

# CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 105

**Municipal Building Commission**

**April 1959**

Approved by Bd 4/1/59  
105

Citizens League  
545 Socony Oil Building  
Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

April 8, 1959

TO: Board of Directors  
FROM: County and City Budget Committee  
SUBJECT: Report on Municipal Building Commission

Background and Purpose of Study

A leading objective of the Citizens League is the encouragement of efficient use of public moneys in our local governments. Perhaps of all the League committees, this objective is most directly the concern of the County and City Budget Committee, which looks behind budgets to the factors that influence them: programs, organization, procedures and management practices.

In early 1957 the committee became interested in the operation of the Municipal Building Commission. This agency has particular interest because of the fact that it is a unique agency, by virtue of its exclusive concern with the operation and maintenance of the Courthouse - City Hall Building; the fact that it is composed in equal parts of officials from two governments - the County and the City; - and its virtual autonomy, with no limit on its taxing power. For these reasons, the Committee decided to make a survey of the Municipal Building Commission, and appointed a subcommittee to conduct it.

Members of the subcommittee were Stuart R. Peterson, chairman, Gerald F. Legrand, Walter A. Smedberg and William J. Powell.

While it was beyond the scope of this study to make a detailed analysis of every Commission operation and expense, it was a general objective to make certain comparisons and suggestions that should be of some help in drawing one's own conclusions.

In the course of the survey the committee had a general orientation from the Commission chairman, Chairman George Matthews of the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners; toured the building with the building superintendent and had several talks with him; met with building personnel in charge of the Ramsey County Courthouse; and conferred with persons familiar with the operation of major office buildings in downtown Minneapolis.

### MAJOR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the following conclusions and recommendations we believe the Municipal Building Commission could make substantial economies and improvements in service in the operation and maintenance of the Hennepin County Courthouse.

1. To reduce the high cost of cleaning the Courthouse, the Building Commission should make a serious study to determine the feasibility of contract cleaning, as is now done with the new Public Health Center building and a number of office buildings.

2. In the interim, the commission should re-examine its liberal wage policy for custodial personnel and should place the planning and supervision of cleaning work on a more scientific basis.

3. The Building Commission appears to be overstaffed in the building trades employees: plumbers, painters and electricians.

4. The Building Commission should be able to get along with five engineers to man the boilers rather than six.

5. The Building Commission should re-examine its liberal wage policy for elevator operators and should install automatic elevators as the present elevators are to be replaced and elevator operators retired.

6. The Building Commission should keep adequate records on a unit cost basis, for purpose of management control as well as public reporting.

7. Considering the total duties of the superintendent and the administrative assistant, it does not appear that there is enough work for a full-time administrative assistant. The administrative duties of the superintendent's office should be reviewed so that the most effective use of personnel will be realized.

8. The Building Commission should explore the possibility of contracting with the City of Minneapolis for the administration of its present services.

The Municipal Building Commission and Its Powers and Duties.

The Municipal Building Commission was created in 1903 by the State Legislature. The act made the chairman of the County Board the chairman of the Commission, the County Auditor the Commission's secretary, the Mayor of Minneapolis its vice-chairman, and the City Treasurer its treasurer. Upon these four officials devolve the care and maintenance of the entire building which serves as a combined County Court-house and City Hall, the hiring of all the personnel, the setting of all wage scales, and the allocation of space to the various offices of both the Hennepin County and Minneapolis city government.

The cost of running the building is shared equally by Hennepin County and the City of Minneapolis. It is financed, except for minor receipts, by mandatory levies against property, which in 1959 amounts to 1.59 mills for Minneapolis' share and 0.85 mills for Hennepin County's share. The latter millage is of course levied against all property in the County, including that located in Minneapolis.

The County and City governments pay separately for whatever renovating and capital costs they incur.

The following table summarizes the finances of the commission for recent years:

MUNICIPAL BUILDING COMMISSION

Financial summary, 1956 - 1959

	<u>1956</u> <u>expend</u>	<u>1957</u> <u>expend</u>	<u>1958</u> <u>budget</u>	<u>1959</u> <u>budget</u>
Personal service	\$550,039	\$562,024	\$576,150	\$585,168
Contractual services	118,639	143,230	148,784	181,460
Supplies	19,615	17,717	21,930	22,600
Repairs and non-capital replacements	16,544	23,444	24,538	25,600
Alterations and improvements	171,887	382,105	393,809	283,430
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$876,724</b>	<b>\$1,128,520</b>	<b>\$1,165,211</b>	<b>\$1,098,258</b>
<u>Chargeable to:</u>				
Hennepin County				
Ops & Maintenance	\$352,435	\$375,188	\$384,383	\$406,106
Alt & Improvements	105,093	98,362	151,301	62,625
	<b>\$457,528</b>	<b>\$473,550</b>	<b>\$535,684</b>	<b>\$468,731</b>
City of Minneapolis				
Ops & Maintenance	\$352,402	\$371,227	\$387,019	\$408,722
Alt & Improvements	66,794	283,743	242,508	220,805
	<b>\$419,196</b>	<b>\$654,970</b>	<b>\$629,527</b>	<b>\$629,527</b>

	<u>1956</u> <u>expend</u>	<u>1957</u> <u>expend</u>	<u>1958</u> <u>budget</u>	<u>1959</u> <u>budget</u>
<u>Property tax mill rate:</u>				
City of Minneapolis	1.11	1.365	1.545	1.59
Hennepin County	.96	.93	.88	.85

#### The County Courthouse - City Hall Building

The courthouse building was completed in 1906 at an original cost of \$3,332,000 plus \$321,000 for land acquisition. The massive structure includes roughly 11,000,000 cubic feet, and a total floor area of 387,500 square feet providing 321,810 square feet of what normally would be considered "rentable area" if operated as a private office building. The age of the building, its size, its design, its use and the time it is open to the public (5½ days per week), are some of the factors affecting its overall operational cost.

#### Comparison with Ramsey County Courthouse and downtown office buildings.

Compared with the measurement of other government activities, the measurement of the operation and maintenance of a public office building is relatively simple, although as in all comparisons caution must be used. In this study, the subcommittee has therefore supplemented its study of the Building Commission budget, talks with the superintendent and administrative assistant, and first hand inspection and observation of the building, by comparing the building operation and maintenance with the equivalent activity in the Ramsey County Courthouse, a group of 10 downtown Minneapolis office buildings, operated by a major property owner, and a single large building operated by the same firm and considered its most efficient building. This comparison was made with a uniform account classification used by office buildings, and while some expenditure items were of doubtful classification, it is believed the general effect is accurate.

These data are summarized in tables 1, 2 and 3 that follow this page.

We have attempted to use the statistical comparisons basically as indicators of spots where costs and/or manpower are unusually high or low, and then to attempt to pinpoint the underlying causes for such abnormalities.

Table 1 shows the 1957 cost per square foot of building maintenance, operation and repairs for the Hennepin County Courthouse, the Ramsey County Courthouse and the 11 private office buildings. Taxes are excluded from the latter.

Overall, Hennepin County's operating cost per square foot is substantially higher than either Ramsey County or the office buildings: \$1.45 compared to \$1.22 for Ramsey, \$1.16 for the 10 private buildings and \$0.94 for the single private building.

By item, Hennepin is noticeably higher than the others in the cleaning, heating, plumbing, and elevator categories. It is lower in general office expense, but note that Ramsey's cost for this item includes operating the central switchboard. With-

TABLE 1

## COST PER SQUARE FOOT FOR OPERATION

Hennepin County Courthouse, Ramsey County Courthouse  
10 Private Office Buildings, and a Top Efficiency Office Building

1957

	Hennepin Courthouse <u>387,500 ft<sup>2</sup></u>	Ramsey Courthouse <sub>2</sub> <u>264,000 ft<sup>2</sup></u>	10 Private Buildings <u>1,299,945 ft<sup>2</sup></u>	Top Efficiency Building <u>447,665 ft<sup>2</sup></u>
Cleaning	54.5 ¢	43.6 ¢	30.3 ¢	23.3 ¢
Electric systems	19.4	18.0	21.8	20.8
Heating	16.6	6.6	8.9	3.5
Air Cond. - Vent.	2.3	-	6.1	11.8
Plumbing	5.2	1.7	2.6	2.5
Elevators	24.1	18.4	13.6	4.6
General expense - office	3.4	12.2	26.0	22.4
General expense - Bldg.	19.6	21.6	6.3	4.9
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total Operating Expense	145.1 ¢	122.1 ¢	115.6 ¢	93.8 ¢

TABLE 2

## MAN-HOURS PER YEAR PER SQUARE FOOT

Hennepin County Courthouse, Ramsey County Courthouse  
10 Private Office Buildings and a Top Efficiency Office Building

1957

Position	Minneapolis Courthouse			Ramsey Courthouse			10 Private Office Bldgs.			Top Efficiency Bldg.		
	No. of employ-ees	Annual Man Hours	Man Hrs. per sq. ft.	No. of employ-ees	Annual Man Hours	Man hrs. per sq. ft.	No. of employ-ees	Annual Man Hours	Man hrs. per sq. ft.	No. of employ-ees	Annual Man Hours	Man hrs. per sq. ft.
			387,500			264,000			1,299.945			477,665
Engineers	6	12,480	.032	-	-	-	5	10,816	.008	-	-	-
Carpenters	2	4,160	.011	1	2,080	.008	2	4,160	.003	5	1,040	.002
Painters	9	18,720	.048	3	6,140	.024	11	22,880	.018	3	6,240	.014
Electricians	6.5	13,520	.035	1	2,080	.008	-	Contract	-	-	Contract	-
Plumbers	6	12,480	.032	-	Contract	-	-	Contract	-	-	Contract	-
Mech Equip & Utilities	4	8,320	.021	2	4,160	.016	12	24,793	.019	4	8,320	.019
Elevator Operators	16	33,280	.086	8	16,640	.063	19	39,520	.030	1	2,080	.005
Janitor - Watchmen	39.5	82,160	.212	28	58,240	.221	54) 73)	236,938	.182	13 ) 20.6)	62,390	.139
Window Washers	2	4,160	.011	-	Contract	-	5	10,712	.008	1	2,080	.005
Telephone Operators	-	-	-	5	10,400	.039	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supt. & Admin.	4	8,320	.021	3	6,240	.024	6	11,960	.009	1	2,080	.005
Rental - Bookkeep. Purch.-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	12,419	.010	.9	1,872	.004
Total	* 95	197,600	.510	51	106,080	.402	193	374,198	.288	45	86,102	.192

Omitted Custodian G.A.R.

TABLE 3

**EMPLOYEES AND PAY RATE COMPARISON**  
**Hennepin County Courthouse, Ramsey County Courthouse**  
**and 12 Office Buildings in Minneapolis**

1957

<u>Position</u>	<u>Hennepin Courthouse</u>		<u>Ramsey Courthouse</u>		<u>Minneapolis Office Bldgs.</u>
	<u>No. of employees</u>	<u>Pay Rate</u>	<u>No. of employees</u>	<u>Pay Rate</u>	<u>Pay Rate</u>
Chief engineer	1	\$8400	Purchase heat from		-
	4	5640	N.S.P. at \$17,525		-
	1	5700	-	-	\$5096
Supt. Mech Equipment	-	-	1	\$7200	-
Electricians	1	8351	-	-	-
	5½	6895	1	6780	-
Asst Supt. mech equipt.	-	-	1	6888	-
Utility mechanics	1	5145	-	-	-
	1	4926	-	-	4638 - ele- vator repair- man
	1	4866	-	-	4222 - Bldg repairman
Carpenters	2	6552	1	6240	6552
Painters	1	7602	-	-	-
	1	7020	-	-	-
	7	6240	3	5928	6240
Plumbers	1	8351	-	-	-
	5	6822	-	-	-
Elevator starters	-	-	1	4368	-
Elevator Operators	16	4626	7	3276 - 4068	3411 - male 3016 - female
Janitors (custodians)	38	4266 - 4626	5	3276 - 4068	
			19	3492 - 4284	3411
Watchman	-	-	4	3492 - 4284	-
Day Maids	1½	3762	-	-	-
Window Washers	2	4960	Contracted		4347
Air conditioning - maintenance	1	6822	-	-	3765 - 4264
Switchboard operator	-	-	1	4068	-
			4	3300	-
Superintendent	1	8520	1	6720	-
Administrative Asst.	1	6119	-	-	-
Assistant Supt.	1	5496	1	5316	-
Stenographer	1	4092	-	-	-
Clerk typist	-	-	1	3288	-
Custodian - G.A.R.	1	3372	-	-	-
<hr/>					
Total positions	96		51		
Annual cost		\$562,024*		\$234,503	

\*Includes \$50,718 for turnover, holidays, sick leaves, etc.



out this, the Ramsey unit cost for general office expense is 1.7¢ compared with 3.4¢ for Hennepin. Included in the private buildings' general office expense are costs attributable to their being a private business, such as management fee, leasing expense and dues and donations.

Table 2 shows a manhour per square foot comparison for 1957 operations and maintenance. This comparison permits an isolation of the manpower factor from that of wage and salary levels and area to be covered.

Overall, the Hennepin Courthouse used about 25% more manhours per square foot than Ramsey, 77% more than the 10 private buildings as a group and 165% more than the top efficiency building.

Major overages for comparable services were in painters, electricians and plumbers. Hennepin was also high in elevator operators, but the use of automatic elevators in the private buildings affects their comparability.

Hennepin was slightly lower than Ramsey on janitor-watchmen, but substantially higher than the private buildings.

Table 3 is a comparison of the number of employees and compensation schedules of the Hennepin and Ramsey Courthouse, and available comparable wage rates for the office buildings. Without exception, the wages and salaries paid to the Hennepin employees were higher than those paid to similar positions at Ramsey courthouse.\* The only exception to the higher salaries relative to the office buildings is in the building trades categories of painters and carpenters.

The committee also made an attempt to obtain operating costs for the main Minneapolis post office, Northern State Power and former General Mills (now Title Insurance) buildings, but insufficient data was available by which even approximate comparison might be made.

In the following pages, we comment and raise questions about various aspects of the Building Commission operation, based on the three tables, but also reflecting the additional research we conducted. While we do not pretend to be experts on the subject of building operation and maintenance, we feel that the facts and analysis are clear enough to point to certain conclusions.

### Cleaning

The extremely high comparative cost of cleaning the Hennepin Courthouse (54.5¢ to 43.6¢ in Ramsey, 30.3¢ in the 10 office buildings, and 23.3¢ in the top efficiency building) deserves special attention by the Building Commission, in our opinion.

The 1958 rate of contract cleaning for the City's new Public Health Center Building was 34.0¢ per square foot, and there seems to be general satisfaction with the results. Window cleaning is also contracted for -- three times yearly at \$1,675 per year in 1958, or about 1.5¢ per square foot.

---

\*Apparently the higher rates paid in Hennepin for the skilled trades (carpenters, plumbers, etc.) are due to the fact the Building Commission gives the outside scale to these groups during the year when they are negotiated outside, whereas Ramsey does not put these measures into effect immediately.

General Mills is paying 34.0¢ per square foot for contract cleaning of its new office building in Golden Valley, and this includes about 2.0¢ for window cleaning.

No doubt it should be less work to clean a building of new design and construction than an older one. However, we do not believe the difference should be as great as is indicated by the present spread of costs between the Hennepin Courthouse and the office buildings or contract cleaners. Some of the private office buildings are also old structures.

We believe an obvious first step for the Building Commission in reducing the cleaning cost would be to make a serious study of the feasibility of contract cleaning. An obstacle may appear to be the question of providing for the present cleaning force, but it would seem that by a gradual transition to the contract system the changeover could be made gradually by adjusting to normal turnover.

Consideration should also be given to having windows cleaned by contract. Ramsey does this for a little over \$1,200 per year. Using two window cleaners, Hennepin pays over \$9,000 for its window cleaning. Assuming that the window area is generally proportionate to the building size, Hennepin is paying four or five times what Ramsey pays.

Pending a decision on contract cleaning, the Building Commission should do all it can to reduce existing costs under present methods. A first step would be to find out why salaries are so much higher than they are in the other buildings, all of which are also under union contracts. It is apparent that the higher salaries paid the Hennepin Courthouse employees are a major reason for the higher per unit cost (in 1957, they were \$4,266 - \$4,626, compared with \$3,276 - \$4,284 at Ramsey and \$3,411 in the private office buildings).

We believe that the Building Commission, as other governmental bodies, should be governed in its wage determination by the community pattern, taking into account fringe benefits.

We were told that the Courthouse is divided into 27 cleaning areas, averaging 14,300 square feet. Cleaning areas per worker in the 10 private office buildings average about 15,300 square feet. Also, the private building areas are somewhat more difficult to clean, it is believed, because the areas are broken up into smaller rooms, generally speaking. Furthermore, these buildings employ a sizeable number of women in their cleaning operations who normally would not be expected to cover as large work areas as men.

This indicates to us that there is room for improvement in the use of cleaning manpower at the courthouse.

People in the private office building business have indicated the value of careful analysis of each cleaning task, followed up by careful scheduling and supervision, as a means of increasing efficiency. Another suggestion is that the Commission investigate the purchase of a mopping machine and/or mechanical sweeper, especially in view of the extensive corridor length in the Courthouse.

### Maintenance services by building trades.

We came to a general conclusion that the Building Commission is overstaffed in the building trades employees. Thus, the Hennepin Courthouse requires the services of seven electricians, whereas Ramsey gets along with only one.

Seven plumbers are needed at the Hennepin County Courthouse, whereas Ramsey uses a contractual arrangement which includes periodic inspections and replacements. Ramsey gets by for one-fifth the cost shouldered by the Hennepin Courthouse on a per unit of area basis.

It is difficult to see why a total staff of nine painters is needed. A private office building operator feels that a good yardstick is that painting supplies should cost about 20% of the labor cost for putting on the paint. Applying this rule to the Hennepin Courthouse, one gets about 8%. Even considering the age of the building, it seems that a total of five painters would be more than ample.

We also question whether it is essential to have a foreman for practically every trade. The electrical and plumbing foreman each receive \$8,600 per year and the chief engineer for the boilers receives \$8,400.

### Heating.

Ramsey Courthouse is in the fortunate position of purchasing its steam for heating purposes directly from Northern States Power Company, resulting in its heating cost being 6.6¢ per square foot compared to 16.6¢ per square foot at Hennepin and 8.9¢ per square foot in the 10 office buildings (on a volume basis, the cost of heating is .35¢ per cubic foot at Ramsey and .58¢ per cubic foot at Hennepin.)

We question however whether the Courthouse needs six engineers to man the boilers. Manning around the clock for seven days a week totals 168 hours. Divided among six men this means each of the average need put in only 28 hours a week. Even allowing for annual and sick leave and emergencies this seems excessive, and it would seem reasonable that the building could get along with no more than five engineers. Five would need to put in an effective average of 34 hours per week to cover the 168 hour week.

### Elevators.

Due to the physical layout of the building perhaps a total of 16 elevator operators is not unreasonable for manning the 11 elevators, especially since the two jail elevators are operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We wonder, however, why one elevator could not serve both the County and City jails. This would require less operators.

More important, though, would be the savings that might be realized from converting to fully automatic elevators. Assuming an automatic elevator life expectancy of 20 years and a cost of \$50,000 per elevator (on the high side, if anything), approximately \$2,000 per elevator per year might be saved, ignoring interest charges on borrowing. We appreciate that the present elevator operators serve some function as information clerks, so possibly two operators would need to be retained for this purpose.

A method of converting to the automatic elevators would be to install them as the manually-operated elevators were due for overhaul or replacement. This procedure would also accomodate the reduction in number of elevator operators through retirement.

Meanwhile, as with custodial employees, we urge the Building Commission to re-examine the salaries of elevator operators to keep them in line with operators in outside employment.

An incidental suggestion, but one we feel quite important from the standpoint of public relations, is that the dress of the elevator staff might be improved without personal hardship.

#### Alterations and repairs, and the need for adequate records.

A substantial amount of alterations and repair work has been carried on in the past several years. Some of the permanent operating staff helps out with these jobs, we are told, thereby reducing the amount of work being contracted for, but records simply do not conveniently show any such diversion of help. As a matter of fact, we believe that the Municipal Building Commission should have available records of operating costs on a unit basis, such as per square foot. This is essential for determining the cost of specific projects, and for differentiating between maintenance and construction projects. Detailed information of this kind, which is considered indispensable in the management and operation of private office buildings, should be equally valuable for control purposes for the Building Commission, particularly since the four commissioners have other duties of a full-time nature. Adequate operating information of this kind would also be helpful for outside groups such as ours to keep informed about Building Commission operations.

#### Supplies.

About \$18,000 is spent each year on supplies. In 1957 this went for cleaning, \$8,100; electrical, \$5,800; hardware, \$1,400; lumber, \$500; office supplies, \$300; plumbing, \$1,000 (sometimes three or four times this amount); and other, \$600. Although a sizable percentage of the supply bill is attributable to electrical and plumbing supplies, these are purchased directly from jobbers.

It is our opinion that the Building Commission should look into the advantages and disadvantages of purchasing supplies through the City or County Purchasing offices. Ramsey operates through the St. Paul purchasing Department, apparently finding it to their advantage to do so. Although the Building Superintendent and administrative assistant claim that items purchased through jobbers are cheaper, nevertheless added bookkeeping is thrust upon the Superintendent's office that could otherwise be eliminated or minimized.

#### Administrative staff.

The Administrative assistant is responsible for preparing the budget, keeping the books and purchasing. He shares general office duties with the Building Superintendent and the stenographer. He maintains regular daytime hours, covering the same period as the Building Superintendent, and the Assistant Superintendent supervises the night crew.

Considering the total duties expected of the superintendent and the administrative assistant, it does not appear to us that there is enough work for a full-time administrative assistant. Perhaps the adoption and maintenance of an adequate unit cost system, as suggested above, would increase the work load of the administrative assistant somewhat. However, we have suggested that the Building Commission consider purchasing supplies through the City or County. If this were done, the administrative assistant would be relieved of some of his current duties and he would have further time to devote to non-commission activities, in addition to time that we believe is already available for other tasks.

While a shifting to a part-time administrative assistant may not be completely practical at the moment, we do believe that the administrative duties handled by the Superintendent's office should be reviewed so that the most effective use of personnel will be realized.

#### Office hours of the City Hall - Courthouse

Although outside the immediate scope of our interest, the subcommittee was impressed with the reasonableness of having the Courthouse open only five days instead of five and a half. City offices now are open only five days, and efforts have been made to get the Legislature to permit County offices to operate on a five day week, but without success. It would seem that obvious savings could be made in operating and maintaining the building on a five day basis.

#### Use of Minneapolis City Engineer's department.

The proposal that the Building Commission explore the possibility of contracting for cleaning service suggests another idea for using the services of other organizations. This is, that the Commission contract with the City of Minneapolis for the administration of its services.

This arrangement would seem to have certain definite advantages.

In the first place, the City of Minneapolis has the administrative advantage which any large, multi-purpose governmental unit has over a small, single-purpose administrative unit such as the Building Commission. This is, the lower unit cost in the conduct of central "housekeeping" functions, such as personnel administration, accounting and purchasing. In the second place, since the City carries on activities similar to those conducted by the Building Commission, i.e., the repair and renovation of buildings, consolidation of such activities should lead to lower unit cost in handling of personnel employed in maintenance and repairs, due to such factors as shifting specialized employees between jobs and the smaller unit cost of overhead.

Economies would be achieved even if the major activity of cleaning (including window washing) were found to be most economically done by a private firm and therefore were contracted out. For there would still be need for purchasing and storage of supplies, employment of building trades personnel (for repair) and the letting of contracts for major repair and renovation. All the latter are activities that the City, through the City Engineer's department, already does on a much vaster scale than the Building Commission.

The advantages of consolidating the administration of buildings was recognized in the City government when the City Council early in 1957 consolidated the management of the buildings under the Board of Public Welfare (General Hospital, Workhouse, Old Relief Building) under the Lands and Buildings Division of the City Engineer's Department. This change has yielded benefits to the City.

It seems reasonable to us that there might be similar administrative advantages, for the reasons stated, if the care and maintenance of the Courthouse were placed in the hands of the Lands and Buildings Division of the City Engineer's Department on a contract basis (subject always to the possibility that cleaning might be hired out to a private contractor). Control would still rest with the Building Commission in determining budgets and taxes, allocating space, and determining the other policy matters that require consideration of both the County's and City's interest in the building.

#### General comments.

This report may seem to stress the negative side of Building Commission operations. This is a necessary result of any effort to find areas of possible improvements.

But the Building Commission does deserve compliments, too. For example, there was the method employed in replacing the old terra cotta roof on the Courthouse nine years ago. With a bid of \$531,000 staring the Commission in the face and having a budget of only \$451,000, the Commission decided to try to replace a piece of the roof on a day labor basis. By scrutinizing the costs of this small-scale operation, the Commission concluded that the entire roof should not cost more than \$435,000 under such a plan. The actual cost totaled only \$370,000, a substantial saving over the bid price.

This subcommittee wishes to acknowledge our limitations as laymen able to devote only limited time to the analysis of such a large scale enterprise. This million dollar a year operation deserves a more thorough analysis of the type provided by an outside expert consultant.

We also wish to acknowledge the fine cooperation extended us by Building Superintendent Dale Stanchfield and Assistant Superintendent Clifford Boies.