Librarian, Montesano

Beverly Walter, Board Recording Secretary

Jane Dowdle Smith, Timberland Regional Library Attorney

Guests Present:

Richard F. McCann, R.F. McCann & Co.
Harry Powell, Consulting Engineer

Chairman Keiski called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. and stated that this special meeting had been called to review matters relating to the development of a service center and whatever concerns the trustees might have. He stated the Board had requested Jane Dowdle Smith, Attorney at Law, to review with the Board the question of the legality of selecting an architect, and they had received a letter from her dated August 6 which the board members were reviewing at this special meeting.

Mrs. Smith stated she could briefly summarize the letter. The specific question which had been asked was "Had the Board acted within its legal obligation and authority" and she found in analyzing the question, it could be broken into two basic questions: 1) Was the Board action with regard to the agreement with the architect legal and 2) inherent in this question, was the problem of entering

into a long-term lease, such as 50 or 100 years. As she had pointed out in her written opinion, there was no specific legal requirement, no statute that said the Board must call for bids for an architect. But the Supreme Court and the Attorney General over many, many years had consistently ruled that as a matter of public policy, particularly in public agencies and taxing districts such as school districts and libraries, the best course of action was to call for bids. That was the only way you could insure the residents of the community of the area covered that you were, in fact, trying to find the best possible design, or whatever it might be, by giving everybody a chance to bid. She said that in her opinion she had cited some Attorney General opinions relative to this matter. She had further discussed this problem with the Chief of the Opinion Section of the Attorney General's Office (attorneys with whom she had worked), and also with Jack Lynch, who was the Attorney for the Port (of Olympia). The first problem which arose was the fact that the minutes of the Board did not reflect the actual actions apparently authorized by the Board and carried out by the staff, primarily she thought by Mrs. Barton. The Board must be reminded that the Legislature in 1971 enacted the Open Public Meeting statute (which has since been amended), and the Washington State Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals had been very busy interpreting the Act, but the gist of their opinion had consistently been very stringent. They construed the Open Public Meeting Act to require that all public agencies must have public meetings which were properly advertised, and every action taken had been authorized in a public meeting. In a recent case, a comparable statute in Florida (which they called the "Sunshine Law") had been cited which specifically pointed out, and which the Supreme Court had adopted, that executive sessions, study sessions, or any kind of such sessions automatically meant "hanky-panky" to the public, and that was the very thing the law was designed to eliminate. She felt that undoubtedly the actions taken were done at the request of the Board, but if they were authorized at a study session, rather than at an open public meeting so that the action did not appear in the minutes, this would create a problem. Dr. Lawrence asked Mrs. Smith if in deriving her interpretation, surely the action of the Board recorded in the minutes wherein funds were authorized would certainly have indicated that the Board was cognizant of directing the staff to deal with this matter. Mrs. Smith replied that this was not good enough **under** the provisions of the Open Public Meeting statute, because in several instances in the last two years, the (State) Auditor had "gone after" public agencies where the staff may have done something authorized at other than a public meeting, but which was not recorded in the minutes, and the Board came back and approved the action or appropriated the money. The State Auditor had said that was no good, that they could not let the Board, after the fact, go back and approve something which had already been done, and for which there was no authority in the statute. She reitereated this was an area in which the Auditor and the Attorney General opinions had been consistent, which meant that when a member of the staff was authorized to talk to an architect or a planner, it had to be in the minutes and recorded as such. Mrs. Smith then discussed the problem relating to the architect and stated that she was just assuming from what Mrs. Morrison had told her, that Virginia Barton at the suggestion of Mr. Siebold of the Port of Olympia talked to their consultant, a Mr. Isaac, who had been working with a consulting engineering firm and doing some developmental work and also attempting to get federal funds. Mr. Siebold explained they were actually doing some planning for the City of Olympia, but basically the Port had been paying the money for the firm even though it encompassed a greater area, and as Mrs. Smith understood it, Mrs. Barton was authorized to go and discuss these matters with them. The question arises when

you get into dealings with the architect who is officed in the same building (although it makes no difference legally whether they are partners or what the association is), it is the fact that it is easy to go from one step to the other without having this documented. She did not think there was any question, but what the discussions with Mr. Isaac's firm were satisfactory, but then when it got into dealing with an architect without anything reflected in the minutes and the architect starts work, the first thing that happens is you go step by step, particularly when you have a time problem, you are suddenly involved in a situation that could be questioned by the Auditor because there is simply no detailed authorization from the Board in the minutes. She advised the Board that she thought the important thing was for the Board to remember that under the provisions of the Open Public Meeting law, actions cannot be approved after the fact. The Auditor and the Attorney General have both gotten much more rigid on this than they used to be and they could go back and set it aside and the Board, of course, is primarily liable for any actions of the library and in the event they would set aside some action that had been taken, somebody was going to have to come up with however many thousands of dollars that had been appropriated for use. It was a matter of (board members) protecting themselves and protecting their staff and just good public relations that it should have been done, particularly in this day and age where there is great competition for architects and for planners. Local people would be very annoyed if it had been done without giving them an opportunity to compare plans. Chairman Keiski then read the opinion written by Mrs. Smith and advised the trustees they could ask questions.

Letter from Jane Dowdle Smith to Mr. Elmer Keiski:

"You have asked for legal advice concerning action taken by the Board of Trustees in entering into an agreement with a consulting engineering firm, Walter M. Isaac & Associates, in Seattle, and an architect, McCann and Company, architects of Seattle, for planning and designing a service center for Timberland Regional Library at the Airdustrial Park of the Port of Olympia. My legal advice is based upon the official records of Board action contained in portions of the minutes furnished to me by Mrs. Morrison, Director of the Library from March 25 through July 15, 1976.

"Your request for advice poses two legal questions, the first regarding the necessity for the Board to call for bids prior to entering into an agreement for an architect, and the second regarding the legal implication of the Board signing a long-term lease of 50 years or more with the Port.

"There is no requirement in the statutes relating to public libraries (Chapter 27.12 RCW) which specifically states that the Board of Trustees of an inter-county regional library must call for bids for architectural or consulting services. It has been a matter of public policy in this state enunciated by the courts and the Attorney General for many years that public agencies should call for bids for all contracts in order to insure that the public receives the benefit of multiple choice in design, planning and cost.

"In the case of Reiter v. Chapman, 177 Wash 392, 397, 31 P. (2d) 1005 (1934) our Supreme Court stated as follows:

> 'The principle of giving notice of proposed public contracts is, broadly speaking, in the public interest... Statutes controlling the making of contracts by the officers of municipal corporations are laws for the protection of the public and those who support public agencies by the payment of taxes. Generally speaking, a sound public policy supports the proposition that a reasonable notice shall be given of the letting of public contracts, in order that, by competition in bidding, the public may receive the benefit of the greatest possible value for the least expenditure.
> Grace v. Fobes, 118 N.Y. Supp. 1062.' (P. 397)
> See Also A.G.O. 1957-58 No. 116.

"In an opinion to the Executive Secretary of the Washington State School Directors Association regarding a school district calling for competitive bids, the Attorney General stated as follows:

> 'While not required (competitive bids) there is nothing which would prevent districts from complying with the 1961 act (requiring it) if the same would be in the best interest of the district. Futhermore, in our opinion, we can think of no more effective method for school directors to demonstrate to the electors that they are discharging their duties in a manner calculated to provide the district with the most prudent investment (financial management).'
> A.G.O. 1961-62 No. 103.

"The real problem posed in the first question is not strictly and entirely a matter of the legal requirements which must be followed by the Board of Trustees. Care should be taken so that all actions taken by the Board of Trustees which are to be carried out by the staff of the library must be shown to have been authorized by the Board and set forth in the official minutes of the meetings so that the auditor can trace the legal actions of the Board. In the present instance, the minutes are unclear as to the specific authorization by the Board of Trustees of the initial discussions between staff and Mr. Isaac and also Mr. McCann.

"I have discussed these matters with Jack Lynch, attorney for the Port, and Mr. Gene Siebold. It appears that the Port has used the services of the firm of consulting engineers, Walter Isaac & Associates, for planning purposes and to check out the availability of federal funds (EDA) for the Olympia area as well as the Port, and I assume that Mr. Siebold gave Mr. Isaac's name to the library staff. There appears to be no question but that the initial discussions with Mr. Isaac by the library staff were in accord with the Board's concern for the construction or lease of a new service center. However, the problem arises with the retention of the architects, McCann & Associates, whose office is in the same suite as Mr. Isaac's firm. The first mention I found in the minutes regarding Mr. McCann are those of March 25, 1976 which state that the firm of McCann & Associates of Seattle had written a letter dated March 24, 1976 to the Board regarding a Supplemental Proposal for Project Development in conjunction with a Timberland staff inquiry

to the Port regarding a possible site for the new service center at the Port. This is the sort of action where the minutes are unclear as to why this particular firm was chosen, and could be the subject of close scrutiny and review by the state auditor.

"Mr. Siebold advises me that he questioned the use of Mr. McCann and his staff with the library staff when the situation first arose. The minutes in this instance (March 25, 1976) do not show clearly that the Board specifically authorized the discussions with McCann or that the Board was in fact aware that they were engaging the services of an architect to begin the planning and design process for a facility which will eventually cost from $300,000 to $500,000 and which could conceivably lock them into a long-term commitment. It was at this point that the discussion by the Board or authorized staff with several architects including some in the Olympia area should have been started with a view to calling for bids, as a matter of public policy and good public relations.

"In the course of my research on this matter, the Assistant Attorney General who advises the State Auditor, advised me that in several instances in the past where a board of trustees (or school districts) has subsequently ratified the action taken by the administrators, the auditor has taken exception to the action and required the board members to repay the public funds advanced. Inasmuch as the legal responsibility for the administration of the library is concerned, including spending of public funds and all staff activities, is upon the Board of Trustees, it is necessary that the minutes, the official record of all Board actions, be specific, clear and detailed.

"I do not know what the time schedule for a design of the building is at this time, nor the present availability of federal funds, and it may be that the Board of Trustees has no alternative, as a practical matter, other than to continue with the present architect. If such is the case, the actual construction of the building should be put out for competitive bidding with alternatives contained in the specifications so that no firm or company is automatically awarded the bid.

"The second question inherent in the request for legal advice, is whether the Board of Trustees has the legal authority to enter into a long-term lease for a period of 50 to 100 years.

"In numerous instances, the Supreme Court of the State of Washington and the Attorney General have been rather strict in the past in limiting the term of a lease, which could be entered into by any public agency in the State, to the number of years or length of the term of the Board members. In this instance, the only way that a long-term lease for fifty or more years could be entered into by the Board of Trustees would be if the Port of Olympia would agree to modification of their usual lease to provide for earlier termination of the lease. In addition, some provision would have to be worked out with regard to the building, if public funds are used for construction. The federal funds obtained to build or assist in

construction of the building undoubtedly contain some restrictions on the use or sale of the building. Thus, the lease will require careful negotiation and preparation by the attorneys for the parties after the various factors affecting the lease have been resolved.

"I have discussed the matter of the lease with Jack Lynch, the attorney for the Port of Olympia, and he advises me that he is certain that a lease can be worked out between the Port and the Board of Trustees which would authorize the termination of the lease at any point in time upon the giving of proper notice with necessary provisions for the disposition of the building if it is built with public funds.

"I trust this answers your questions. If you need any further advice concerning this matter, please call me."

Dr. Lawrence stated that the Board may have acted imprudently, but asked Mrs. Smith if they were not illegal in proceeding if they chose to do so with the present architect. Mrs. Smith stated they were not violating any specific statute, but it was a matter of public policy and the State Auditor could issue an audit report criticizing the action where the Board had violated public policy. Dr. Lawrence suggested that the Director go back and examine the tapes from previous meetings which might conceivably contain some conversation or an important phrase or direction which had inadvertently been omitted from the minutes. Discussion then followed regarding the tapes. Chairman Keiski stated that he had asked Mrs. Morrison to provide a scenario as to how the Board had proceeded and requested that the memo dated August 11, 1976 to Becky Morrison from Virginia Barton could assist in clarifying the matter, and requested the memorandum be made part of the record. It reads as follows:

"Steps I have been able to reconstruct from materials in my file include the following:

"February 1976 Mrs. Barton read in a newsletter that North Central Regional Library had agreed to have a building constructed at Port of Wenatchee, the building partially financed by EDA funds, to be leased to the library district by the port district.

"February 1976 The trustees and director were informed (through a memorandum to the director) that with permission Mrs. Barton would investigate further any possibilities of arranging anything similar for Timberland. Board and director agreed that Mrs. Barton should investigate.

"February 1976 Telephone call to EDA in Seattle referred her to Mr. Frank McChesney, in charge of the southern part of Washington State. Mr. McChesney said there was little likelihood of EDA funding, but that port districts had property and money to lend, and that a building could be constructed on port district property with a low-cost lease. He cited some of the requirements for consideration for location at port district property: keeping jobs in a local area, and improving a service to the local area. He referred Mrs. Barton to two people: Mr. Walter Isaac, a planning consultant to Port of Olympia, and Mr. Gene Siebold, Manager.

"March 4 Mary Stough and Virginia Barton met at Mr. Walter Isaac's office in Seattle, to talk with Mr. Isaac. Mr. Isaac said the Port Commission would meet March 9, and he would mention the TRL project. He said the port district could consider building a service center and leasing it to the district at a favorable interest rate.

"March 4 Mr. Isaac introduced Mr. Richard McCann, an architect with offices in the same building, who had experience in designing learning resource centers. Mr. Isaac said that the President had vetoed a public works bill, and that there were no federal funds available.

"Mr. McCann recommended an open concept building,

"Mr. Isaac would ask Mr. Siebold to write to Timberland.

"Mr. McCann would write a proposal for preliminary planning to present to the board.

"Mr. Isaac wrote to Mr. Siebold explaining the TRL project in brief. He asked Mr. Siebold to write to TRL explaining terms.

"March 8 Mr. Siebold wrote to TRL, including possible terms for leasing a building, an aerial photograph, and a sample lease agreement.

"March 25 Memo from Virginia Barton to Becky Morrison with 2 proposals for planning from Mr. McCann. In two stages, each taking six to eight weeks. A proposed building to be constructed. If 20,000 square feet, cost might be $3,000 per month.

"May 19, 1976 Letter from McCann and Co., stating that on May 10, work began.

"June 1, 1976 Service Center Building Committee met at Dr. Lawrence's office in Centralia to receive from McCann and Jorgenson preliminary estimates of space and equipment needs for work performed. Committee asked McCann to be prepared to meet again July 15 at the Service Center in Lacey, because Dr. Lawrence was going to Europe.

"June 11 Mrs. Morrison, Mrs. Barton met with Mr. McCann and Mr. Jorgenson in Seattle just before Mrs. Barton left on vacation, to discuss further planning.

"June 14 Mrs. Morrison wrote asking that a piece of property be reserved at Port of Olympia.

"July 15 A special board meeting had been arranged to discuss the North Mason building project. Since the building committee planned to meet, it seemed better that a board quorum meet rather than only the committee.

"July 15 The board agreed that McCann and Co. would proceed through step 5½ of planning, which included design, development, and construction documents.

"July 15 The board was informed that Congress would reconvene the following week, and contrary to precedent the veto of the public works bill might be overridden.

"July 21-22 The veto was overridden in both House and Senate. Prior to that time vetoes had been upheld in the Senate.

"July 28 Mrs. Morrison wrote a letter to Mr. Mark Smith of EDA (regional administrator in Seattle). She requested an application when funds became available.

"August 2 A copy of a memo was received at TRL. The memo was from J.C. Swanson, Chairman, to members of the Thurston County Overall Economic Development Plan Committee. It stated that Timberland was included in the OEDP list of projects for funding under the public works act, S 3201. Projects approved must be ready for on-site construction within 90 days of receipt of approval."

Mrs. McArthur stated that she had noticed that the letter from Mr. Isaac had the same address as that of the Architect, Mr. McCann. Mrs. Morrison replied that at the meeting of March 26, the minutes reflected a specific phrase which read "A proposal from the architect who is a partner with the planning consultant had been received" and this was an erroneous statement. They were not partners, but shared a suite of offices. Mrs. McArthur stated she was not aware of that until she checked and noticed the addresses were the same, and she was surprised that Mr. Isaac was urging that this Board approve Mr. McCann, and she had previously brought her concerns regarding this matter to the attention of the Board. Dr. Lawrence stated that a competitive bid process for the construction of the building would relieve the board of any suggestion of collusion. Mrs. McArthur also stated she had very mixed feelings about the letter Mrs. Morrison had sent (to board members) from Mr. Powell who stated that any reputable construction company could enter into competitive bidding. She questioned this statement because of the design, and particularly with the dome, because this type of construction had not been used that many times. Mrs. Barton stated that she had a conversation via telephone and had been advised there were two firms in the Los Angeles area which were constructing their own forms on Harry Powell's design. Mrs. McArthur replied the building under discussion was in Washington and these things needed to be discussed. Dr. Lawrence then stated the Board should resolve matters in an orderly fashion and the first question was whether there was any record or any way of reconstructing from the minutes whether the Board did, in fact, direct that contact with the architect. He stated that Mrs. McArthur's concerns were very legitimate concerns, but felt it would be handled when the Board decided whether they were going to build this particular building and put it out for competitve bids. Mrs. McArthur then asked if any minutes were taken at the Board retreat. Discussion followed regarding the Board retreat, and since it was not a public meeting and notice requirements had not been met, it was not an official board

meeting. Chairman Keiski reminded the Trustees that they did get letters from the planner and the architect stating where their offices were located, that they were not partners, and also they had received a letter from the consulting engineer regarding the forms and Mr. Powell would be at the meeting tonight and the Board could ask him questions and resolve the matter. Mrs. McArthur stated that she was simply trying to reconstruct the matters relating to the service center and again questioned whether this matter had been considered at the retreat. Mrs. Smith advised the Board that the law specifically stated that if they had considered it and did not follow the provisions of the statute, it would be null and void. Further discussion followed, with the Board reviewing the minutes for the past several months, Mrs. Barton's contact with the Port of Olympia planning the possible site, her contact with EDA relative to federal funding, and specific dates and times. Dr. Lawrence reiterated that he felt the tapes from the previous meetings should be reivewed to see if there was some reference or some statement by a Board member or a phrase which stated the staff should pursue this matter, then there would be a record. Mrs. McArthur asked Mrs. Smith if this were true. Mrs. Smith advised her that she did not know whether that would solve the problem because the Board still had the problem of the point at which you go from any planning to any architect--this is the area in which you have to hire an architect--and this is the question where you could say "well, maybe we should have input from local architects and see which architect comes up with the best solution." Dr. Lawrence stated that he is willing to face the question with the state auditor, but he wanted to be sure that there would be no suggestion that the Board took this action and there was no record. Mrs. Smith stated that when a situation such as this occurred, the Auditor was not impuning the Board's motives, but it was a question of what showed in the record and how they could trace it.

Chairman Keiski stated that the Board was back to the two basic questions Mrs. Smith had brought out in her letter, and while she was at the meeting the Board should use her advice. He stated that Dr. Lawrence had suggested that the tapes be reviewed to see if there was further clarification on directing the staff. The Board had made a commitment as of July 15 for additional hours of work by that architect to bring this up to a given point should federal funds come in; then the Board could review at that point in time.

Dr. Lawrence said that he felt the fundamental question was, as Mrs. Smith had pointed out, the Board had not done anything illegal; but may not have acted quite as prudently as they might in terms of the record or in terms of asking for two or three architects to do this; and he felt the question now would be whether the Board stopped the process or continued the process and then insured competitive bidding (on construction). Mrs. McArthur stated that it was her feeling that perhaps the tapes should be reviewed in order to understand why the Board was at the stage they were now. She felt questions had been unanswered; that at first they were talking about tilt-up building and jumped from talking about tilt-up buildings to approving this architect and she did not know how it happened. The Board had obtained this architect, who was on a temporary preliminary proposal, and the Board had jumped right straight from a tilt-up building to this. Dr. Lawrence stated that the architect had presented some cost figures about construction and a tilt-up concrete building was the most economical. Mrs. McArthur stated that was right, and that was the type he was recommending, and then the Board jumped right from the tilt-up building to approving these plans, and she wanted to know how this happened.

Mrs. Schmidt stated she felt the Board got to a point, and appreciated Jane Dowdle Smith saying how this could happen, but there were some things on which she had raised questions. She had pointed out to the Board that the Olympia Library had interviewed 11 firms, had issued invitations, and every point she raised about this, she was always reminded that if the Board was going to get federal funds, they had to push through on this, and they had pushed through and she stated that at the Ocean Park meeting. She said that she had said very firmly and loudly that this was the worst public relations the Board could have engaged upon simply because it would be bad enough if Olympia had done so (that was only one county) but the Board was a five-county area and they were facing all five Counties. She stated that they had gone from a building of some 15,000 square feet which would cost approximately $300,000, and now had reached a building that had almost equal parts--building and parking--with another 11,000 square feet for landscaping, and at $16.53 a square foot, the price was up to $617,849 and the Board had given no thought to this. She felt that Board members allowed themselves to be carried along under the momentum of the "carrot" (federal funding) out there, and that was the only justification she could make for the Board acting in this manner. She felt that the Board had been weakened by the absence of Bob Baker, who was very cognizant of costs.

Chairman Keiski stated that he felt the Board had tried to plod through this matter as slowly as possible so that everyone knew what each step was, and at the last meeting in July (15th) Dr. Lawrence had moved and Rita McArthur had seconded, and the motion had passed unanimously that McCann and Associates continue with additional contract work; there was another motion made on the planning of the service center in the amount of 250 hours made by Dr. Lawrence and seconded by Mrs. McArthur, which had authorized the present contract, and now after several meetings, the procedures as to how the Board arrived at this point were questioned. The Chairman stated that he assumed everyone had all of their questions answered as the Board moved along.

Mrs. McArthur reviewed some specific questions which had been asked and stated that they still did not have answers. Mrs. Schmidt stated that at the meeting at which Mr. McCann came and gave his presentation when this matter came up (July 15), she did not realize they were going to have a motion before the Board to approve another two steps. Chairman Keiski asked why she did not say something then. Mrs. Schmidt stated that again she thought when the Chairman stated "Why didn't you say something then" she herself had asked several times and Mrs. Morrison would recall, that they had quite a session going and coming from the meeting at Ocean Park, and the answer was always that "we cannot stop now because if we stop now and we do not have this, we cannot get this underway in 90 days." In asking how the Board could possibly justify its action, and as Mrs. Jane Dowdle Smith so kindly pointed out in her letter, possibly the fact that the Board was faced with no alternatives as a practical matter other than to continue, would be the only justification for going along. She stated that she had sat on the Board and approved, and would admit that she did not understand when Mr. Isaac introduced Mr. McCann as the architect, that the Board was committed, and there was no way back. The Board had not stated at that point to Mr. McCann "but of course you understand we will be asking other architects to submit plans" for the simple reason that she felt the staff received instructions, although she had not found a motion to that effect. In fact, the Board had made it quite general in which there was no end point "go this far--come back-- and at that point we will do so and so." Dr. Lawrence interjected

that all he understood was the Board was getting a plan for a building. Mrs. Schmidt stated that she had been told over and over again there was no way back--that the Board was committed-- and asked Mrs. Morrison to state to the Board what she had stated to her several times, very forcefully, as Dr. Lawrence now did not feel the Board was committed. Again Dr. Lawrence stated the Board was not committed until they approved the plans and Mrs. Morrison agreed. Mrs. Schmidt stated Dr. Lawrence had implied it was of the utmost importance that it be approved. Mrs. Morrison stated they would have to be ready to go to construction in 90 days. Mrs. Schmidt asked if the Board did not approve the plans and had invested "x" number of dollars, what would happen then. Dr. Lawrence replied that the Board had a plan, a study of a building, apparently there were some questions relating to it, but that the Board was not committed to anything except to get a plan for a service center. Mrs. Schmidt then stated just supposing the Board members said they were committed, they approved the plan, they got the money for it, then it was paid for, of course, and they were in the clear; but, say the Board spent all of this money and had a plan and it was their plan, but they still had not invited any other architect--they would have a plan that was paid for, but no money to pay for another plan. Dr. Lawrence remarked he did not know. Mrs. Schmidt felt she did not know either, but was worried about it. Mr. Cox stated that if they had considered six architectural firms, they would have presented plans and their thoughts, and he agreed it was unfortunate that the Board had not considered anyone else, but felt they had a very capable architect. Mrs. Schmidt again replied that she was not impuning his capability but was stating that Timberland was a five-county system and they had not invited one architect from even one of the five counties, and to say that it was unfortunate was putting it mildly.

Dr. Lawrence felt that perhaps the opportunity to get federal funds had been a driving force which moved the process along and said that he would not deny that, and perhaps in the staff's eagerness, they had moved along in order to qualify, but still thought the Board was in control of the process by virtue of its ability to stop it or authorize its continuation.

Discussion followed. Mrs. McArthur stated that one of the problems facing the Board was that the meetings started at 7:30 p.m. and they tried to get out by 10 p.m., and one could not conduct a $2,300,000 a year business that way. Chairman Keiski said he was open for suggestions; all board members were volunteers; but most of the time they worked during the day. He asked for recommendations on how to expedite the business of the Board. Mrs. Schmidt futher stated her concerns that at this special meeting, someone would bring up a motion before the Board to carry it another step in the wave of the desire to qualify for federal funding, and since this was a special meeting, she hoped they would not take any action beyond that to which the Board had previously committed itself. Board members were committed for another 250 hours; they had spent $5,000 and possibly more, and at one point in a memo from Mrs. Morrison, she stated that the architect had already put in 120 hours, and Mrs. Schmidt wanted to know if the $5,000 already paid him was the 120 hours, and how much more the next 250 hours would cost, and if the Board was legally and morally obligated to pay it. Chairman Keiski replied that the next 250 hours, as of July 15, would cost $2,152. He did not know how far the architect had progressed in the new authorization on the new 250 hours, but felt the Board should ask him when he appeared for the presentation. There was general discussion by the Board on moneys expended and the additional costs which had

been authorized as far as the fee was concerned. Dr. Lawrence felt that the Board needed to ask the architect what it was dealing with in the way of costs. Chairman Keiski remarked he would like to answer Mrs. Schmidt's question about the total cost: The record showed on the meeting of July 15, 1976 "The Board then asked for clarification of Dr. Lawrence's motion so that they would be aware of dollars and hour amounts. Mr. McCann stated the actual money figure was $12,775" which the Chairman assumed would complete this portion. All of these questions should be asked of Mr. McCann when he made his presentation at the meeting tonight. Don Cox stated there was another motivating force besides the federal funding, and that was the fact that the service center was located in inadequate quarters and needed new quarters, and that was something very real. Mrs. Schmidt further reminded Board members that they had been promised, in writing, a budget of how much it would cost for a building, with alternatives, and the Board still had no facts or figures, and she felt it was important the Board have this information. Further discussion followed relative to the architect's fees, whether fees paid him so far were included in his overall cost, building costs, and whether or not the Board could accept the plans drawn by Mr. McCann, and then hire another architect if they so desired; or if the Board did not like the plans Mr. McCann presented, to ask him to design a different building. At this point, Mrs. McArthur asked Jane Dowdle Smith for advice. Mrs. Smith replied that as she had pointed out in the opinion, it was unfortunate the Board had gotten into a situation like this, but as a practical matter, which was not a legal question, the situation would be determined to a large degree by the fact of whether the Board did intend to get federal funds, and did intend to continue through, and she did not know if the time framework was such that they would have time to take the plans, if they wanted, and ask other architects to design a building and then ask for competitive bidding. She felt the legal position was fixed as of now. Mrs. Morrison stated that as far as the architect and any design he might come up with, it was probably the most economical thing that could be planned. The point at which he moved away from the concrete tilt-up was because he did not know what the funding would be, whether he would have to build a building in two or three pieces or whether he would be able to build it all at once. If he built it all at once, a concrete tilt-up was no problem, as the architect had explained to her that the outside wall was a supporting wall with laminated beams; it was earthquake absorbent; but you would not be able to take that outside wall off later and expand the building. You wuld have to build more compartments which would destroy the effect of the building, and the domed concept was as old as Methuselah.

Dr. Lawrence felt the Board should be aware that they had committed themselves to a new service center, whether they went with the building Mr. McCann was designing or not. But he said the clock was running on the lease of the present service center; the clock was running on the federal grant and he was sure the taxpayers in the five counties might be unhappy because of the selection of the architect unilaterally, but the majority of them would not object to using federal funds to facilitate the grant if it meant in the future, the funds from tax derived revenues would not be used; and a third clock running, which was inflation. Also, the attendance of the Board was voluntary and not all members could attend each meeting, and Dr. Lawrence wanted to go on record saying the Board could not conduct the business of the library on a full-attendee basis, and decisions must be made by the trustees that represented the quorum and communications must be made with absentee members to get their input.

The Chairman then stated that while Jane Dowdle Smith was present, he wished to ask her advice on the first question (as to the legality on the selection of the initial planning). Dr. Lawrence felt that question had been answered. The Chairman then asked if the second question had been answered regarding the term of the lease. Mrs. Smith stated she had talked to Jack Lynch, Attorney for the Port, and there was no problem there. However, the Board would have to take into consideration that if they used federal funds, there would be certain restrictions, and the terms of the lease would have to be such that the Board would not have any difficulty with a 50 or 100 year term as opposed to 6 years. Dr. Lawrence felt that by leasing the land from the Port, it was saving approximately $50,000. Discussion following regarding retaining Mrs. Smith as the Board's attorney, and Mrs. McArthur felt Mrs. Smith should be involved in all aspects of building the service center so the Board could take her advice. Chairman Keiski stated that a motion had been made at the Hoquiam meeting to retain Mrs. Smith as the Board's attorney. Dr. Lawrence asked that it be made a matter of record that Jane Dowdle Smith had been given a specific job assignment to participate as legal counsel in the construction of the service center, including lease negotiations, review of construction plans, and all phases of the contracts and actual construction.

Mrs. Schmidt requested copies of the minutes of the Board meetings be sent to Mrs. Smith. She also expressed her concerns again relating to the Board not having a legal description of the proposed site, and concerns over the size of the site, which had changed from the original size, and further advised the Board members that the property had not been staked, nor was there a sign indicating this particualr site was the future site of Timberland Regional Library Service Center. Chairman Keiski stated that Mrs. Smith would include the site description in the lease, and the Director had a letter from the Port which stated where the site was located, with attached photographs, and had also been advised they did intend to post it as to the future location of the library building. Also, Mrs. Morrison reminded the Board that the Port Commission had final review of the plans prior to construction on the site. Mrs. Smith was requested to stay for the remainder of the meeting. Chairman Keiski further stated that the Board had options of terminating the present architect at the end of completion of the present work authorized by the Board, and asked the board members to ask any questions of him at his presentation they so desired. Dr. Lawrence requested the Board be polled to see whether they wanted to meet the deadlines for obtaining federal funds, and then they would have a course of action. However, if the Board decided not to try for federal funds, they could coast along at whatever pace they desired. Mrs. McArthur said that she felt it would be a good idea to poll the Board, but her question was whether or not the Board had to tie this particular architect to the federal funding, and if the Board had the alternative of getting the preliminary plans that he was working on, and which the Board was buying, and then asking another architect to work on them. Mrs. Morrison stated she felt the Board could do anything.

Mrs. Schmidt directed a question to Mrs. Morrison regarding a memorandum dated July 30 from Mr. Swanson regarding this Public Works development, wherein on page 1, point 5, she had underscored a sentence reading "Grants can be made only when it is shown that on-site labor can begin within 90 days of project approval", and wanted clarification as to whether within 90 days, the Board

would have to advertise for bids and be ready to go to construction. Mrs. Morrison replied that on-site construction bids must be ready in 90 days. Mrs. Schmidt felt that this was a factor that must not be overlooked.

The meeting recessed at 8:15 and reconvened at 8:30.

Chairman Keiski introduced Mr. McCann and Mr. Powell to the Board members, staff and guests, and stated that they would proceed under the assumption that the Board members would ask questions regarding the design of the building and how work was proceeding.

Dr. Lawrence asked for clarification of the records, as to the meeting held in his office on June 1, and at which time he had asked Mr. McCann and his associates to come back to the Board with a plan that was bare bones; and one which they felt represented a substantial building sizewise which would handle the needs over a decade. He felt at that time the Board would be looking at a top plan, a minimum plan, and an in-between plan. Mr. McCann had come back to the Board on June 15 with a plan, which Dr. Lawrence really felt represented the ultimate building, and then a bare-bones building, but he had not made a proposal on an in-between. He had submitted his estimate of the needs based on a work study, and then Dr. Lawrence believed that was a part to that plan which stated those were the bare minimum. Mr. McCann replied that they had a bare minimum in case of a budget tightening, but what they were offering on July 15 was to provide a facility that one could operate in, but still get it outside of what would be considered a warehouse category, and as inexpensive a structure as would be serviceable. Dr. Lawrence asked him if in his professional judgment, he did in fact come back with a two-level plan, which in spirit met his concerns. Mr. McCann added one bit of clarification, and that was in taking the figures he had square footage wise, one could reduce them by 15% to the lower figure. However, as fast as the library was growing, if in fact there was a need for expansion in five years, it would cost more money within several years of the original construction than what would be saved now by building a smaller portion at this time. Dr. Lawrence then asked how Mr. McCann had arrived at the analysis of the work needs. Mr. McCann stated that it had been derived from what they call programming, in that it came first from Virginia Barton and Becky Morrison which was the first level of involvement, from what an administrator sees as important; and then to the second level which would be the employees actually talking to the people who were working at the desks, using the card files, etc. They had been at the service center on at least four days, and Mr. Jorgensen had been able to come and literally sit down at each desk and review the functions. Dr. Lawrence asked if these findings would be reflected in their thinking and planning. Mr. McCann stated they had attempted to organize information. It was one thing to list information, but to relate this information was where architecture took place. Today, the architect was an organizer, and that was the key point. Mr. Cox asked Mr. McCann if on the Board's dollar fee schedule and the amount of involvement with him, should he be engaged as the architect for the entire project to see the building to its end, would the dollars that the Board had expended to the point he had been hired to date be included as part of the payment of this overall architectural fee, say his fee was 7% as an example. Mr. McCann stated that in present practice standards, architects were not to state to any client that they would charge them on a percentage fee. Mr. Cox

commented what Dr. Lawrence was trying to say was, "Would it be more expensive for the Board to go to another architectural firm from here on in, or continue with Mr. McCann?" What he was trying to do was pinpoint the dollars the Board had spent and whether they would be incorporated in the overall fee or were they "plus" dollars to the overall fee. Mr. McCann replied that he had already stated their fee which was offered; it was right on the sheet. It was important because on the sheet, you have at the end a building you can walk into. He asked if Mr. Cox was asking if another architect would do it for less money? Mr. Cox replied that was not what he was saying. Dr. Lawrence asked Mr. McCann if the work he was doing now was part of the total fee for the package. Mr. McCann replied that they had agreed that sections labeled four and five were the present, and one and two had been comprised of what was officially the first phase of $5,000 allocated by the Board. In other words, they were half-way through number four, or getting to the end of number four. Mrs. Schmidt asked if the Board was not in the 250 hours that had been allocated at the last meeting, which theoretically would take the Board up to Step 5½ or Step 4½, or right in there. Mr. McCann replied that Step 5 was 300 hours and that was where they picked up the Board's one-half of 300--at 105, so 100 plus 150 is 250. Mr. Cox asked if that meant through Step 5½. Mr. McCann replied at that point, if the Board were to take the drawings, which they had completed, and give them to another architect to finish, someone in his office could continue. Mr. Cox stated that all the Board was questioning was that the Board had not contacted or interviewed or considered any other architect and that had made some of the Board members a little uneasy. Mr. McCann asked if that was a legal requirement. Mr. Cox replied not as he understood it. Dr. Lawrence stated that it had been pointed out to the Board that it was a prudent course of action, but that they had not broken any laws, rules or regulations.

Mr. McCann stated that what they were doing as a design approach was what would be possible for the best cost break, and gave a brief resume of other architectural work which he had done, including theaters, etc. Chairman Keiski then asked if any general contractor could bid on this particular design in view of the reservoir concept multi-room roof system with conduits for post-tensioning. Mr. Powell advised him that any knowledgeable contractor would be able to bid on that design. Further discussion followed relating to bidding on this particular design structure. Dr. Lawrence stated he thought the questioning was directed to whether the Board was locking itself into a unique system of construction which would reduce the opportunity for competitive bidding. Mr. Powell replied that they would not be locked into any particular contractor or anyone.

Mrs. McArthur questioned, in terms of being locked in, that Mrs. Morrison had stated the reservoir had been constructed by the use of forms--if the construction company which built the reservoir happened to get the bid, would they have an advantage in being able to use the forms which they already had built? Mr. Powell replied that they would rent those forms to anybody, and if they did the job themselves, they would include a form-rental price in

the bid. Dr. Lawrence stated this was common business practice. Mr. McCann stated any contractor was open to bid on this design, and could also make his own forms. Mr. Cox again asked if the Board did not like the reservoir type design, if there was any reason why Mr. McCann could not design a conventional building. Mr. McCann then explained in some detail the general design of the proposed building. Mr. Cox stated that this was not answering his question. He said he had no objection whatever to the design, but wanted to know if Mr. McCann was flexible so that if the Board decided to scrap this particular building design, he could come up with another type of building. Mr. McCann stated that he could take the floor plan and build it with contrete blocks and long span joints, but that it would cost more. Mr. Cox said he was just concerned as to whether the plan was flexible. Mrs. Schmidt also questioned that, since this building was so innovative whether the Port might think it did not fit in with other structures already built at the site, and as a public body, they had to consider this. Also, she had a question regarding the storage of books and asked how many volumes the building was designed to hold. Mr. McCann stated they were not going by volumes because the volumes came in all sizes, but they had taken figures Jan Blumberg had given them in terms of vertical heights and measures of what was used now, and increased that two-fold, and they were actually concerned about linear footage. Mrs. Schmidt asked if that information could be provided to the Board. Dr. Lawrence stated the Board had been "osmosing" into this arrangement with Mr. McCann by increments, and at some time the osmosis would be complete with the plan, but at no point had the Board entered into any contract with Mr. McCann that stated he was going to be the architect of the service center. The Board had been asking him to present working plans in increments but at some point, the board would have to enter into a contract, and asked Mr. McCann if that was not correct. Mr. McCann replied that Mrs. Morrison and Mrs. Barton had stated the word of the Board was good and that when he mentioned bringing an AIA contract they had advised him it would be in the minutes by motion which was legal. Dr. Lawrence stated the motions in the minutes asked for a particular phase to be accomplished which was identified by a number of hours of work, so that Mr. McCann had been receiving payments for certain stages, but at no point had the Board stated he was their architect "this is your job" they had been asking him to do his work on an incremental basis. Mr. McCann replied that was correct. Dr. Lawrence further stated that when an increment was completed, the Board could stop the process and see what it had, and where it was, and have a piece of property which they could re-activate with Mr. McCann or with another architect if they chose to do so--was that not correct? Mr. McCann asked if he meant if the Board signed the deal with the Port property. Dr. Lawrence replied "No, what he was saying was, the Board pays you for 4½ steps--you deliver a piece of work at Step 4½ which will have some work plans, layouts for workflows and things like that--floor plans." Mr. McCann stated Step 4½ would be like details for the windows and walls, and the reason he would say 4½ is that in his mind he wanted to do the engineering, structural, mechanical and electrical, and then have all the details in what would be rough form, and then stop short of actually coordinating the document for construction and hand them over, the engineering work which meets disciplines and planning. Dr.

Lawrence stated what he was getting at was that they were progressing in this plan, maturing the plan in stages, and at each stage there was a property. Mr. McCann replied the Board physically owned up to that stage--they specifically owned documents for a certain amount of work. Dr. Lawrence said then at some time, the Board would have to say they liked the design, they would call for bids, and Mr. McCann would be the architect and "police" the construction. Mr. McCann stated he had been hired before with no contract and he had been hired with an extremely elaborate contract. He could not be doing what he was doing if he were not a licensed architect, and the Board could not have hired him incrementally or otherwise. Dr. Lawrence replied he was trying to arrive at whether the Board was paying its way as Mr. McCann completed the work. Mr. McCann answered that was fine, right. Dr. Lawrence said the Board had good intentions of having a service center, but the Board had not yet said that Mr. McCann was the architect who would "police" the contract--the Board had just asked him to do certain things. Mr. McCann replied "No, we have supervision--." Dr. Lawrence advised him this had not been implemented by the Board as yet. Mrs. McArthur stated they had only gone to 4½ steps. Mr. McCann replied that the administration would be in Step 7. Dr. Lawrence stated all he was trying to do was bring out in the discussion a process the Board had been following which was stepwise planning, and at the end of each step, the Board had a set of drawings and a report which belonged to the Board if it so chose. Mr. McCann replied that was right, but they could not go to bid at Step 4½. Mrs. McArthur asked if he meant without finishing through Step 7?

Mr. McCann briefly discussed the work relating to the other steps, and stated that he was planning a formal presentation at the next board meeting. Dr. Lawrence asked if it would be a plan the Board could look at and understand something of the workflow. Mr. McCann felt that only the persons involved in the day-to-day operations could make comments on the workability of the work flow process. Dr. Lawrence felt that was an appropriate task for the staff--not a task for the Board. He also felt there was some confusion in the Board's mind about terminology relating to tilt-ups, and asked if the plans were still for tilting-up with a domed roof. Mr. McCann stated they had not made that decision. There was then a general discussion relating to the design of the building, the terminology of tilt-up, the interior design, concerns expressed over interior lighting, building codes, OSHA and WISHA. Dr. Lawrence asked specifically about the dome, the joints and expansion, and how the joints were sealed and how they retained their watertight integrity. Mr. Powell, the engineer, explained there was a water-proof membrane sprayed over the top of it with artificial rubber so many mills thick. Dr. Lawrence asked if it maintained a live quality. Mr. Powell replied it did, and thought it was guaranteed for 20 years. He also explained there was a sealant over the entire thing so the members could expand and contract. Discussion followed regarding calculating earthquake factors, fire resistance of the building, water drainage from the roof, patch repairs for the sealant and various other technical questions.

Chairman Keiski then asked each member of the Board if there were any further questions. Mrs. Barton stated there was one thing she would like clarified, and that was if they found they were not able to get any funding she wanted to know if they built a minimal size building, how much would it cost for one which was 10,000 square feet, one of 15,000 square feet and one of 20,000 square feet. Mr. McCann stated you could take whatever square footage you wanted--the figures he had on the cost included furnishings so if you got above the furnishing level where you could see building construction, you make it about $18.50 a square foot for something about half the size of the one they were building--in round figures. Mrs. Morrison stated his early estimate of cost was based upon an inadequate understanding of what actual functions were at the service center--that he had been thinking of a warehouse type building--and would this proposed building be about as fireproof as one could get. Mr. McCann replied this building was more fireproof because of the long span joints and Steel Type 2. Dr. Lawrence stated that he was impressed with the sensitivity to the needs of the Board for flexibility and the excellent job Mr. McCann had done of fielding a variety of questions from an uncertain base as to why such questions were asked. Mr. Cox felt his questions had been answered. Mrs. Schmidt stated she had no more technical questions. Mrs. McArthur stated she had no technical questions, but regarding the vouchers he had submitted, one was for Richard F. McCann and Associates and the other was for Richard F. McCann AIA. Mr. McCann replied there was no Richard F. McCann and Associates--there was an R. F. McCann and Company as he was a partner in M & H Company which was a Los Angeles and Seattle firm that does consulting all over the United States, but the vouchers should have been Richard F. McCann, AIA. Mr. McCann then stated he would make his presentation to the Board at the next meeting, and there was further discussion regarding the presenation at Yelm on the 19th. Mrs. Schmidt felt the building should be aesthetically pleasing as the staff would be spending one-third of their life in the building. Mrs. McArthur stated she wanted to make it very clear she was not ready to go ahead with this until she had seen what had been done, and wanted to have no misunderstanding about her personal position regarding this matter. Mrs. Schmidt stated she was standing on the motion at the last meeting relative to the next 250 hours that the Board was into now, and felt Mr. McCann had been very patient with the Board with their piecemeal arrangement, but that was the way they had to go. Don Cox stated he wanted to see the presentation. Dr. Lawrence questioned whether or not Mr. Powell felt there would have to be pilings, and Mr. Powell stated he did not think so, that it looked like good foundation conditions at the Port. Chairman Keiski advised him the Thurston County Planning Commission had completed a geological survey of the entire county which would be available to them if they so desired. Mrs. Morrison reminded the Board that the agreement with the Port of Olympia would depend on the Board being able to furnish the Port with the total number of square feet which would be needed by the library district. Mr. McCann stated that information had been given to them when they were there before, and also given to the Port and felt there should be some communication between the library and the Port. Mrs. Morrison stated that as soon as she received the site

dimensions, she thought they should prepare a formal lease with option to the site location and dimension. Mrs. Schmidt again stated her concerns regarding a legal description of the site location. Mr. McCann and Mr. Powell left the meeting, and the Board thanked them for their attendance and information.

Mary Stough stated that previous conversation had to do with whether the Board was going to other architects to get a plan, and whether the minutes would reflect this. Mr. Cox stated he was still not concerned about this, but before they did anything, they should get what they paid for and see his presentation, and then make a decision. Mary Stough stated she was not questioning this, but the whole furor was over the fact that the minutes did not reflect where the Board was--and asked if from now on it could be spelled out in the minutes as to what the Board expected and wanted. Mrs. McArthur felt she had made it very clear that she was not going beyond this point until she saw what he had to offer. Mrs. Schmidt stated they were morally committed to the present step authorization.

Mrs. Jane Dowdle Smith stated she would assume from the conversation and the discussions, the Board members were saying they wanted to see what the architect had done and the work had been committed for 250 hours--and at that time, the Board was free to then decide whether they would continue or call in other architects. Mrs. Schmidt said Mr. McCann had indicated that actually those plans that ended at 250 hours would not be complete enough to take to bids. This had not been discussed, and the Board would have to ask him to go through Step 7. Mr. Cox replied "No, to Step 5", but if they did that, the Board had covered the major part of his fee also. Mrs. Morrison felt it looked as though a real commitment had been made. Mrs. McArthur stated the architect had said at the end of Step 4½, this would include details such as windows, walls, etc. and he would take the Board that far and at that point, the Board could hand it to another architect. Dr. Lawrence stated he did not think the Board needed to specify Step 4. As he understood it from his questioning, the architect could prepare the final working drawings, and the Board had paid him for them, and they would be the property of the Board to do as they wished. He felt it would be very foolish not to let this architect complete the job in terms of getting a set of plans so if they decided not to go on for one reason or another, they would have something that they could pick up and go with at another point. He requested the Chairman to poll the Board as to whether the Board was of a mind to address itself to the task of trying to meet a deadline to get federal funds that might serve as a supplement to their commitment of the funds for construction of a service center, and if the Board agreed to that principal, he would like to see the staff prepare for the next meeting, a critical path which would indicate the deadlines the Board had to meet. Chairman Keiski stated he personally favored the chance to get federal funds and thought the taxpayers in the five-county area would want the Board to do this. He felt it would mean the difference of whether Belfair was built because they had to find money for that somewhere, and it would not be prudent in denying return of federal tax dollars back to the area by overlooking federal matching funds. He said he thought the Board should move quickly on it and try to meet the deadline and get the application in so the chances of obtaining funds would be fair. Mr. Cox agreed that every effort should be made to get the funds and meet the deadlines. Dr. Lawrence agreed.

Mrs. McArthur was in favor of trying to obtain federal funding, but did not want to tie that to a commitment to Mr. McCann at the present time. Mrs. Schmidt stated she felt the Board owed it to the taxpayers and Timberland to try to get federal funding, but wanted to go on record that just because the Board bought completed plans from Mr. McCann, that did not mean he was their architect. Also, she requested the staff, if they could squeeze in the time, to draw up a critical path, and how the Board would be sure that Point 5 in the letter Mrs. Morrison had pointed out her concerns to her that in 90 days they would be ready to ask for bids, was certainly a critical matter, because she did not feel it would be just a simple "Point 5." Mrs. Morrison replied that Point 5 and Point 4 was that federal grants should be 100% of the funding. Dr. Lawrence felt if it was 100%, the Board better "get in gear". A short discussion followed regarding invitations to other architects in the area. Chairman Keiski stated it would have been nice if the Board had invited architects from other areas. Mrs. Schmidt also stated they were building a service center and Olympia was building a new city library (at less funds than requested originally), and raised the question of whether there would be any service which could be incorporated in the service center that would realize some of the costs for Olympia, such as bookmending, film services, etc. Discussion followed. Dr. Lawrence asked why the new building could not produce revenues to defer costs, such as storing welfare records etc, to generate revenues. Further discussion followed.

76-65 DON COX MOVED THE MEETING ADJOURN; SECONDED BY DR. LAWRENCE; PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Adjourned at 10 p.m.

Louise E. Morrison
Secretary

Elmer Keiski
Chairman