

## CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE MINUTES

---

### County Facilities

March 7, 2006 – 7:00 p.m.

### Current Champaign County Nursing Home – Adult Day Care

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Avery, Hogue, Jay, Knott, Sapp, Weibel

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Beckett, Cowart, James

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Denny Inman, Deb Busey, Barb Wysocki, Julia Rietz, Susan McGrath, Joel Fletcher, Alan Reinhart, Duane Northrup, Vito Palazzolo (CUPHD) Media

### CALL TO ORDER

Following a tour of the facility, Vice-Chair Sapp called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A roll call confirmed a quorum present.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDUM

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

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

### CHAMPAIGN COUNTY NURSING HOME

#### Reuse Study of Old Nursing Home

#### Presentation – Isaksen Glerum Wachter

Mr. Glerum reminded the committee that at the first meeting they presented a number of concept options, hoping to narrow it down to one to develop further, the committee did not do any narrowing of options but they did come up with more questions, which he is going to try and answer tonight. He addressed the question regarding the cost of demolishing the complex stating that his investigation determined the cost would be around 1 million dollars to demolish the complex and clear the property. He explained that number is comprised of a few different expenses; the demolition of the building itself, hauling the material away and dumping fees. Another element is the requirement for abating any hazardous materials prior to the demolition and, after talking with Mr. Reinhart, he has discovered there is still some hazardous material in the building. Regarding questions raised about the worth of the property, he explained that the county had an appraisal done in September 2005 which resulted in having a value placed on the building, and 13 acres of property associated with the building, of 1.925 million dollars, which is a square foot value of \$20.00.

Nursing Home cont.

He explained that the appraisal did not include the basement area and if you do include that space, it would reduce the value to \$16.00 per square foot. There would also be sellers closing costs and the possibility of issues with the hazardous materials, which leads him to believe any profits from the sale would be less than the 1.925 million number. The value of the land, cleaned off, was placed at \$18,000 per acre so a sale of the land would yield \$234,000, less expenses.

He presented to the committee 4 options. The first includes the County deciding they do not want to lease property and they do not want to maintain the old portion of the building. The west portion of the complex would be demolished and the 1971 addition would be remodeled to meet our high priority county needs which are the CAC at 4,660 square feet, the Coroner at 7800 square feet and the County Clerk at 5000 square feet. Those three uses trigger 80 parking spaces, currently they have an existing parking lot with 45 spaces which means they would retain that and supplement with 40 new spaces. After the 3 agencies are in the building, they would have 32,120 square feet in the 1971 addition unoccupied and the intent would be to remodel for the county needs only and defer remodeling on the other portion of the building until future needs require it.

Option 2 includes the County having a major tenant, and he has used CUPHD as an example, removing the old portion of the complex while retaining the 1971 addition which would be remodeled for the Coroner and CUPHD. Because those two agencies take up most of the space in the 1971 addition, they would have to supplement with new construction for the County's high priority needs so there would be an addition to the northwest for the CAC and an addition to the south west for the County Clerk. This option creates the need for 260 parking spaces, the decision is to do away with the existing 45 spaces and put in 150 spaces on the north and 110 on the south. With this option, there is no set aside space to address any future needs.

Option 3 includes the demolition of the entire complex and building new for the CAC, Coroner and County Clerk, with the need for 80 new parking spaces. There is no set aside space in this option and we would be building new 17,000 square feet to meet only our needs.

Option 4 A includes keeping all buildings and using them, including a major tenant, the Coroner is in the same place, CAC in the west end of old building and the County Clerk in the ARD annex area. This generates a need for 260 parking spaces with 32,000 square feet set aside for future needs and would defer any remodeling until a future need arrives.

Option 4 B is a variation of 4 A and consolidates two of the County's needs into the annex building, places the parking more responsive to the scheme and leaves about the same amount of available space in the old building. He explained that the boiler building comes down in each option and they figured, into these estimates, a small cast iron steam boiler just to serve the 1903 building.

Nursing Home cont.

Ms. Avery asked if they have thought about including the child day care center in any of these schemes and if so, where it would be located. Mr. Glerum stated they are aware of the discussion about the center and would think there is a good opportunity for that use in some of the available space. He stated they might consider relocating that function to an area where it could take advantage of an interior controlled courtyard space.

Ms. Avery asked, from this information before them, if they are looking for a consensus about these schemes. Mr. Sapp stated after they have all of the discussion and all questions are answered, the next item addresses narrowing this down to one option. Mr. Glerum stated he recognizes there may not be the perfect option before the committee at this point and they could decide on a set of ideas from different options. Ms. Avery stated it would help her determine which option she is leaning towards if she knew how strong the possibility is of having that anchor tenant.

Vito Palazzolo of the CUPHD stated that although he can't speak for his board, he can say that they are looking at a few things to decide if this is an option they want to pursue. He is here tonight to see what options the committee is going to pursue and also cost, so he can go recommend to his board what their best option is. He stated he has talked to Mr. Inman and Mr. Glerum about the building being for sale or if it is lease only and what costs they would be looking at, they will take that information into consideration as they look at other buildings. He feels, although again he doesn't want to speak for his board, he wouldn't be here if it wasn't something they wanted to consider.

Ms. Wysocki asked, looking at option 2, if they could estimate how much it would cost for demolition of just the older section. Mr. Glerum stated about \$500,000. Ms. Wysocki asked if the remaining section would just be able to house the major tenant and the Coroner. Mr. Glerum stated it could house a little more than that but it would fall short of addressing the needs of all three of the County agencies.

Mr. Glerum discussed comparative costs explaining that they are only talking about construction costs here, not total costs. These numbers are preliminary and once they can focus on a scheme, they can sharpen the costs. As part of this estimate they made a point to include deferred site and building maintenance costs that were identified in a previous study.

He explained they have added, across the board for all options, 5% general conditions and overhead and profit at 15%. Option 1 is estimated at a cost of \$3,495,588.00, 17,460 square feet at \$200.00 per square foot which leaves the County with available square footage for future development. Option 2 includes remodeling as well as CAC and County Clerk going in at new construction with a total estimate of \$8,753,904.00, this option also includes potential revenue. Option 3, which includes all new construction for County needs is estimated at \$4,744,704.00.

Nursing home cont.

Option 4 A and 4 B compare similarly but 4 B is a little less expensive because we have consolidated two uses into the annex. Option 4 A is estimated at \$6,844,488.00 and 4 B is estimated at \$6,753,156.00.

Mr. Jay stated he is concerned about getting into the rental business and he feels we need to serve our own needs. It looks like the best option might be to level the building and start new, for what we need, which will eliminate any unknown costs in the future. He is also concerned about soft costs.

Mr. Knott stated, without revenue factored in, it is hard to decide what to do because it looks like a bottomless pit for money to him. Mr. Weibel stated it is also important to find out revenue and how certain it is and they need to have more information about the possible leases.

Mr. Sapp stated option #2, at 8.7 million, which includes demo of part of the building then new construction, seems like it defeats our purpose.

Committee consensus to eliminate option #2.

Mr. Knott stated options 4 A and 4 B are similar and we need to decide if we want to be in the tenant business.

Mr. Sapp stated 4 B brings the annexes together and reduces some of the costs and he prefers 4 B over 4 A. 4 B also opens the option for us to consider another tenant down the road.

Mr. Weibel questioned if it would be possible to take option 4 B and demolish the old part of the building, keeping the annex and the 1971 addition.

When asked about eliminating option 4 A Mr. Knott pointed out that they had told the CAC, in the beginning, they would take care of them. Ms. Rietz stated they are fine with 4 B.

Committee consensus to eliminate option 4 A, narrowing the options down to 1, 3 and 4 B.

Ms. Avery stated option 3 is the most appealing option to her but she questions what would happen with the major tenant as far as the remodeling costs and she would just as soon do new construction for our offices. Mr. Sapp stated option 3 would eliminate the entire building so there would be no chance for a tenant. Mr. Knott stated the space for the County clerk is mostly for storage and asked if the cost for that space, in option 3, could be brought down. Mr. Glerum stated that was projecting the construction for the County Clerk at about \$100.00 per square foot but they could look at ways to reduce that.

Nursing home cont.

Mr. Jay stated, again, he doesn't understand why we would want to be in the rental business. One of the things that he feels has killed the Facilities committee, since he has been a member, is our ability to take care of the buildings that we have. He stated he would never want to sell the property.

Ms. Avery stated she agrees we would not want to sell the property. Mr. Glerum pointed out that by retaining some of the old building, the County would be setting itself up to address future needs at a lower price.

Ms. Rietz reminded the committee that the CAC is not really a County agency, the County does not have an obligation to build them a new building and she doesn't know if financially, that is responsible. They were happy to go from where they are currently located to a remodeled area of the old building but if they choose to tear it down, they are not required to build the CAC a new building.

Mr. Jay stated they told CAC we would take care of them and he feels an obligation to do so, pointing out that there will be costs associated, for the County, in moving them to the old building. Ms. Avery asked, as far as energy efficiency and maintaining the building, how we would do that until the space is leased out.

Mr. Gleason explained that they use the term mothballing of the 1903 complex in the scheme where there are no people residing. They want to keep minimal heat in the building, which they would do with a new boiler which would be far more efficient than the boilers currently there. They would maintain the sprinkler system and the fire alarm system with subtle lighting throughout the corridors, all of which would preserve the space for future use.

Mr. Weibel asked if they go with option 4 B, if it gives the option of tearing down the 1903 building. Mr. Glerum responded yes.

Mr. Jay stated he is ready to move on option 3. Mr. Weibel stated he would like to get more information for options 3 and 4 B and more information on leases and who will pay for remodeling costs.

Ms. Rietz stated another question is the time frame. The highway facility is being built and if we are talking about new construction there is the chance the CAC would have to move before the new building is ready. Mr. Northrup stated his concern, with new construction, would also be time frame.

Mr. Sapp stated he agrees with Mr. Weibel and would like to see them continue with options 3 and 4 B, looking at 4 B to add additional cost analysis for revenue and time frame.

Nursing home cont.

Ms. Wysocki asked where the money is coming from for this project. Ms. Busey stated there needs to be some financial analysis done overall because she doesn't know how they are going to the next step of anything without determining how this is possible. She stated we need to look at, if we keep the building for County needs, including the costs of operating, and, in reference to a tenant, she thought if there was a permanent tenant it would be another governmental entity and there might be some ability to sell that portion of the building, which would play into the financial analysis. She doesn't see that being discussed at all which may be a critical component for this being financially viable.

Ms. McGrath stated there may be legal problems with building for new tenants and she believes there are some legal questions here to resolve.

**MOTION** by Knott to defer to the April committee meeting; seconded by Avery.

Mr. Sapp asked Ms. Busey, if the committee decides to narrow the options down and ask for financial analysis on 4 B and 3, with a State's Attorney's opinion, if that would be sufficient to bring back to the next meeting to decide between those two options. Ms. Busey stated that is not narrowing it too much.

Mr. Knott asked what the purpose of our subcommittee is thinking they were going to be the group to make these hard decisions and he is not willing to support anything until they have more numbers.

Ms. Avery stated they have talked about having CUPHD as an anchor tenant but we do have a Champaign County board of health, which is a part of that, so it is a County function.

Ms. Busey stated it is a County function but it is a separate fund and she wouldn't want anyone to assume the general corporate fund would build space for the County board of health. When the committee talks about paying for this, they are talking about using the general corporate fund.

Mr. Inman stated Mr. Knott is correct that the subcommittee will be the group to make these decisions and Ms. McGrath is on the subcommittee to look at the legal issues. He suggests the committee narrow the options down to 2 to allow Mr. Glerum to keep moving forward and see where we are in April.

Mr. Jay stated, referring to the timing for moving the CAC, the highway building will not sit on the CAC building. Mr. Inman stated the issue with retention and drainage has modified that somewhat, but we don't know that CAC has to be out of their building as soon as construction begins on the highway building.

Nursing home cont.

**MOTION carried** with Sapp opposed.

Mr. Sapp stated the subcommittee needs to get together soon because we ended this meeting with more questions than answers. He declared the meeting in a 5 minute recess.

**Committee Motion: Committee direction to the Architect for further development of selected reuse option.**

Deferred to the April meeting.

### **Isaksen Glerum Wachter Architecture Invoice #3**

**MOTION** by Knott to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #3 from Isaksen Glerum Wachter Architecture in the amount of \$11,232.23 for professional services rendered through February 3, 2006 per agreement dated October 2005; seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried.**

### **Construction Project**

#### **Change Order #3**

**MOTION** by Weibel to recommend County Board approval of Change Order #3 to the general conditions project budget; seconded by Jay.

Mr. Inman explained that the facility utilities have been turned on and the billing has gone to the county, the general conditions costs keep going up with the three month extension of the project. This is the amount that was estimated, in a meeting with PKD that was needed for the completion of the project. The money is for utilities, site superintendent and any other general conditions charges that may come up. He reminded the committee that they had shuffled money around for the remediation and this is to build the pot back up.

**Motion carried** with Avery opposed.

#### **PKD, Inc. Pay Request #37**

**MOTION** by Knott to recommend County Board approval of Pay Request #37 from PKD, Inc. in the amount of \$80,601 for professional services provided through February 20, 2006 per agreement dated February 2003 (\$9,366 – Staff; \$1,795 – Reimbursable; \$69,440 – General Conditions); seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried.**

Nursing Home cont.

**Mold Remediation – Professional Services**

**The Raterman Group Ltd. invoice #12114**

**MOTION** by Knott to recommend County Board approval of invoice #12114 from the Raterman Group Ltd. in the amount of \$1,936.64 for professional industrial hygiene services relating to mold remediation rendered through February 16, 2006; seconded by Jay. **Motion carried** with Avery opposed.

**Alliance Environmental Group, Inc. invoice #1040**

**MOTION** by Knott to recommend County Board approval of invoice #1040 from Alliance Environmental Group, Inc. in the amount of \$13,139.75 for professional services relating to mold remediation rendered through February 15, 2006; seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried** with Avery opposed.

**Mold Remediation – Contractor Payments**

**Contractor payments in the amount of \$7,351.14 for mold remediation project**

PKD, Inc. Pay Request – reimbursement for contractor performed mold remediation work in the amount of \$5,836.14, itemized as follows:

- a. Brunson Construction - \$314.15
- b. Area Disposal Services - \$516.99
- c. Pelmore Farming & Development Company - \$5,005.00

Tile Specialist Inc. - \$1,515.00

**MOTION** by Knott to recommend County Board approval of the following contractor payments in the amount of \$7,351.14 for the mold remediation project: PKD, Inc. - \$5,836.14, itemized as follows: Brunson Construction: \$314.15; Area Disposal Services: \$516.99; Pelmore Farming & Development Co: \$5,005; and Tile Specialist Inc. - \$1,515.00; seconded by Jay.

Ms. Avery stated she understands that we are paying minority contractors here, and she is happy there are more minority workers on the job, but until this is settled, she will be voting no.

**Motion carried** with Avery opposed

Nursing home cont.

**Information**  
**Project Update**

Mr. Inman reported that the mold remediation is complete, there is no further testing that will be done now, the Raterman group has deemed the facility void of visible mold and air quality tests are fine. The Raterman group is writing the formal report for IDPH and they will be onsite when IDPH is there for the licensing. He explained that we are about 95% complete with the remediation build back. Wing three requires some duct repair and balance and testing of mains of the sprinkler system because some of the mains were removed during the remediation process and he provided pictures showing the attic area and what it was like to work in it. He explained they are trying to get as much money as possible from the contractors for any repair work. Wing three, main corridors, final finish coat of paint is currently being applied. He explained that currently, for the remediation costs, to date, the County has been billed \$1,425,190.72. Of that, \$407,971.67 has been for professional services, \$719,946.70 for mold remediation contractors and \$291,432.87 for build back contractors with a final not to exceed amount of \$1,445,190.72. He feels confident that they will not have something jump out at them and he believes we are close to being done. Summarizing the construction, he explained they are getting down to the final stages. Once the test and balance of ventilation, heating and life safety issues is complete, those reports will go to the architect who will send them to IDPH who will, in turn, come on site to start the licensure process. He pointed out that the original project manual stated a must finish date of January 5, 2006. Today, there is a finish date of March 30, 2006.

**Open House**

Mr. Sapp referred to a memo from Mr. Inman proposing April 15<sup>th</sup> as the date of the open house.

Mr. Inman stated after the contractors meeting this morning he feels like they are on the course of wrapping up and he believes they could still have an open house around April 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Sapp stated that April 15<sup>th</sup> is the day before Easter and the day after Good Friday and he would recommend they look at moving that date back to April 22<sup>nd</sup>.

**MOTION** by Jay to approve the appointment of the committee chair, Mr. Knott, Ms. Avery, Mr. Inman, Ms. Busey, Mr. Buffenbarger, Jeremy Maupin and Tiffany Talbott to the Nursing Home open house working group; seconded by Hogue. **Motion carried.**

### **FLEET MAINTENANCE/HIGHWAY FACILITY**

#### **BLDD Architects Invoice #12793**

**MOTION** by Jay to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #12793 from BLDD Architects in the amount of \$23,625.00 for professional services provided through February 1, 2006 per agreement dated July 2005, Invoice is for schematic design phase services; seconded by Knott. **Motion carried.**

#### **Project Update**

Mr. Inman reported that he, along with Jeff Blue, attended a meeting on March 2<sup>nd</sup> which included representatives from the cities. He explained that the cities plan on releasing an RFP for a phase I study, which will be due back in September, with the report due in December so it looks as though any studies or agreements wouldn't happen until the middle of 2007.

### **PHYSICAL PLANT REPORTS**

#### **Monthly Budget Report**

Mr. Reinhart stated these are for the committee's information.

#### **Manpower Report**

Mr. Reinhart stated these are for the committee's information.

### **CHAIR'R REPORT**

There was no chair's report.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **Scottswood Drainage Project – Report on Court Hearing March 6, 2006**

Ms. McGrath reported that all of the objectors either withdrew or settled their claims and the Judge approved the drainage district petition for Scottswood Drainage District which allows us to move forward with the intergovernmental agreement and will allow bids to be let and construction to start.

#### **Champaign County Humane Society Lease**

Committee consensus to defer this item to the April County Facilities Committee meeting to allow time for State's Attorney review.

Other business cont.

**Semi-Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes**

Ms. McGrath stated she has reviewed the closed session minutes and her recommendation is to keep them all closed as they deal with personnel and land acquisition issues.

**MOTION** by Avery to concur with the recommendation of the assistant State's Attorney and maintain all the County Facilities closed session minutes as closed; seconded by Hogue. **Motion carried.**

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

Committee consensus to include items V A 3, V B 2 and VI A on the County Board consent agenda.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Vice-Chair Sapp declared the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Talbott  
Administrative Secretary