

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE MINUTES

County Facilities

January 24, 2006 – 7:00 p.m.

Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center

MEMBERS PRESENT: Beckett (Chair), Avery, Cowart, Hogue, James, Jay, Knott, Sapp, Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Barb Wysocki, Denny Inman, Deb Busey, Alan Reinhart, Susan McGrath, Joel Fletcher, Roger Holland, Mark Shelden, Isaksen Glerum
Wachter team members: Riley Glerum, Doug Milburn, Paul Wiese, Jim Gleason

Called to Order

Chair Beckett called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. A roll call established a quorum present.

Approval of Agenda/Addendum

MOTION by Knott to approve the agenda; seconded by James. There was no addendum for the meeting. **Motion carried.**

Approval of Minutes – January 10, 2006

MOTION by Jay to approve the minutes of January 10, 2006 as presented; seconded by Knott. **Motion carried.**

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Chair Beckett asked committee consent to move to item VII B.

Ms. Hogue arrived at 7:05 p.m.

Ms. Avery and Mr. Weibel arrived at 7:09 p.m.

Champaign County Nursing Home

Reuse Study – Presentation:

Riley Glerum, of Isaksen Glerum Wachter Architects, introduced his team explaining that they are just getting started on the reuse conversion study for the existing Champaign County Nursing Home. His understanding, as it has been explained to him, is that given the pending opening of the new nursing home the existing building will be vacated and available for reuse.

Nursing Home cont.

He explained there is a ground swell of interest in re-occupying the space at the existing nursing home, basically for general office use but as it develops, there are a number of social service agencies who are also expressing interest in the re-occupancy of the building. He explained that the purpose of the study is to consider the feasibility of re-occupying the building and he reported that he has met with some of the interested parties and has done some preliminary programming with them. He provided the committee with a list of the 10 agencies interested and reviewed the amount of space requested, including parking, by each one, explaining there are two potential anchor tenants; C-U Public Health District and Prairie Center. He included the Woman's Fund on the list of agencies but explained that even though they have shown interest, to date, he has no space requirements to include. Based on their findings, they have 103,160 gross square feet of requested space. He stated that as a result of discussions during the early meetings with the county, a number of planning prerequisites have been included; relocation of the CAC into space currently occupied by adult day care, avoiding the occupancy of any basement space for other than mechanical equipment or possible storage and relocation of the election building function into space currently occupied by the alzheimer's related diseases activity area.

He presented a preliminary building reuse program analysis stating that the total building area that exists is 120,000 gross square feet, after subtracting the unusable basement area we are left with 94,760 as the total available space. The demand is 103,160 so they are already behind in providing space for the requested needs. He stated the space shortfall will grow as the project becomes real because of increasing needs and the realities of subsequent detailed design phases, the possible options to reduce the shortfall include expanding the building use, reducing the programming or utilizing a portion of the basement.

Mr. Gleason, a member of the team from GHR Engineers, reviewed what they call characteristics of effective office space. He explained the information was intended to be an aid to help them measure the change in occupancy from a nursing home to office space as they move through the process. He explained that the first look told them that the HVAC systems would give them the most trouble as they tried to adopt them to reuse, they started at the heating plant and most of their decisions stem from that point. He explained that it is a steam plant that generates steam at a much higher pressure than what is needed for office space, the boilers and the plant have reached the end of their functional life, efficiency is low and reliability is not what they like to see in a modern building. They recommend a conversion from steam to hot water in each section, which is more controllable and more efficient. He explained they looked at the existing facility as if it were three separate buildings; the 1904 building, the annex and the 1971 addition and developed three separate levels of rehabilitation they labeled as high, medium and low. He discussed the different options of each level for each building as well as the pros and cons of each. Ms. McGrath asked if they would make the same recommendations if we were to sell the building as opposed to keeping it. Mr. Gleason stated he wouldn't put a lot of money into fixing a car he was planning on selling so the same idea applies here.

Nursing Home cont.

Mr. Glerum stated when they were meeting with agencies, they identified the parking needs as well and they have generated a total of 485 spaces, of which, 261 would be considered public and 224 would be considered staff. He stated there is a shortfall on their ability to place that many spaces on the site.

Paul Wiese explained that in the property's use as a nursing home site it is in a very passive setting and the building will take on a different character from the outside to address the potential user's needs. He stated they will have the emergency call center to the east, the highway facility to the south and the new fleet maintenance facility to the west, those are facilities that don't draw a lot of public to them and they would like them to remain secure. The use they are considering is a very public one so they will have a lot of public coming to the facility. He explained that when they looked at how they would organize the site, given the new users, the building would be in the center and on the north side, off of Main Street, is where they would be locating the public parking. Most of staff parking would be located on the south side because they would be trying to separate the lots; he explained they are also looking at a separate parking lot for the CAC facility. He presented a diagram of the preliminary lay out of the parking with access into and out of lots; he explained they still end up with a lot of green space with the public parking in the north primary entrance off of Main Street, with drop off at the front where entrance is today. They are showing about 193 public spaces right now, he stated they have a storm water requirement they need to meet and he has talked to the architects of the fleet maintenance building to see if one building or the other could address the needs of both of these projects, this assumes they may have to provide some storm water. On the south side parking for staff, at about 200 spaces, they are trying to provide for the proper number of drop offs with easy access to the election voter area. He explained that the entrance drive, which is currently for visitor parking, will be a drive into the fleet maintenance facility and the plans they have seen show it would be gated. They have identified that area as CAC parking and this would be an access point with the same entrance being used by highway so there will be some overlap in that area they will have to manage. Mr. Glerum stated it is their understanding that the access drive, to the fleet maintenance building off of Main Street, will serve some staff parking areas outside of the gate but the large vehicles that are accessing through the gate will have a one way flow. Their south side parking has internal circulation for nursing home reuse vehicles to minimize the amount of conflict with the old highway area.

Mr. Glerum stated they have three different conceptual alternatives for reusing the facility, they already know they are behind in fitting all demand but they took a shot at trying to accomplish that. Reviewing alternative 1, he stated that Prairie Center, one of the anchor tenants, has been placed in the 1971 addition with the other anchor tenant, CUPHD, in a portion of the main building. CAC will be going into the western portion of the old main building on the first floor, with the election building in the annex addition. He explained that when they have the people pressure of these agencies, the existing entry lobby may not be adequate so reconstruction of that area has also been included.

Nursing Home cont.

With this alternative, the big anchor tenants fall short of their requested space and this scheme puts a majority of the coroner's needs in to the 1971 basement. He stated this is not a successful alternative because they have pushed people into the basement and have occupied every space, with no room for growth. He explained the population of the building is going to be significantly different and both anchor tenants would want their area to be located in the 1971 addition. Mr. Weibel asked about expanding the entrance, Mr. Glerum stated it is a building circulation issue and was just a preliminary thought. Alternative 2 examines the option of including only one of the major tenants, and in this case he has placed CUPHD in the 1971 addition delivering all of their needs to them. The meeting room can be placed in the existing 1971 addition with the CAC and the election building in the same areas. In this scheme, they have the 2nd floor of the main building available for future expansion. Alternative 3 excludes CUPHD with Prairie center receiving their full request. This is identical to alternative 2 with the meeting room added as new construction and 2nd floor space available.

Mr. Beckett stated the County Clerk will need more space in the future and asked if this programming allows for future space. Mr. Glerum stated it doesn't show in these schemes but it is something that can be planned for. Mr. Beckett pointed out that there may be users who may not be compatible and Mr. Glerum stated there was some thought given to that to date but those issues need to be explored more deeply.

When asked about the Coroner's office and the concern with having them next to other offices, Mr. Glerum explained that the goal is to move the Coroner's entire operation to the building, including a morgue, and this would happen on the south side of the service entrance. He explained they haven't even looked at cost yet because they don't have tenant commitments at this point and don't know what the level of remodeling would be.

When asked about the 2nd floor being considered for future expansion instead of current space, Mr. Glerum explained that it can be usable just as any other space but when one of the major tenants drops out of the list it becomes available.

Mr. Sheldon asked where the 1600 square feet for their space comes from. Mr. Glerum explained that the alzheimers area was suitable for his current requirements and he came to that understanding through their discussions. Mr. Sheldon stated that currently they have 2500 square feet in the election building and garage and they need more than they have now, he explained that he did not have just the open space in the alzheimers unit in mind when he stated he could use that area. Mr. Glerum stated they have the space to address that.

Mr. Beckett stated at some point they will need to apply cash flow. Mr. Glerum stated they want some feedback relative to the placement of the agencies because there will be different cost levels associated. Mr. Beckett stated it doesn't make sense that we could have both of the anchor tenants in the building.

Nursing Home cont.

Ms. Wysocki stated that to her, it seemed that the CUPHD may be more interested than any of the others in owning a building, not leasing, so that may help with the decision about the anchor tenant.

Mr. Glerum stated the last two pages of information he provided includes questions and answers. He stated one of the questions was if it would be in the best interest of the County to sell the building, he stated they need to know the value of the building to know the answer to that question. He pointed out that Prairie Center feels a tenancy is as viable as owning a building, he doesn't know where CUPHD stands. He stated there would be costs with the rehabilitation as well as operating and maintenance costs, which could be passed onto the tenants in the form of their lease, some of the agencies interested are probably paying below market rents and he isn't sure how our rate would compare. He stated it is their opinion that the first and 2nd floors are habitable for office use, with improvements, the basement is not.

Mr. Jay stated he is one who didn't want to tear the building down right away but he feels that first we need to be concerned about our County agencies and if they can't make this other space work he would rather tear the part down that we can't use. He is opposed to selling the building.

Mr. Glerum stated their purpose for coming before the committee was to present their information and get some sense of direction to take a next step of development. Mr. Beckett stated it is difficult to make a decision without knowing numbers. Mr. Glerum stated they can generate some rough numbers, make some judgments as to the level of remodeling for the various agencies and put some costs to the mechanical improvements. Mr. Beckett stated we need to know how much it will cost us to prepare this for occupancy and he would like to see those numbers for the low medium and high rehabilitation for the repairs and site development.

Mr. Sapp stated he would recommend, from what IGW has provided, the rehabilitation on the heating and cooling systems and the tenants will have to decide what remodeling they need in their area. Mr. Glerum stated they haven't done that much detail but they can guess at the level of rehab of a space in the structure and they can get to those costs. Mr. Sapp stated they need to start out knowing what the rehab will cost while they decide what agencies to include for tenancy.

Mr. Beckett stated he agrees with Mr. Sapp and wants to make sure representatives from the CAC, the County Clerk and the Coroner's offices agree that the space will work for them.

Mr. Weibel stated he would like to see what the agencies are paying for rent now or in case of the coroner, what we would be saving.

Nursing Home cont.

Mr. Knott asked if we could revisit the demolition estimate. Mr. Beckett stated he doesn't feel they should look at the expense of demolishing the 1971 addition because we will not tear that part down, although if Mr. Knott would like to see that number, they can get it. Ms. Busey suggested they get an estimate for sale of the entire building stating the revenue from the sale could pay for the County needs.

Mr. Beckett stated the committee is asking Mr. Glerum to continue to work with alternatives, taking care of the County agencies needs first and best, see what is left over and report back in March. When asked about cost design programming, Mr. Glerum reminded the committee that both of those anchor tenants desire the same space in the building but one of them may be more suitable to go into the building with less rehabilitation.

Chair Beckett declared the meeting in a five minute recess.

Appointment of County Nursing Home Project Team

Committee consensus to defer this item to the March County Facilities meeting.

Mold Remediation – Professional Services
Raterman Group, Ltd. Invoice #12096

MOTION by James to recommend County Board approval of invoice #12096 in the amount of \$19,180.40 from Raterman Group, Ltd for professional industrial Hygiene services relating to mold remediation rendered through October 31, 2005 (\$17,731.25 – Professional fees; \$1,449.15 – Direct expenses); seconded by Jay. **Motion carried.**

Raterman Group, Ltd. invoice #12105

MOTION by James to recommend County Board approval of invoice #12105 in the amount of \$16,530.86 for Professional Industrial Hygiene services relating to Mold remediation rendered through December 27, 2005 (\$13,545 – Professional Fees; \$2,985.86 – Direct Expenses); seconded by Jay.

Ms. Cowart asked for a breakdown of the fees.

Mr. Beckett explained that professional fee is the hourly wage we pay for their services and direct expenses are out of pocket expenses.

Mr. Knott asked how many more bills the committee will see and what the grand total will be.

Nursing Home cont.

Mr. Inman stated he believes, today, that the ending bills will be around \$1.3 million. There will be a delay because the final group working on wings 1 and 3 are painters and that invoice will probably not come to the committee until March, he believes there may be one more invoice from Raterman Group. Mr. Beckett asked, when he is questioned about the total cost is for the remediation and he states 1.3 million, if that is accurate. Mr. Inman responded that it would be accurate, according to the numbers that were run yesterday. Mr. Knott requested a spreadsheet of totals be provided to the committee at the next meeting.

Motion carried.

Proposed Industrial Hygiene Professional Services Agreement – The Raterman Group, Ltd.

Mr. Inman explained that this agreement is for their services after the remediation. It is recommended that, for five years, they retain the services of The Raterman Group in case, on an annual survey, there are questions by IDPH. This has been reviewed by our outside council

MOTION by Weibel to recommend County Board approval of the Industrial Hygiene Professional Services Agreement; seconded by Cowart.

Mr. Beckett explained that the cost for this service is \$60,200 in 2006, in 2007 it is \$31,605 and in 2008 it is \$33,190. When asked if we are required to do this, Mr. Inman explained that we are; IDPH knows there is an issue that we have taken care of, but it will become an annual review from them so we need representation.

MOTION carried with a 5/4 roll call vote. Voting aye were Beckett, Cowart, Knott, Sapp & Weibel. Voting nay were Avery, Hogue, James & Jay.

Mr. Beckett pointed out that the agenda states this item is for discussion only and after discussing this with Mr. Fletcher, they have determined that the vote tonight will be non-binding and the item will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Sapp stated on the last page of the agreement, it states that they will charge their fees plus 15 %. Mr. Beckett stated we would never agree to that and asked Mr. Fletcher to contact their attorney and make sure they understand our policy.

Nursing Home cont.

Information – Project Update IDPH Visit

Mr. Inman explained that the last unofficial pre-survey life safety tour was conducted on December 20, 2005 and they came back with four primary concerns. The first is the fire damper installation in the attic; when they were installed drywall was used on one side and codes now say there has to be drywall on both sides. The second concern is access door accessibility in the wing mechanical rooms, the third concern is the duct work from the dishwasher in the kitchen to the roof top exhaust fan because it has two areas where condensation can collect, that duct work will be rerouted. Finally, primarily in the resident dining areas and the kitchen, the sprinkler heads and light fixtures are in conflict which they are working to fix. He and the architect have been in contact with IDPH on a continuing basis and he explained the process, which is basically when we feel the facility is at a critical point of being completed the architect will send a letter, they will send us a project checklist and we will have to report on that. The contractors will provide those reports and upon completion of that review they will schedule the on-site life survey. Upon completion of that, they notify the nursing group who will come on site to do a survey at which time they will also review the mold remediation plan. Once that is taken care of and all steps are completed successfully, we will get the license. He stated IDPH was on site at the old facility last week and they want us out of the old building as soon as possible.

Construction Update

Mr. Inman explained that all visible mold has been remediated. He has provided a letter from the Raterman Group for the committee tonight stating that air samples have come back and we are in a positive state. The project schedule, released today, has all tasks completed by February 24th with all information to the architect by March 8.

Mr. Beckett stated that it seems to him if there are issues with the duct work and the other concerns that were found, something is wrong with the design and asked why we are paying for the remediation of those issues. He stated a properly designed building wouldn't have those issues and he asked if we can address that with the architects. Mr. Inman stated they are tracking the errors and omissions and there have been several issues raised, which are under review, regarding architect performance. He stated that when IDPH came on-site early in the program, the idea was to find these issues. IDPH told the architect directly what they needed to do and it was not followed.

Bed Alteration Request

Mr. Inman stated on January 23, 2006 they were awarded the alteration to change the 34 beds which means additional revenue of about \$300,000 per year.

Nursing Home cont.

Finance Committee Request for Financial Impact Statement – Children’s Day Care

Mr. Inman stated the Finance committee has discussed the issue of the children’s day care and the cost to run the center, which has reached a terrible state. The Finance committee was going to create a report on the financial impact of the center and they plan on coming back with a minimum of four uses for that space.

Mr. Beckett stated that in the vote yes twice campaign, they told the voters the day care would be included and he asked how we can decide, before the new building is even open, that now we will not include it.

Mr. Inman stated he agrees, although losing money at the rate we are, he believes even those who supported this may have to agree there is a problem. In the presentation they saw tonight, there is a component for daycare included and potentially this operation could be moved to that facility using the tenants and their families there to beef up enrollment. Ms. McGrath stated, at the Finance committee presentation, Mr. Buffenbarger and other employees there pointed out that the capacity is 40 children and currently there are only 10 enrolled, 6 of whom come from two employees and the cost of daycare for the employees is such that it is more expensive for the kids to be there than a private facility. Mr. Beckett stated that the operational aspect, if the home has a center, is something that Justice should address. This committee is responsible for building a building with a certain design and he doesn’t think we can say, even before the building is occupied, that we should change the use.

Ms. Avery stated she doesn’t feel that when the voters were asked to vote for this building they were aware that we were losing money to the tune of over \$200,000 on this operation. This is something we thought would be a nice thing to have in the facility and now it is up to us to look at how much we are spending of the taxpayers’ money for this operation. Mr. Sapp suggested they look at other alternatives such as having a private service come in and run it but he wouldn’t support just giving up on it. Mr. Beckett stated they have been discussing the deficits in the day care for a long time, he agrees that the extended loss is much worse than has ever been projected but he also feels that they told taxpayers it would be there and they should do their best to see if it can be included.

Fleet Maintenance/Highway Facility

Project Update – Group meeting January 25, 1:30 p.m. @ Urbana Public Works

Mr. Beckett reported that there is a meeting scheduled for January 25th at 1:30 p.m. for the same group that has been getting together to discuss fleet maintenance. He and Mr. Inman will be there and all are welcome to attend.

Courthouse

Cost issue for proposed public seating cushions – Agoti & Becks Country Shoppe, Inc. cost Estimates.

Mr. Inman explained that this issue started with the design of the courthouse, at which time, as a cost saving measure, they opted for the design of the seats that are in the building. They began receiving complaints about the comfort of the benches so they brought Agoti, the original furniture supplier, back in for review. He met with them, and left that meeting with the impression that the cost would be about \$15,000. After receiving their estimate he noticed it did not include the outer coverings which would be an additional couple thousand dollars, at that point, Ms. Wolken contacted local firms to obtain cost estimates.

Mr. Inman stated these estimates include putting a cushion on every bench. Mr. Beckett pointed out that most of the time the courtrooms are not full and when they are, the first two rows are the ones that are in use. He continued, stating that if the taller benches had been put in originally the cost would have gone up another \$150,000. The committee needs to decide if we want to replace them all or try to use a cushioning, reminding the committee that samples were placed on benches for a trial and they seemed to work well. Mr. Inman explained that this has not been formally bid, they wanted to find out who locally could do the work. Mr. Beckett stated he would like to see us go out for bid using two rows instead of the entire courtroom. Committee consensus to go out for bid.

Courtroom Numbering System

Mr. Beckett stated he received a letter from an attorney who felt that having the courtrooms labeled A-L is confusing, especially for people not familiar with the courthouse. He has asked that we create a numbering system for the courtrooms with the first floor having a 100 system, second floor having a 200 system and so on. He alerted Mr. Holland and Judge Difanis to this issue, which is on the agenda for discussion tonight.

Mr. Holland stated they appreciate the need for everyone coming to the courthouse to have an understanding of where to go but the current system has been around for a long time and a lot of forms and documents have been created with those designations on them. They feel to change from a lettering to a numbering system would cause a lot of confusion to the high percentage of people who are repeat or frequent users to the courthouse in favor of those few who don't have access as often. He stated it is always a concern that people find where they need to go in the courthouse but there may be other ways of doing it without going to the drastic step of renumbering everything, he stated he would hate to guess what it would cost to re-draft the documents not to mention that others who use the courthouse would have to change all their information.

Courthouse cont.

Mr. Jay asked if we could integrate a new system slowly.

Mr. Holland responded that integrating may cause even more confusion and he reminded the committee that there are RSVP volunteers who sit at the desk, right up the stairs by the entrance, to assist people in finding where they need to go.

Ms. Wysocki asked if it would be possible to pick a date in the future when the new system would begin, to give everyone enough time to make the changes, so as the documents were being created someone would know when to start using numbers instead of letters.

Mr. Holland stated it would be possible to set a date in the future but the changes would still have to be made and everyone would have to be notified. He feels they are trying to avoid the confusion that would come along with changing.

Mr. Beckett gave an example of a citizen who has to come to the courthouse, who is scared and doesn't want to be there and will most likely not ask for directions. He believes the system in the courthouse is designed for that citizen, who is there and confused. He believes that lawyers and judges resist change more than any other profession and as a legislature we owe serious consideration to a request that makes some sense. He agrees that changing forms is an important issue but he feels that if the Judges knew that on a certain date they would have numbered courtrooms instead of lettered we would be able to adapt, change the forms and do something that made sense to the citizens.

Mr. Weibel described his recent experience with having to use this system and having trouble finding the correct courtroom. Ms. Cowart stated she feels they need to number the courtrooms.

MOTION by Knott to change from a lettering system to a numbering system at the Champaign County Courthouse; seconded by Cowart.

Mr. Beckett stated he would like to defer this issue to allow Mr. Holland time to share this information with the Judges to see if there is a way we can implement this proposal in a team way.

MOTION by Sapp to defer this item to the February meeting; seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried.**

Brookens Administrative Center
Restroom Improvements

Mr. Beckett stated it has been long enough and there needs to be hot water in the restrooms at Brookens, he stated he wants to see cost estimates for putting individual water heaters in each restroom, including permitting and the cost of a plumber.

Ms. Avery left the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Physical Plant Reports
Monthly Report

Mr. Reinhart explained these reports are for the committee's information, they show they are trying to catch up on line items.

Manpower Report

Mr. Reinhart explained this is a condensed version of a report they supply to the Auditor's office each year for projects they have done in-house, on any county buildings.

MOTION by Sapp to receive and place on the file the Physical Plant reports for January 2005; seconded by Cowart. **Motion carried.**

Chair's Report
Clock & Bell Tower Project

Mr. Beckett explained the Clock & Bell Tower Committee did not meet in January.

League of Women Voters

Mr. Beckett reported he has not heard back from the League on the update to the waiting room.

Museum Update

Mr. Beckett stated there is a looking for Mr. Lincoln luncheon on February 15, 2006 at the Champaign Convention and Visitor's Bureau at 12:00 noon.

Other Business

Scottswood Drainage Project

Mr. Beckett reported there is a public hearing on February 1st at Prairie School and the Court Assessment hearing for the pending petition, regarding the per house assessment for the drainage district, is February 6, 2006 in Courtroom D at 1:30 p.m.

New Business

Future Meeting Schedule & Locations

Mr. Beckett stated he will not be present for the March meeting and in April he would like to go to the Courthouse so the committee members can see the exterior masonry, the benches and other related issues. Mr. James asked if they could go to the old nursing home in March, as it states in the proposed schedule before the committee. Mr. Beckett stated he wants to go to the Courthouse in April so they will have an updated schedule at the February meeting.

Mr. Beckett asked Ms. Cowart how the negotiations are going with the A/E firm for the masonry project. Ms. Cowart responded that the meeting went well and they told them just what they wanted, including minority participation; they are looking for another meeting in about a month.

Determination of Committee Actions to be placed on County Board consent

Mr. Beckett explained that due to the timing of this meeting, all items to be addressed are on the January 26th County Board agenda.

Adjournment

Mr. Beckett declared the meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Talbott
Administrative Secretary