



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

MINUTES – Approved 3/3/2015

DATE: Tuesday, February 3, 2015
TIME: 6:30 p.m.
PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington, Urbana, IL 61802

Committee Members

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

County Staff: Dana Brenner (Facilities Director); Deb Busey (County Administrator); Van Anderson (Deputy County Administrator of Finance); Sheriff Dan Walsh & Chief Deputy Allen Jones (Sheriff's Office); Linda Lane (Administrative Assistant)

Others Present: Stan Harper, John Jay, Jim McGuire, Pattsy Petrie, and Pius Weibel (Champaign County Board); Chuck Reifsteck (Gorski Reifsteck Architects); Dennis Kimme, Shawn Bott and Kevin Price (Kimme & Associates); Jim Gleason (GHR Engineers); members of the public

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair Maxwell called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Approval of Minutes

A. January 6, 2015

MOTION by Mr. Rosales to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2015 meeting; seconded by Mr. Anderson. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

IV. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Maxwell said that item X will be moved to item XII-C. **MOTION** by Mr. Kibler to approve the agenda as amended; seconded by Mr. Rosales. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

V. Public Participation

Mr. Stuart Levy read a statement on behalf of Robin Arbiter stating that two years ago stakeholders in the neighborhood advocated for alternatives to incarceration. He said that when they asked about the County's intention to raise \$20 million they were assured that wasn't the amount the Board and staff planned to spend. Ms. Arbiter stated she was surprised the County is entertaining jail construction projects costing over \$32 million. Ms. Arbiter felt that half of that money could transform the county's

services to those inappropriately incarcerated and at risk of incarceration. She mentioned several of those services and said she is opposed to any funding on any jail project.

Ms. Dorothy Vura-Weis said she was disappointed the report has no breakdown of costs for the board to decide which items could be approved and which should go. She expressed disappointment that there was no option of building lower security housing or an option for the smaller jail population if recommendations for alternatives for incarceration were implemented. Ms. Vura-Weis said that she is grateful for the report because it shows a shift if needed to ensure the safety of residents. She recommended several resources and programs that could be put in place. She noted the Sheriff and local police have already expressed interest in some of the alternatives.

Mr. Mark Enclin underlined the point in Ms. Arbiter's statement that half of the \$32 million could transform the county services. He cited several of the programs and services she mentioned.

VI. Communications

None

VII. Sheriff's Operations Master Planning: Gorski Reifsteck Architects and Kimme & Associates, Inc. Presentation of the Master Plan

Mr. Maxwell asked the committee to hold all questions until the end of the presentation.

Mr. Reifsteck summarized Part 1 of the report and mentioned that although the downtown jail wasn't being looked at for corrections, it was still being considered for law enforcement. He said they also looked at the satellite for not only corrections, but for law enforcement as well. He said Part 2 of the report has two options: 1) jail renovation/addition at the satellite site and law enforcement renovation at the downtown site; or 2) jail renovation/addition at the satellite site and a law enforcement addition at the satellite jail.

Mr. Kimme explained they identified a series of objectives that they wanted to obtain based on the mission from the County. He said the first was that they were going to present long-term solutions. He stated they wanted to reinforce the Sheriff office's mission for the jail and law enforcement as well as the new inmate classification system. Mr. Kimme said they wanted to address the jail housing needs not being met by the existing facilities. He noted they wanted to improve the safety, security and environmental quality of the facilities. He said they also wanted to solve specific identified building and support problems. Mr. Kimme said they wanted to address problems revealed by architectural engineering and corrections walk-throughs conducted by their team.

Mr. Kimme summarized some of the housing and building issues and some of their recommendations for correcting the issues. He said they addressed the deficiencies, plus the additional needs generated by consolidating populations. He remarked that the non-housing components square footage requirements in the proposal are almost the same as they currently have, but they are getting more out of the space. Mr. Kimme said they are addressing inadequacies on the law enforcement side as well and stated the most critical need is in evidence processing and storage and record storage.

Mr. Kimme showed the proposed building plan of Option 1 with the additions proposed. He summarized the changes. Mr. Kimme said Option 2 is basically the same in terms of the jail addition but the big difference is the law enforcement addition. He said a lot of the solutions are common to both options because the satellite jail will be the same. He went through each solution.

Mr. Kimme noted that the southwest quadrant might be the most interesting renovation. He said that the proposed changes are driven by the lobby location. He said the changes would include a legitimate administrative area, a public meeting room, storage linked to the old sally port, re-entry programs space, electronics home detention operation space, and professional contact visiting space.

Mr. Kimme next pointed out the differences between Option 1 and Option 2. He said the biggest difference is that the downtown jail would need to be closed for 12-15 months, creating the need for 17,000 sq. ft. of rental space. He summarized costs involved with a rental space. Mr. Kimme said the

upper level would remain basically the same but they would convert locker space to records storage, and the current booking space in the lower level would be converted to an evidence area. He noted the old visiting area would become part of a training area and the old work release would become staff lockers and showers. Mr. Kimme said the only difference between the options at the satellite jail is in the northwest quadrant. He said they are suggesting expanding the laundry area and extending the garage. He noted the current locker area could be turned into dry goods storage and a commissary.

Mr. Kimme stated the options result in a savings of 7.7 in FTE. He explained that even with less staff it is a safer and more efficient environment.

Mr. Kimme stated that Option 1 has a projected completion date of June 2020 while Option 2 is projected to be completed in August 2019. He talked about the pros and cons of both options. Mr. Gleason gave a utilities cost comparison for both options. Mr. Reifsteck talked about maintenance and repair costs needed at both facilities. Mr. Gleason stated this will only keep downtown on life support and the deferred maintenance items will continue to increase. He also commented that the intercom system at the satellite needs replaced.

Mr. Reifsteck summarized construction costs for both options. He said there are options to rent in the Champaign area but they may need improvements. He stated Option 1 is roughly \$26.8 million while Option 2 is about \$27.4 million. He listed several soft costs estimated at \$3.4 million that would be in addition to the hard construction costs, bringing the total base project cost to \$30.2-\$30.8 million in today's dollars. He explained that since the project won't be bid for two years they've added escalation costs bringing the total estimate to \$32.1-\$32.6 million. Mr. Reifsteck noted not all the details are known and contingencies are built in, so they are giving a range for Option 1 of \$29-\$36.9 million and for Option 2 of \$29.4-\$37.6 million.

Mr. Reifsteck stated that Option 2 saves almost \$1 million in utility costs over 20 years, would be done 10 months sooner, is simpler, is more flexible, and has more efficient law enforcement space. He stated that their recommendation is Option 2 and asked for any questions.

Mr. Quisenberry wanted to know if either option would approach any certifications. Mr. Gleason said the new geothermal at the satellite would definitely qualify and there are other options that might qualify for DCEO incentives. Mr. Quisenberry asked if it included any heat recovery wheel technology. Mr. Gleason said they have proposed it but it would be harder to do on existing buildings. Mr. Quisenberry said that some space for family contact seems to be in the future. Mr. Kimme said that is one thing that is still to be determined. Mr. Quisenberry noted there is a significant amount of training space and wondered if it was really necessary with having PTI and ILEAS here. Mr. Kimme said the advantage is being able to run more focused programs and not wait on others. Mr. Quisenberry said he sees that as nice-to-have rather than a necessity. He said he was surprised that additional project costs for Option 1 are more expensive than Option 2 since Option 2 has more new construction. Mr. Reifsteck said design is more expensive for renovations.

Mr. Kibler said he noticed that the door to the administrative storage area goes into a secure area and asked if this was a common trend. Mr. Kimme said this is the route that supplies come from. Mr. Kibler asked for clarification on what the storage was for. Mr. Kimme replied it was for things such as paper towels and linens. Mr. Kibler commented that he would like to see family visiting space as a priority. He felt the new design doesn't have any better line of sight and seems to increase staffing. Mr. Kimme explained that the beds are on the perimeter with each pod having its own sick, exercise, and visiting components that can be monitored by one officer.

Mr. Quisenberry wanted to know why the capacity for women is twice what the peak numbers are. Mr. Kimme said the female/male pod is a changeable pod that can expand or reduced in order to maintain a good staff to inmate ratio. Mr. Quisenberry pointed out that there has been a lot of talk about an adult assessment center and that the numbers don't take that into account. Mr. Kimme said that is correct and that if the population falls, the multiple occupancy cells can become single occupancy.

Mr. Jack Anderson said he noticed there is no increase in face to face visiting but there is in video visiting. Mr. Kimme replied that is correct because much of the visiting is by video. Mr. Anderson said that while on the tour he noticed that all of the face-to-face seating was occupied and may not be adequate. Mr. Kimme said at the conceptual stage they felt it would work but it is something that could be changed in the programming phase.

Mr. Kibler asked about the video conferencing location. Mr. Kimme said that most arraignments take place within 72 hours and would be in the pre-classification pod. He said the officer would have direct line of sight. Sheriff Walsh asked if Mr. Kibler was asking about inmate visitation video or video arraignment. Mr. Kibler replied for inmate visitation. Mr. Kimme said they are focused on the pods and the goal is to have the video visitation acoustically private.

Mr. Weibel asked if they had looked at renting cells at other facilities. Mr. Kimme stated that in part one of the study they had an estimate of 45 inmates per day at \$70 per inmate with a cost of \$1.5 million for one year.

Mr. Quisenberry said he understands what they asked for and what they received but is concerned the proposal exceeds the capability to fund and is beyond the capacity for public support. He said he didn't see the ability to trim it down based on what they want to expect with regards to reduced incarceration or to what they can afford. He felt they have been put in a difficult position as a board.

- VIII. Direct County Administrative Staff to Proceed with the Concrete Panel Investigation at the Satellite Jail MOTION** by Mr. Kibler to approve; seconded by Mr. Quisenberry. Mr. Quisenberry asked Mr. Brenner if he had anything to add. Mr. Brenner stated they had received two varying expert opinions and felt they needed to investigate what is causing the concrete to crack. He said the study would examine three panels of the engineer's choice. Mr. Brenner explained that they would receive help from the Highway Department and maintenance staff for digging in order to save some costs. He said they will also need to get roof and concrete contractors. He believed this is a must to maintain the facility at a high level.

Mr. Kibler asked if the County is providing laborers for the digging, what they will lose by not having those people available for other things. Mr. Brenner replied it's a short period of time and that some costs are unknown. He said they don't have a quote on the roofing yet and that highway and maintenance crews should take no more than half a day to dig. Mr. Kibler asked if the project could be done without roofing and have that done later. Mr. Brenner said it should all be done at the same time to be able to make the building water tight. Mr. Kibler noted that in the recommended action it states TSI Advanced Roofing. Mr. Brenner explained that is because TSI installed the roof, has done the repairs on it, and are the most familiar with it. He said he didn't think they were talking about a lot of money. Mr. Kibler said he wants to understand what is being voted on. Discussion continued.

Mr. Maxwell called for a vote. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

IX. Update on the US DOJ ADA Compliance Audit for Champaign County

Ms. Busey said in June 2011 they were contacted and randomly selected to have an ADA compliance audit done on all of their facilities. She reported that they shared a lot of information with the DOJ during the summer of 2011, the DOJ brought a team in September 2011, and that they heard back from them in December 2014 with their findings.

Mr. Van Anderson stated they received 200 pages of information on their findings and a proposed agreement. He said the County is a unique entity because with elected officials they need to have more involvement in determining policies and how they will accommodate people with disabilities. He provided a handout explaining what is needed and who is responsible. He noted that within each section are multiple issues that need to be addressed. Mr. Anderson said that they will meet with groups and develop responses, and noted that some of the issues could have changed within the last 3 ½ years. He said they will have to hire an independent licensed contractor for certification and that it will be an intense process. He said they are starting to put dollars to it and coordinate with department heads and elected officials. He indicated that the DOJ expects a quick response and will have a phone conference

the end of next month. Mr. Anderson stated that when the agreement with DOJ is finalized, it will be presented to the committee.

Mr. McGuire asked what the timeline for response and compliance is. Mr. Anderson said it varies with the issue, that some annual reporting is required, and some items require immediate action.

X. Approval of Courthouse LED Lighting Replacement from Courts Construction Fund

Moved to XII-C

XI. Approval to Bid Courthouse Window Replacement Project

MOTION by Mr. Kibler to seek bids for certain courthouse windows; seconded by Mr. Rosales. Mr. Brenner explained that the windows in the original courthouse were installed in 1986 and many are different shapes and sized. He noted that some severely leak when it rains, some have no seal, and they are not very efficient. He proposes they be replaced with low E glass and thermal frame to match the new addition. Mr. Maxwell pointed out that they had received the proposed bid schedule and this will have to come back to the committee for action.

Ms. Petrie asked for a rough calculation of the bid amount. Mr. Brenner replied \$180,000 - \$210,000. Ms. Busey pointed out that \$215,000 is already budgeted for this project in the courts construction fund. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

XII. Facilities Director's Report

A. Update on Brookens Mechanical Controls Project

Mr. Brenner reported that the last piece of this project was installed today and that they are 100% up and running. He said they will get the paperwork ready and send it to DCEO.

B. Update on the IT Services Back-up Generator Project at Brookens

Mr. Brenner said this project is 99% complete. He said there is one final piece of the project that will be done tomorrow and they will be 100% complete. He said they will sit down with GHR to go over the punch list and he expects the invoice from Barber DeAtley next week.

C. Approval of Courthouse LED Lighting Replacement from Courts Construction Fund

Mr. Brenner noted that there are several decorative T8 fluorescent lights in the lobby, near the Circuit Clerk's office and on the 2nd and 3rd floors in front of the courtrooms. He said there are 510 lights, most of which require a 12-16 foot ladder to get to and about 120 bulbs require a scissor lift to reach. He noted these areas collect large amounts of dust and about 75% are burned out. He felt they hadn't been replaced because they are difficult to reach and have to be done during off hours. Mr. Brenner said he would like to replace those hard-to-get-to lights with LED bulbs that have a life span of 15-20 years. He stated the project cost is \$12,831. He indicated that the savings should pay for the cost of the bulbs in 56 months but they will keep burning for 15 plus years, with an overall electric savings of around \$40,000 over 20 years. Mr. Brenner explained that these LED lights can be put into T8 ballasts, but that some of the ballasts may need replaced. He said this project will be funded out of the courthouse R&M fund.

Mr. Quisenberry asked if the LED would extend the life of the ballast. Mr. Brenner said it would. Mr. Quisenberry asked if the regularly scheduled use of ladders would now be used for cleaning the fixtures. Mr. Brenner said that was correct. Mr. Quisenberry asked if many of them are burned out do they really need to replace all of them. Mr. Brenner replied that it doesn't look good and that if they were to replace every other one it would look odd.

XIII. Other Business

Mr. Quisenberry asked if tonight's seating arrangement was specifically for the presentation or if it was an experiment for future meetings. He said if it was an experiment he recommended that it not be used again. Ms. Busey replied that it was for the presentation.

XIV. Chair's Report

- A. Future Meeting – Tuesday, March 3, 2015 at 6:30 pm
- B. Tour of EMA, 1905 E Main, Urbana at 5:15 pm Prior to the March Facilities Committee Meeting
- C. Discussion of a Strategic Plan for Facilities
Mr. Maxwell stated that the strategic plan for facilities would be put on the back burner until the overall strategic plan for the County is further along.
- D. Sheriff's Operations Master Plan Review Schedule
Mr. Maxwell felt everyone was a little shell-shocked and they needed more time to review. He said they have a lot of work ahead and noted that there will likely be more public participation at the study session. Mr. Maxwell said they may discuss at the next facilities meeting and this is something that will be ongoing.
 - February 24, 2015 – County Board Study Session
 - March 3, 2015 – Facilities Committee Review and Recommendation to the County Board
 - March 19, 2015 County Board Approval of Recommendation for Master Plan

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

Mr. Maxwell stated that there are no items to be placed on the consent agenda.

XVI. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Maxwell adjourned the meeting at 8:43 p.m.