



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

***MINUTES – Approved 10/4/2016***

---

**DATE:** Tuesday, September 6, 2016  
**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Lyle Shields Meeting Room  
Brookens Administrative Center  
1776 E. Washington, Urbana, IL 61802

---

**Committee Members**

**Present:** Jack Anderson, Josh Hartke, James Quisenberry, Jon Rector, Giraldo Rosales, Rachel Schwartz  
**Absent:** Gary Maxwell (Chair)

**County Staff:** Dana Brenner (Facilities Director), Rick Snider (County Administrator), Linda Lane (Administrative Assistant)

**Others Present:** Pattsy Petrie (County Board Chair)

---

**MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order**

Committee Vice-Chair Rosales 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 Agenda**

**MOTION** by Mr. Hartke to approve the agenda; seconded by Mr. Anderson. Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously**. Mr. Rosales stated that item VII would be removed from the agenda. Mr. Brenner explained that they were considering taking a portion of the cost for the replacement of the CCNH boilers from Capital Asset funds. He said the CCNH Board had a special meeting which resulted in the project being paid for from the money received from Ameren, therefore there is no need to bring it forward.

**IV. Approval of Minutes – August 2, 2016**

**MOTION** by Mr. Anderson to approve the minutes of the August 2, 2016 meeting; seconded by Mr. Rector. Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously**.

**V. Public Participation**

None

**VI. Communications**

None

**VII. Request Approval of Authorization of Updated FY16 Capital Asset Projects**

Removed from agenda.

**VIII. Request Approval of Authorization for ITB #2016-009 Champaign County ADA Compliance Interiors Work**

**MOTION** by Mr. Quisenberry to approve; seconded by Mr. Anderson. Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously**.

**IX. County Facilities Action Plan Proposal**

Mr. Rosales explained this handout was given out about a month ago, but it's been cleaned up and there is one omission. Mr. Snider said this information was presented to the Board at a few other meetings, and most of the content was drawn from the memo the committee received from him. He stated that in response to some comments, the prioritization has been removed and all of the deferred maintenance items have been added. He said this is a line-item list of all the expenditures included in the \$22 million that is in the Bailey Edward study, along with the most recent information provided by Mr. Brenner, on all of the items that they would proceed with if they were to advance the ¼ Cent Facility Sales Tax. Mr. Snider indicated that in speaking with Mr. Maxwell, the intent is to advance this to the COW so it can be voted on by the Board. He said it is supposed to represent what they think would be the projects included in the expenditure list for the Facility Sales Tax.

Mr. Quisenberry commented that Mr. Snider had suggested leaving Brookens and moving downtown, but noted that the list includes a lot of work to be done at Brookens. He wanted to know what would be the timeline and what items would they try to avoid by moving. Mr. Snider referred to page 12 of the handout that has a budget summary for all the maintenance items. He said all projects listed total about \$28 million, but the recommended projects are about \$22 million. He noted the difference is partly due to eliminating the Brookens projects expenses. Mr. Quisenberry asked what else is eliminated. Mr. Snider responded that a suggestion in the preliminary planning was to consider building a new Animal Control facility because of the high deferred maintenance costs. He summarized the problems with the current facility. Mr. Quisenberry stated that after touring the facility tonight he has a better context of the situation and agreed the building wasn't designed for its current use.

Ms. Schwartz asked if the suggestion to move this to the COW means Finance? She noted that when the Board approved the ¼ Cent Sales Tax referendum they never put a plan with it of what they were going to do with the tax. She said they have this plan from Mr. Snider, but the Board hasn't approved it. She thinks they need to see the whole plan, including the jail, when it's moved to the COW, Finance or the Board. Mr. Snider referred to page 14 that had information about the corrections consolidation. Ms. Schwartz asked if there are two lists, one being deferred maintenance and one development projects. Mr. Snider replied that is correct and listed some of the development projects. Ms. Schwartz recognized this is the Facilities Committee and they aren't supposed to talk about money, but felt they can't really separate that. Mr. Rosales asked if it would be appropriate for this to go to the special committee. Ms. Petrie felt it would be. Mr. Quisenberry said he heard earlier that they were going to send this to the COW without recommendation and asked if it would be the Finance portion. Mr. Snider replied that Mr. Maxwell wanted the plan reviewed by the Board and to decide if it represents what the priorities will be for the spending plan. Mr. Quisenberry wanted clarification that Mr. Maxwell is trying for more input than just the Facilities Committee, and because COW has the full Board participating they can have committee discussion. Mr. Snider answered that is correct.

Ms. Petrie thought the goal was to get input from Facilities before it went to any other committee. Mr. Anderson said he's not prepared to make a recommendation since they only received the document tonight. He felt it's important to get this to other Board members as an information piece of possible expenditures of the potential funds. He said it's conceptual at this point, and is contingent on the referendum passing. Mr. Quisenberry said he wasn't sure what the value or impact of passing this would be since there is no money. He noted there is nothing new since they received the Facilities Condition Report, and doesn't see a problem with the COW looking at it without Facilities passing it.

Ms. Schwartz felt the big difference is not so much the deferred maintenance but the new projects. She said it's not true that there is nothing new because this has a scaled down version of the Sheriff plan. She said at some point the Board needs to say, this is the plan and if the tax is approved this is what we're thinking of doing. Ms. Schwartz says it looks like the County is asking for money with no plan on how to spend it, and that's where Finance comes in. She commented that she's not sure there's enough money in the ¼ Cent Tax. She felt the start and end needs to be programmed better. She also thought some

projects could be bonded soon and some could be bonded later. Ms. Schwartz thinks the Board need to take some vote to say this is what they are thinking of doing with the money.

Mr. Quisenberry **MOTIONED** to refer this to the Finance portion of the COW without recommendation; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Mr. Quisenberry noted that now is the time to discuss anything they want to flush out in preparation for the discussion at Finance. Mr. Rector agreed with what's been said and stated that nothing is binding. Mr. Quisenberry said it's important for this Board to communicate the intent of the request and what the goals of it are. He said it's important to guide the future Board members to understand the context the money was asked under and what promises were made. He also said it can give the public a tool if future Boards are deviating from the ask.

Ms. Schwartz commented that she would take out the behavioral health center and put it someplace else. She noted they have no plan on how to staff or fund it. She said she hears all the time they shouldn't be in the nursing home business so why would they want to go into the behavioral health business. She said there needs to be more serious discussion on this. Mr. Anderson agrees with Ms. Schwartz's idea. Mr. Snider said the inclusion of the behavioral health was an attempt to leverage the Facilities Sales Tax. He said there are limitations on what they can do with it. He said that it's not fully fleshed out and it would be up to the Board to include it or not in the final plan. Mr. Anderson said it can be included now and removed later.

Ms. Schwartz expressed concern that they will find the funds to build but have no plan to maintain the buildings. She said she would like to see future maintenance included as part of the pricing. Mr. Snider asked for clarification that Ms. Schwartz was talking the maintenance for the facility itself and not operations. Ms. Schwartz replied that is correct.

Ms. Petrie encouraged comments be sent to Mr. Snider so he can include them in what he gives to the COW. Mr. Rosales felt it's important to get out a message because public opinion is the County doesn't know what it's doing. He suggested they all review the document and email comments to Mr. Snider.

Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously**. Mr. Quisenberry asked that all Board members receive this as soon as possible. Mr. Snider said he will send it out tonight.

## **X. Facilities Director's Report**

### *A. Update on Brookens PODs #200 & #300 Boiler Replacement Project*

Mr. Brenner reported that the boilers are 95% complete, but the new flues are on backorder. He said he is having a discussion with the engineer and contractor tomorrow to see if there is another solution. He commented they have applied for a DCEO grant and got confirmation that the application was received. He stated they will get just under \$19,000 for a rebate. Mr. Brenner noted they will be putting glycol in the piping, which goes onto the roof, of the Pod 300 boiler to prevent freezing in the winter. He said they will put slightly less in Pod 200 since it is indoors.

### *B. Update on the Pre-Cast Concrete Wall Panel Repair Project-County Highway Painting Project*

Mr. Brenner said the painting at Highway is 85% complete. He said they are putting two coats of paint on and should be done next week.

### *C. Update on Veteran's Memorial*

Mr. Brenner explained that the Veterans Memorial on the corner of Main and Broadway was leased to the Veteran's Association, which is now defunct. He said they were supposed to maintain the memorial, but a few veterans approached the County and said they can't keep up costs since the Association has gone out of business. Mr. Brenner said the cost to replace the flags is \$800-\$900 annually, plus the cost of any maintenance that needs to be done. He said they received a proposal from Otto Baum to replace the joints and that work has been done. He stated they have talked to the State's Attorney about what needs to be done for the County to take over the maintenance. Mr. Brenner said several veteran's groups have said they will donate money for the flags, and the

Veteran's Association will pay the \$2,500 for the repairs with the little money they had left. He noted that the Physical Plant has painted the handrails and done a little work behind the memorial.

*D. Update on Dobbins Downs Playground*

Mr. Brenner stated the playground in Dobbins Downs is a single lot the County acquired in 2003 because it was in such bad shape. He said a group approached the County in 2010 to put in a playground through grants and the County put together a five-year lease at \$1 per year. He said the association would provide an insurance policy and the community would take care of the property. Mr. Brenner noted the association has since disbanded. He commented the community is complaining that the playground is now an eyesore and has become a night time gathering point for unwanted people and a gang hangout. He stated that Planning and Zoning put a fence up until the playground equipment can be removed, but the fence was damaged half of a month after it was put up. He said they have talked to Head Start and the Urbana Park District about taking the playground equipment. Mr. Brenner noted the Park District inspected the equipment and it is in good shape but they won't use it. He said Head Start has someone going out to get a quote to dismantle. He said the County's job is to take the equipment down and return the lot to its original state. He said he and the County Administrator have talked about donating the property to an organization that would put a house on the lot.

Mr. Rector commented that it is sad they have to do this but said it's good they are trying to repurpose the equipment. Mr. Brenner commented that the equipment is in good shape and they have tried to remove some of the graffiti. Ms. Petrie said if they decide to make an arrangement for housing to be built there Susan Jones is the person to contact in neighborhood services at the City.

Mr. Rosales asked if the intent is to take the fence down and grow grass. Mr. Brenner responded yes. Mr. Rosales wanted to know the size of the lot. Mr. Brenner answered that he wasn't sure but it isn't very big. Ms. Petrie asked if the lot is in Hensley Township. Mr. Brenner replied he didn't know but Planning and Zoning would have that information.

**XI. Other Business**

*A. Semi Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes*

Mr. Rosales said that a memo from the State's Attorney's office said there are no closed session minutes to review at this time. **MOTION** by Mr. Quisenberry to keep the closed session minutes closed; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously**.

**XII. Chair's Report**

*A. Future Meeting – Tuesday, October 4, 2016 at 6:30 pm*

Mr. Rosales informed everyone that the next Facilities Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 4, 2016.

*B. Tour of METCAD*

Mr. Rosales said there will be a tour of METCAD at 5:15 p.m. before the next Facilities Committee meeting.

**XIII. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda**

Mr. Rosales noted item VIII is to be placed on the consent agenda.

**XIV. Adjournment**

**MOTION** by Mr. Anderson to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Hartke. There being no further business, Mr. Rosales adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

*\*\*Please note the minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.*