



Champaign County Board Facilities Committee
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois

MINUTES – Approved as Distributed – 9/3/13

DATE: Tuesday, August 6, 2013
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington, Urbana, IL 61802

Committee Members

Present	Absent
Stan James (Chair)	
James Quisenberry (Vice Chair)	
Josh Hartke	
	Jeff Kibler
Gary Maxwell	
Giraldo Rosales	
Rachel Schwartz	

County Staff: Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Kirk Kirkland (Facilities Manager), Beth Brunk (Recording Secretary)

Others Present: John Jay & Patsi Petrie (Champaign Co Board), Mick McAvoy (ILEAS), Ryan Wolber (IGBA)

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair James called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call

A verbal roll call was taken and a quorum was declared present.

III. Approval of Minutes

A. June 4, 2013 – Regular Meeting

MOTION by Mr. Maxwell to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2013 meeting as distributed; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

IV. Approval of Agenda

MOTION by Mr. Quisenberry to approve the agenda as presented; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

Mr. Rosales entered the meeting at 6:01 p.m.

V. Public Participation

None

VI. Communications

Mr. James announced that Mr. Reinhart will be retiring in September and wanted to express his appreciation for Mr. Reinhart's hard work and professionalism.

VII. Courthouse Exterior Maintenance project Update – IGW Report

Mr. Reinhart referenced the letter dated 7/29/13 from Scot Wachter, Principal/President of IGW Architecture. IGW has completed all on-site observation and the preliminary design of the project. Mr. Reinhart noted one adjustment – the construction contingency was increased from 10% to 15%. The total project cost is estimated at \$303,170 down from the original estimate of \$304,000. The project schedule includes an issuance of documents for Bidding on 8/21/13 and Receipt of Bids on 9/11/13. Since the bid opening will be after the Facilities Committee meeting on 9/3/13, there will be a short 30-minute Facilities Committee meeting at 6:30 p.m. prior to the County Board Meeting on 9/19/13 to recommend the award of contract for the Courthouse Exterior Maintenance Project. Approval of the awardee will be at the County Board meeting on 9/19/13.

Mr. Reinhart reported that construction could begin as early as fall depending on weather but is guaranteed to start in spring 2014. Mr. Quisenberry would like an explanation concerning the increase in contingency fees. Mr. Reinhart will check with IGW and e-mail the response back to Committee members.

Ms. Petrie noted that expansion joints were used in the Courthouse Addition (east portion) when it was built 10 years ago and cracking has occurred. She wondered how installing expansion joints in the Courthouse's west portion will solve the problem of cracking mortar. She does not believe that the root cause of the failed mortar joints has been established, and the problem will reoccur. Mr. James commented that it will be difficult to ascertain the root cause due to all the variables (weather, climate, traffic vibrations etc.) that come into play with a building. He felt that the repairs have been identified by more than one engineering firm, and it needs to be done. Mr. Reinhart stated that the expansion joints have done their job in that water has not infiltrated the Courthouse, and it is time to replace them.

VIII. Capital Improvements Projections – Primary Building Equipment

Mr. Reinhart explained the parameters that qualified the classification of primary building equipment:

- Replacement value would be a large capital expenditure
- Planning and design would require professional services
- Long lead time for replacement equipment before installation could start
- Failure of the equipment would cause the a large part of the building to become non-usable for an extended length of time

Additionally, the ancillary systems to the equipment may compound the cost and complexity of the design and installation which are not included on the spreadsheet. From the physical plant records, Mr. Reinhart assigned original installation values to some of the equipment. Other values were derived from estimates on similar equipment or from outside contractors.

Mr. Reinhart used a global life expectancy following the actual equipment replacement timeline over the last 20 years with Champaign County. The estimated replacement value was calculated using a 3% increase per year. As seen from the chart, some major costs are estimated to occur in 2021 and 2022. Ms. Schwartz confirmed that the estimated replacement value is the total cost. Mr. James commented that manufacturer warranties usually only last 5 years. Some of this equipment is probably not as expensive due to changes in energy-efficiency, technology improvements and reduced labor costs to install. Mr. James would also like to see a list of improvements needed to all the parking lots that the County owns. Mr. Quisenberry would like to have a copy of the spreadsheet to organize it by cost, replacement year, etc.

Mr. Quisenberry asked about the condition of the air handlers in Pod 300 that should have been replaced in 1990. Mr. Reinhart replied that they are not energy-efficient but are still working. There are other items that are more critical that need to be replaced.

A. Funding County Facilities Primary Building Equipment

Ms. Busey took the Primary Building Equipment spreadsheet and put it in financial terms. The two potential funding sources for the replacement of primary building equipment systems include \$517,000 in the Courts Construction Fund and the General Corporate Fund. If the equipment had annual reserve funding in place and was fully amortized, the cost to the General Corporate Fund would be \$318,185 per year. Delayed action in funding the capital needs of the County building equipment has resulted in a situation where the General Corporate Fund cannot presently sustain the cost to catch up to fully amortize in FY2014. Therefore, five critical items have been prioritized from the list that needs to be replaced in FY2014 as follows:

• Brookens Pod 300 Chiller	\$159,100
• Brookens Pod 200 Chiller	\$159,100
• Satellite Jail Water Heater	\$ 56,000
• JDC Building Automation System	\$ 15,300
• JDC Water Heater #1	\$ 46,700
Total	\$436,200

This amount is in addition to new appropriations requested by this Committee for roof replacements totally \$313,000 for FY2014. Staff recommends that the Facilities Committee recommend to the Finance Committee that this appropriation be included in the Physical Plant FY2014 budget as a transfer to Capital Asset Replacement. The money would be spent as this Committee directs and any money not spent would remain in the Capital Asset Replacement Fund. Ms. Schwartz confirmed that the money set aside could be used for other equipment if something fails. Ms. Busey hoped that the Pod 300 and Pod 200 chillers would be replaced as the conditions in those areas are frequently very uncomfortable.

MOTION by Mr. Maxwell to recommend to the Finance Committee that direction be given in the preparation of the FY2014 budget, that \$436,200 be budgeted in the General Corporate Fund as a transfer to the Capital Asset Replacement Fund Facilities Budget to provide funding for a County Capital Improvement Plan, specifically for the replacement of primary equipment at the Juvenile Detention Center and Brookens Administrative Center in FY2014; seconded by Mr. Quisenberry.

Mr. Quisenberry noted that when the final ILPP study comes out, there may be some needs that will adjust the priority list. These five items serve as a blueprint but is not meant to be set in stone. Mr. Quisenberry would like to accrue more money for capital reserve but recognized the need for fiscal responsibility. Mr. James thought that this is a good start to building up a capital reserve. The five items listed on the priority list are not locked in. If an emergency arose, money would be used from the capital reserve. However, sooner or later, that equipment will need to be replaced. Ms. Busey stated that most of the equipment listed on the spreadsheet cannot be purchased until the Facilities Committee authorizes the release of bids.

Ms. Petrie would like to see more due diligence to research grants that may be available for equipment that may or may not be at the top of the list. In the past, Mr. Reinhart has always looks for grants that may be available to address one of these projects, and staff will continue to do so.

Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

IX. Illinois American Water (IAW) Water Main Easement along Art Bartell Rd – For Information Only

Mr. Reinhart reported that in 2007-08 as the Nursing Home was completed, a water main was installed down Art Bartell Road. The County agreed to turn over the ownership of the water main to IAW so that they will be responsible for its repair or maintenance. However, the documentation of this transaction was never recorded. IAW has contracted Mr. Reinhart to complete this agreement so the

documentation will be officially recorded. Mr. Maxwell wondered if this agreement will require the approval of the Champaign County Board as IAW may require that.

X. Recommendation of Illinois Green Business Association (IGBA) Business Certification Program

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to issue a contract with Illinois Green Business Association for an amount of \$1,500 to start the Business Certification Assessment on Brookens Administrative Center to begin in FY 2014; seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. Hartke explained that beginning this program in December 2013 will coincide with the start of the new Facilities Director. Mr. Ryan Wolber of IGBA was present to answer any questions from Committee members. Ms. Schwartz clarified that looking at energy-efficient options for the large chillers at Brookens would be covered under the \$1,500 fee. Mr. Wolber affirmed that was the case as the checklist looks at the entire complex. The checklist has 200 items, and 50% must be completed for the client to receive certification. Some employers concentrate more on employee engagement but IGBA will look at recommendations for the HVAC system if requested to do so. Ms. Schwartz commented that employee engagement would be hard to manage with the elected officials' offices and the concentration should be on what this Board can control. Mr. Hartke agreed that we should focus on what we can do but there is also the potential to develop a policy that elected County officials will want to adopt.

Mr. James asked how much staff time would be involved in this study. Mr. Wolber responded that typically he will meet with a manager of the business for one hour every two to three weeks. Mr. James inquired if skilled technicians look at the equipment for example or an IGBA staff member will perform the check. Mr. Wolber replied that if IGBA did not have the expertise, then a qualified partner would be utilized to find the answer. Mr. James further clarified that an individual would come in to check the overall operation of the HVAC without additional costs. Mr. Wolber affirmed that an individual would come in to examine the system if the client requests it without additional cost. Mr. James asked if the County gets certified, what would be the benefit to the County. Mr. Wolber stated that the answer is somewhat ambiguous – what you put into the process will be what you get out of it. For example, Busey Bank saved \$30,000 annually from the energy upgrades IGBA helped install. Mr. James thought it sounded like additional money may be needed to implement some of the upgrades to be certified. Mr. Wolber said that if more money is needed, IGBA will assist in trying to find grants or avenues of funding.

Mr. Rosales asked how long this certification process would take. Mr. Wolber replied that the average project length is from 8 months to one year. Once a business is certified, IGBA will conduct check-ins every 3-4 months to see if the strategies are working or if they need revising to be more beneficial for the client. Certification includes a plaque and logos that can be displayed on any marketing material. Ms. Schwartz would be surprised if Brookens could achieve certification considering the equipment in the building but instead viewed this as an opportunity to see where we could improve. Mr. James commented that he also thought that Brookens will not be certified. The County has done numerous studies by specialists that point out shortcomings in buildings, but nothing is done due to a lack of funding. Mr. Wolber stated that only one business was not certified due to the fact it went out-of-business. All others qualify due to the flexibility of the program.

Mr. Hartke noted that the staff of IGBA is qualified professionals with a great deal of "green" knowledge that many contractors do not have. The goal is not the certification plaque but to be environmentally responsible, reduce carbon emissions and save some money on utilities. Mr. Quisenberry noted that the reduction of the carbon footprint may be worth even more money ten years down the road. Ms. Petrie thought it was prudent to pay \$1,500 so the County could be a model for the community on green and sustainable practices.

Mr. Quisenberry called the question.

Upon vote:

Aye: 5 – Hartke, Schwartz, Rosales, Quisenberry, Maxwell

Nay: 1 – James

MOTION CARRIED.

XI. ILEAS Lease Renewal

Mr. Reinhart stated the ILEAS currently leases the County Building at 1701 E Main Street in Urbana. This lease expires on December 31, 2013. Jim Page, Executive Director of ILEAS has expressed the desire to renew the lease on the building at 1701 but has serious concerns about the east section of the Annex. That section of the building has multiple roof leaks and is deteriorating rapidly. Mr. Page asked if the County would consider the demolition of that area. Mr. Kirkland showed the Committee several photos of the existing conditions of the east part of the annex showing extensive damage to the brick exterior due to water infiltration, several roof leaks, loosened floor tiles that contain asbestos and mold in the interior of the building. The flat roof would need total replacement. The demolition quote of \$101,000-\$141,250 includes remediation of the asbestos in the floor tiles and mastic.

Mr. James commented that this damaged portion of the annex demonstrates what happens to a building when it is not maintained. This situation is not just faulty bricks but the lack of funding allocated to keep up the maintenance of this building. Ms. Petrie expressed her dissatisfaction with the lack of a comprehensive plan for this County Campus as to what the space needs are. The County must spend money to demolish this building because the County did not take care of it. Ms. Petrie asked where was the leadership of past County Boards to allow this situation to happen.

Mr. James responded that at the time the building was vacated, strong opinion was to tear down the whole building. The County was fortunate to find a tenant in ILEAS that was willing to do many building improvements with their own money. Mr. Rosales asked if an RFP was put out to open bidding to other architectural firms. RFPs are required for amounts over \$30,000 per the County's Purchasing Policy and the design, bid and construction phases of this demolition will be an amount less than that. IGW Architecture was recommended because they worked with ILEAS on a \$2.8-\$3 million remodel project on the building at 1701 E. Main so are familiar with the building. The County Board will approve the actual bid for the demolition project.

Mr. Maxwell remarked that he did not find the argument compelling that because IGW did the remodeling and therefore they will give a more competitive bid. The bid for the Courthouse Exterior Maintenance Project by IGW is similar to what other architectural firms would offer. Mr. Maxwell felt that this unfairly excludes other firms in town from bidding on County projects. Mr. Hartke agreed with Mr. Maxwell that the bidding process should be opened to all firms in the area. Mr. Rosales wondered if some of the materials from the demolition could be recycled instead of putting it in the landfill.

Ms. Busey explained that to move forward with ILEAS for lease negotiations, a commitment for demolition of the east part of the annex would be necessary. Mr. Quisenberry asked what would happen to the improvements if ILEAS did not renew the lease. Ms. Busey affirmed that the County would own the improvements. Mr. Quisenberry wondered if the cost of demolition would be participatory with the tenant. Ms. Busey noted that if specific terms of the lease negotiations are to be discussed, this meeting would need to go into closed session.

MOTION by Mr. Maxwell to direct the Facilities Director and the County Administrator to negotiate for the demolition of the east portion of the Annex and issue a RFP for the architectural/engineering services; seconded by Mr. Hartke.

Since this amount will be under the RFP bidding requirement of the County's purchasing policy, Ms. Busey asked for an informal RFP process so that all the timeline requirements and legal publications would not be necessary. She suggested sending out notice to all the local Architectural/Engineering firms so it could be done more expeditiously.

Mr. Maxwell would like to amend his motion to include an informal RFP process. Mr. Hartke agreed to the friendly amendment.

AMENDED MOTION by Mr. Maxwell to direct the Facilities Director and the County Administrator to negotiate for the demolition of the east portion of the Annex and furthermore conduct an informal RFP process by notifying local architectural/engineering firms of the project.

Mr. James asked when this could be done. Ms. Busey thought responses could be back in a 10 day timeframe which would necessitate a special Facilities Committee meeting for approval to move forward. Mr. Reinhart thought that the firms would need a tour of the building which may take more than the two week timeframe to get responsible bids. Mr. Rosales stated that IGW may be willing to give the County a discount since they are working on the Courthouse Exterior Maintenance Project.

Ms. Petrie suggested that PACA should be invited in the building before demolition to see if materials could be salvaged before the engineering firms bid on the job. Secondly, perhaps storm water management should be considered in the landscaping component after demolition. Mr. James was concerned about a lawsuit without set standards on letting people into the building to savage materials. Ms. Petrie countered that the University does it and has no problems. Mr. Quisenberry noted that the cost of the demolition would go up with the additional salvaging effort.

Ms. Busey remembered that the Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS) process must be used if the bidding for design of the demolition project is opened to all architectural/engineering firms. In this process, a short list of firms is selected based on their qualifications. The County would select a firm, and that firm would define the scope of services. Then the fee is negotiated for the contract. This differs from awarding a contract to the lowest responsible bidder. Ms. Busey pointed out that legally and under the County's Purchasing Policy, this Committee can negotiate with a firm with whom the County has an established positive working relationship which is the case with IGW.

Mr. James asked Mr. McAvoy of ILEAS if there is a timeline necessary for the demolition. Mr. McAvoy stated that there is no deadline by ILEAS for the demolition. ILEAS wants to continue to lease the building but is concerned that the space on the east side of the annex is unhealthy and unsafe. ILEAS is ready to commit to a 3-year lease extension but would like a good faith effort at resolving their concerns about the annex.

Mr. Reinhart anticipated that demolition would begin in FY2014. Ms. Schwartz wondered if lease negotiations could move forward if the square footage of the east part of the annex, 5,650 sq ft, were removed. Ms. Busey felt that ILEAS would need a commitment from the County for demolition of the area in question. Mr. Quisenberry reiterated that the QBS process is a state requirement and takes approximately three months. He remembered that the last time the County went the QBS route; they ended up selecting the firm they were going to choose in the first place. After listening to the discussion, Mr. Hartke felt that QBS system was very complicated and may not save the County any money. He would support the selection of IGW to design the demolition project.

Mr. Maxwell withdrew his amended MOTION; seconded by Mr. Hartke.

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to direct the Facilities Director and the County Administrator to negotiate the scope of services and contract with IGW Architecture for the design, bid and construction phases of the demolition of the east section of the annex complex located at 1701 E. Main Street in Urbana; seconded by Mr. Rosales. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to direct the Facilities Director and the County Administrator to negotiate a new contract with ILEAS less the square footage that will be demolished; seconded by Mr. Rosales.

Ms. Petrie asked how this square footage that will be demolished was priced. Ms. Busey answered that the 5,650 sq ft space was classified as part of the unfinished area in the 74,600 sq ft – it was priced at \$2.08 per sq ft. Mr. Jay asked why the area to be demolished is halfway down a hallway. Mr. Reinhart replied that the dividing area is where the two buildings adjoin. The cost to close the building up is included in the RFP.

Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

XII. Other Business

None

XIII. Chair's Report

Mr. James would like the Facilities Committee to tour the Coroner's building once the new Facilities Director has been hired.

XIV. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda

None

XV. Adjournment

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Rosales. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

There being no further business, Mr. James adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.