

## CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE MINUTES

---

### County Facilities

March 6, 2007 – 7:00 p.m.

Old Champaign County Nursing Home – Main dining room

**MEMBER PRESENT:** Beckett, Betz, James, Jay, Richards, Sapp, Weibel

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bensyl, Cowart

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Denny Inman, Deb Busey, Susan McGrath, Alan Reinhart, Duane Northrup, Andrew Buffenbarger, Capt. Jim Young, Riley Glerum, Jim Gleason, Media

### Call to Order

Following a tour of the facility, Chair Beckett called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.

### Approval of Agenda/Addendum

**MOTION** by Betz to approve the agenda and addendum; seconded by James.  
**Motion carried.**

### Public Participation

There was no public participation

### Champaign County Nursing Home – Reuse **IGW work in progress report** **Reuse Plans 2006**

Mr. Glerum explained that the next step is for them to get back together with maintenance staff and go through the mothballing task check list, for the two scenarios discussed, then apply costs. They haven't been able to meet yet. Mr. Beckett stated one of the scenarios mentioned a year ago was to totally occupy this wing with county uses and not consider using the old wing; he asked if that is any part of the mothballing options. Mr. Glerum stated it is and he and Mr. Gleason need to figure out what will be the most cost effective way to occupy space in the mothball scenario and they need to figure out where to put the occupants explaining that currently in that scenario the Coroner would go just as the Coroner indicated, County Clerk storage would be in wing c, CAC in wing A and nothing right now in Wing B.

Mr. James asked, of those spaces that might be used, what type of plan we have in getting the space up and running, what costs would be associated and where the money would come from.

Mr. Glerum stated they are still investigating the cost of mothballing and the costs associated with whatever remodeling needs to be done. In the case of the County Clerk it is minimal, with the Coroner there could be significant remodel. Mr. Jay stated until they know the costs of closing this building and securing it to give us time, there is no money to do any of these options. He stated we don't even have enough money to tear it down if that was the only option left, if we could close the building and secure it for a year or two that would give us time to figure out what we want to do.

Mr. Beckett stated he is concerned about the CAC because he doesn't feel we have the luxury of saying they can wait two years to find a space.

Ms. Busey stated as far as she knows everything they are talking about is supported by the general corporate fund which is dangerously low right now. She explained they had to borrow to make payroll last week which is the earliest they have had to borrow in a number of years. The nursing home isn't done and they have already put \$327,000 into their operating this year and they are going to come back in March saying they need more because they are still operating at a deficit and there is no fund balance there. The general corporate fund took on an annual \$310,000 obligation last August to pay for the \$4 million dollars for the new nursing home until we figure out what is going on with the litigation and it absorbed \$90,000 just to cover the utilities of this building as it sits vacant this fiscal year and we did that by not buying Sheriff's squad cars and by borrowing from public safety sales tax funds to offset the salaries of law enforcement officers, hopefully just for this year. She doesn't have an answer for how they can pay to do anything with the building at this time, even mothballing is going to be difficult because there is no funding source other than the general corporate fund.

Mr. Jay stated that some of the items included with mothballing he feels are absurd. He asked if we didn't repair something when we were in the building why we would we do it now especially when we don't know if we are going to tear the building down. Mr. Glerum stated this was a comprehensive list that would probably get widdled down. Mr. Jay stated some of the things on the list are things some of county personnel could do.

Mr. Sapp stated he agrees with Mr. Jay but he is not sure the building could withstand locking the doors for a year to figure out our financial situation and he wasn't aware we were going to take some of the money put aside for reuse to consider closing and locking the doors. Mr. Beckett stated the A& E we are using right now is in the budget because it was a contract we started over a year ago and we haven't expended all those funds. Mr. Weibel asked if the CAC could fit in the old child care center and asked if they could shut down the heating system except for that area. Mr. Glerum stated the CAC couldn't fit in that space.

Mr. Jay asked why the CAC has to move, that building is in the middle of a retention cell that isn't built yet but if they are only talking about slowing down the building of a retention cell he doesn't see that as a problem. Mr. Weibel stated they are planning to use some of the fill from that site to use elsewhere. Mr. James stated that was part of it but there were also construction issues that would make working in that building difficult. He stated, based on what he has seen and heard, he suggests looking at other buildings in Champaign to move them to.

Ms. Reitz stated as long as they don't need to tear that building down they can stay there forever but her understanding was that they need to tear it down for the good of the County as a whole. The CAC board stated they will not stand in the way of that because they understood we were going to end up with space here; the board has been very appreciative of the support of the County as a whole. The need for this building is very clear if the CAC needs to move someplace outside of County facilities they need to know that now so they can start looking. She stated they pay \$1200 per month for rent to the County and explained that 1/3 of the cases come from our Sheriff's department, 25% from Champaign and 20% from Urbana and 10% from Rantoul, those are the main users of the CAC. The travel issue for people is a significant one but they are not closed to any possibilities. She stated she, with the board, has been approaching the Police Chiefs asking them to go to their cities to ask them to contribute toward hiring a forensic interviewer who would be employed at the CAC. Currently all the funding comes from grant funding, the cities benefit from this facility but they pay nothing. She stated it is not outside the realm of possibility to consider approaching the cities to ask for their help in relocating the CAC because currently the County bears all of the expense other than that which is funded by grants. The building was paid for by the MHB and they are not willing to pay to remodel another one.

Mr. James stated he doesn't see the CAC moving to the old nursing home and they need to look into other buildings. Mr. Betz asked about using space at Lincoln Square. Mr. Inman stated he doesn't believe there is space available there. Mr. Weibel stated we should check with the CUPHD regarding their new building.

Mr. Beckett stated it appears there will be a point in time where BLDD will want that building moved, he doesn't know what that is but it will happen. He stated the committee has been glad to support CAC but if there are options away from the County they should look at them. He stated he is looking for the remodeling numbers because if he learns he is going to have to spend so much money to mothball and he could take that same money to get agencies in to collect rent and help the public he would rather spend the money that way. He still needs to see what the options are.

Mr. Glerum stated they will have those numbers in April.

**Isaksen Glerum Wachter Invoice #7**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #7 from Isaksen Glerum Wachter in the amount of \$4,255.40 for professional services rendered through February 1, 2007; services are provided per the authorization of the County Facilities Committee to investigate the “mothballing” of the existing CCNH. Funds for payment of services are in the CCNH conversion study project budget per agreement dated October 2005; seconded by James. **Motion carried.**

**Fleet Maintenance/Highway Facility  
BLDD Invoice #128697**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #128697 from BLDD in the amount of \$6,949.92 for professional architectural/engineering services rendered through February 1, 2007 per agreement dated July 2005; seconded by Jay. **Motion carried.**

**BLDD Invoice #128699**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #128699 from BLDD in the amount of \$620.00 for professional architectural/engineering services rendered through February 1, 2007 – invoice is for site observation per agreement dated July 2005; seconded by Jay. **Motion carried.**

**Champaign County Nursing Home  
Construction Project  
Pay Requests**

**PKD Inc. Pay Request #49**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of Pay Request #49 from PKD, Inc. in the amount of \$8,424.00 for professional services provided through February 20, 2007 per agreement dated February 2003 (\$1,736 – Reimbursable, \$6,688 – General Conditions & Change Orders 1, 2, 3); seconded by James.

Mr. Inman stated there may be one more, smaller pay request. **Motion carried.**

**Duane Morris Invoice #1235576**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #1235576 from Duane Morris in the amount of \$2,854.54 for professional services provided through January 31, 2007 related to certificate of need and IDPH/Health Facilities Planning Board; seconded by Sapp. **Motion carried.**

**Raterman Group, Ltd. Invoice #12188**

**MOTION** by James to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #12188 from Raterman Group, Ltd. in the amount of \$1,963.00 for professional industrial hygiene post remediation/moisture control; seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried.**

**Farnsworth Group Invoice #100873**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #100873 from Farnsworth Group in the amount of \$8,077.50 for architectural/engineering professional services relating to construction administration rendered through January 19, 2007 per agreement dated March 2003; seconded by Weibel.

Mr. Inman stated they submitted this invoice and our policy is that we bring it before the committee for action.

Mr. Beckett stated, in the past, we were concerned that our other lawyers were telling us there would be an issue if we didn't pay our bills but it seems strange to him to pay this since we have a mediation date. Mr. Betz asked what specific services this invoice is for. Mr. Beckett stated this is work, with IDPH, that was part of the original master plan that they would have to do to get us our occupancy. He doesn't have any doubt they did the work but because we are in a fight with them he doesn't feel comfortable paying this.

**MOTION** by Betz to defer the invoice and ask Phebus & Koester for an opinion as to what we should do with it; seconded by James. **Motion carried.**

**GHR Engineers & Associates Invoice # 015970**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of Invoice #015970 from GHR Engineers & Associates in the amount of \$3,132.80 for professional architectural/engineering services relating to HVAC system evaluation and retrofit rendered through January 27, 2007 per agreement dated June 2006; seconded by James. **Motion carried.**

**Investigative & Forensic Services at new Champaign County Nursing Home Site**

**MOTION** by Betz to recommend County Board approval of the request for Investigative & Forensic Services at the new Champaign County Nursing Home; seconded by James.

Mr. James stated he feels this issue should be deferred because mediation is going to be starting.

Mr. Beckett stated the idea of this study is to develop another area of potential damage the County has and without it, the argument cannot be made. It is an investment into a forensic analysis that brings numbers to the table that illustrates all of the loses the County has incurred. The cost is only \$7,000 and if we don't spend it, we won't have it. It relates to site drainage issues and the potential expenditures that might have to be made to modify the current structure to get the water offsite, that might include roof guttering and some other tiling work. Mr. Betz stated if the mediation failed the report would be of help at the next level.

Mr. James stated they may settle on a good price without this report and even in mediation, if we have the report they may still say they don't agree. He questioned when we say enough is enough and stop spending money. Mr. Beckett stated if this were the other attorney's that had been advising us in the past he may feel the same as Mr. James but this is a specific request from our present attorney's and so far he is listening to what they are saying and his feeling is we should give it to them.

Mr. Jay stated he is not going to support this but it's not because he is against Berns, Clancy he is just tired of having open ended contracts with a not to exceed amount. Ms. McGrath stated on pg. 40 of the proposal they have a not to exceed figure which is where the \$7,000 number came from.

Betz moved to amend the motion to include the language, not to exceed \$7,000; James concurred. **Motion carried** with a 6/1 roll call vote. Voting yes were Betz, James, Jay, Richards and Weibel. Voting no was Sapp.

### **Requests for Reduction in Retainage**

Bid Item #7 – Roofing-EDPM & Shingles – Advanced Roofing: Reduction in Retainage to \$0 due to 100% completion of contract work and closeout requirements.

Bid Item #10 – Masonry – Stobeck Masonry: Reduction in Retainage to \$0 due to 100% completion of contract work and closeout requirements.

Bid Item # 14 – Plumbing – McWilliams Mechanical: Reduction in Retainage to \$0 due to 100% completion of contract work and closeout requirements.

**OMNIBOUS MOTION** by Betz to approve the following requests for reduction in retainage: Roofing/EDPM & Shingles - Advanced Roofing to \$0 due to 100% completion of contract work and closeout requirements; Masonry - Stobeck Masonry to \$0 due to 100% completion of contract work and closeout requirements; Plumbing – McWilliams Mechanical to \$0 due to 100% completion of work and closeout requirements; seconded by Weibel.

Mr. Inman explained these contractors have completed 100% of their work and punch lists and we have no reason to withhold any of their money. When asked if any of these firms are tied to issues we have in mediation, Ms. McGrath stated they are not.

**Motion carried.**

## **CHAIR'S REPORT**

### **2007 Meeting Schedule**

Mr. Beckett asked the committee if they would like to add the CAC to the schedule. When asked about removing the Courthouse from the list Mr. Beckett stated he wanted to go there because of the Exterior Masonry contract. Mr. Sapp stated we should go to the CAC in April. Committee consensus to amend the schedule, meeting at the CAC in April and moving all other locations back one month.

## **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR – REPORT**

### **Update – Certificate of Need**

Mr. Inman reported we are still waiting to hear about the non-compliance issues, we have received word that we will know prior to any public notice.

### **Life/Safety Issue – Satellite Jail**

Mr. Inman reminded the committee that last month they talked about the age of the downtown jail and the fact that they had a design issue with not being able to get people evacuated from the building. The committee concurred and upon approval by the Finance committee we will be constructing an outdoor assembly area. At the Satellite jail the Sheriff has two options available to him during emergency events; one is the movement of prisoners to the outdoor recreation area on the east side of the building which is adjacent to the outside wall and actually takes two recreation areas and combines them into one egress point. When you have 160 people plus security personnel trying to leave a building from one area there is a great likelihood of the exit getting blocked. The other option is to use the doors on the east side on the north and south ends to egress out into an open field which is not something we would like to have happen because the close proximity to Brookens and the new nursing home could create a bad situation. They would like to recommend to the committee that we construct a secure prisoner staging area on the east side of the existing satellite jail with egress points on the north and south which would allow vehicles to pull up adjacent to the building and evacuate safely. We would solicit bids and bring the results back to the committee with the hope being to have it all done by July 2007.

When asked about cost, Mr. Inman stated it was \$50,000 last time they took a look at it.

**MOTION** by Betz to authorize the Administrator to begin the secure prisoner staging area with north south egress points and let it out for bid; Seconded by Sapp.

Mr. James asked how we will pay for this and if this means we will continue to do upkeep on the downtown jail.

Mr. Inman stated there is grant money but they are not sure how it will be divided between the two locations. Capt. Young stated they will address issues at the downtown jail as they come up. Mr. Weibel asked about any money being budgeted for this item.

Ms. Busey stated it is not budgeted for expenditure this year and not the amount they are talking about. They had anticipated this in the long term plan but it would require money from the general corporate fund and we would need a budget amendment.

Mr. Beckett asked about the general nature of the construction. Capt. Young explained there is fencing, security gates and cameras but nothing is being done, structurally, to the building.

**Motion carried.**

### **Remodel Project – State’s Attorney/Support Enforcement**

Mr. Inman explained the Support Enforcement remodel project is 95% complete and they need the State’s Attorney to do a walkthrough for final approval. The next phase is the changes to the current Support Enforcement space in pod 200; those plans are being finalized with Mr. Deedrich. He reported the City of Urbana building inspectors have visited pod 200 and they are requiring an emergency egress, which would sit next to Mental Health and Board of Review suites. When asked about the cost, Mr. Inman explained it will be no more than 300-400 dollars. The final phase is to build out the existing Supervisor of Assessments space for Planning & Zoning and add a conference area for RPC space. He reminded the committee that RPC representatives presented new requirements to them and as a result, Mr. Reinhart went back to the drawing board with that information; preliminary changes do not look like they will have a major impact except cost and time. The April 1<sup>st</sup> deadline has been removed by RPC to fully explore the space they are requesting and all costs will be born by RPC. He will bring more information to the committee in April.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

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

Ms. McGrath stated after review of the closed session minutes she recommends keeping them all closed.

**MOTION** by Jay to maintain all County Facilities closed session minutes as closed; seconded by Betz. **Motion carried.**

**ADDENDUM**

**Approval of contracts between Champaign County & White & Borgognoni Architects for Champaign County Courthouse Exterior Masonry Project**

**MOTION** by James to approve the contracts between Champaign County & White & Borgognoni Architects for Champaign County Courthouse Exterior Masonry Project; seconded by Weibel.

Mr. James stated he has read through these contracts and everything is conducive to the negotiations he was a part of.

Ms. McGrath stated the first contract is a standard form of agreement between owner and contract and the second is general conditions for the contract for construction and the committee needs to approve both of those. The A/E contract cost is \$425,649.

Ms. Busey explained the Courthouse construction fund still has money and we will need to issue bonds later this year to cover the balance of the expense. Mr. Jay asked about the \$425,000 and if it includes the \$82,000 for onsite observation and the \$39,000 for reimbursables. Ms. McGrath stated it does not. Mr. James stated there is a stipulation in the contract that the Architect will go by the County's mileage and some other terms as far as reimbursables go. Mr. Jay stated we are right back where we were with these contracts; we are paying for mileage, food and lodging. Mr. James stated during discussion all of that was brought up and we told them we would be watching that. Mr. Beckett stated we have the expectation that we are going to have an expert and we have one here and then we are going to expect them to give us a fee price which wouldn't be what it is if we made them put their expenses to it; they are committing themselves to an amount of reimbursables they have to bill against and they are saying they will follow our policies. He stated we are not going to get the kind of qualified professional we want and say by the way this is all on your dime. Ms. McGrath stated they did put a cap on the expenses in the contract so the Architect committed to two things we have not had in previous contracts.

**MOTION carried.**

**Proposed Bid Package to be utilized by White & Borgognoni**

Ms. McGrath stated this is for information tonight, explaining that the subcommittee was clear on some goals they wanted the Architect to pursue in terms of reaching out to small business and MBE/FBE businesses in the contracts. She worked with Mr. White on these documents and she wanted the committee to see the bid forms to see they tried to include what the subcommittee asked for.

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

Committee consensus to include items IV C; V A and B; VI 1 A, B, C, E; VI 3 A, B and C and Addendum items XII A and B on the County Board consent agenda.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Beckett declared the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Talbott  
Administrative Secretary