

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
COMMITTEE MINUTES

COUNTY FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Tuesday, February 3, 2009

Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington St., Urbana

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Beckett (Chair), Bensyl, Cowart, James, Jay, Sapp, Smucker, Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Denny Inman, Deb Busey, Gail White, Brad Klein (White & Borgognoni Architects) Media

AGENDA ITEM

Call to Order

Chair Beckett called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A roll call confirmed a quorum present.

Approval of Agenda/Addendum

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

Approval of Minutes - November 12, 2008

MOTION by James to approve the minutes of November 12, 2008 as presented; seconded by Jay. **Motion carried.**

Public Participation

There was no public participation

Courthouse Masonry/Bell Tower Project
Project Update by W&B & Roessler

Gail White, of White & Borgognoni Architects, presented an update to the committee. He explained that the pre-cast structure has been erected so the tower is up to the full height it is intended to be. Part of the lower portion of the tower is enclosed so work on the masonry can continue in spite of the weather. The stone has been reinstalled up to the level where the first story is approximately and the additional masonry work is progressing upward. The rest of the tuck pointing on the other portions is not yet underway due to the weather, but the work in the interior is progressing well. The contractor and subcontractors have all been very conscious about staying on the project, working with weather conditions and continuing on a normal work schedule.

Mr. White stated the foundation was a real unknown and some conditions of the old stone work were unknown, once the stone was taken out and they could see how it had been cut, which wasn't what they anticipated finding, there were some costs there. Some of the construction detailing in the original building was a little different from what was anticipated and what was built into the design so they had to make some adjustments there but overall he feels we have been fortunate that things have gone smoothly for the type of construction it is and the level of documentation that was available in the original drawings.

Mr. Beckett stated it sounds as if the issues there were raised once they could see what they couldn't before, and asked if there are their anymore issues like that where we are going to face something new. Mr. White stated he feels they are beyond the worst of that because now they are getting to a level where things are a newer construction.

When asked if all materials are on sight, Mr. Klein stated not everything is on sight.

When asked about precautions that have been taken against the weather and the costs for that, Mr. White stated those costs were built in from the beginning and they are maintaining certain levels of heat where they are doing the masonry work. The contractor is responsible for maintaining the property and repairing any damage that may occur due to weather.

Mr. Weibel stated we have spent about 22% of the contingency fee and asked if they anticipate our spending rate remaining about the same and if we will end up with leftover contingency. Mr. White stated he anticipates there will be some contingency left at the end of the project, they had a lot of potential for a lot of things to go wrong when the tower was coming down but it was a very controlled process with no issues, he stated Roessler Construction is proactive in their approach to the project.

Mr. Sapp asked if the change orders listed came before this committee. Mr. Beckett stated the change order for the gargoyles did but he is unsure about the other money.

Mr. Inman explained the additional owner expenses are for the renovation of the 2nd and 3rd floors for the State's Attorney and Public Defender which was not in our original contract. Mr. Sapp pointed out if you add those costs to the contingency it will bring it down to under \$400,000.

Mr. Beckett asked if there is any other issues anticipated that we need to get beyond to have a handle on the use of contingent funds. Mr. Inman stated he believes we are at that point now.

Mr. Sapp stated the added expenses by owner payments this month were \$17,655 which is not included yet in the contract total so in fact the contract total should go up higher which will bring the contingency down even lower.

Ms. Busey explained that the first column on the spreadsheet shows the original contract amounts, the second column is change orders and any changes related to construction are being subtracted from contingency, so the total building construction is zero. They have added \$134,000 in cost and subtracted that from contingency.

All other changes are added to the total project budget; the original budget was \$6,747,522 and it is currently \$6,943,086 so they are only contributing construction changes with construction contingency. There was no original budget for owner items; the total in payments year to date is the amount that existed in the previous report plus payments this month for a total \$87,900.

Mr. Sapp stated he is concerned that we originally approved a budget of 6.7 million knowing we had almost \$600,000 in contingency and although we have approved other amounts, our contract total is now up to 6.9 million so we are not staying in budget. Ms. Busey stated this reporting is new but her understanding was the contingency was for construction changes not necessary A/E contract changes or additional expenses so if you look at that column, if it is subtracted from contingency it would adjust the project total back to 6.7 million. They may change the format of the reporting so they can see the running total of changes.

Mr. White stated some of the additional expenses they have run into were not because of problems and gave the example of the north exit out of the jury assembly room. He explained that was something that had been a concern to them, putting such an effort into reconstructing the tower then not having a door there seemed out of character with the overall effort. So they suggested re-establishing an exit out of the jury assembly room for that purpose but also to increase the level of life safety. Mr. Beckett explained they had a meeting with the Sheriff who pointed out if there was a fire there would be a way for everyone on the upper floors to come down and go out the south door, people in jury assembly would also have to get to the door which could be a problem, by closing off the wall it would also help him keep track of people going in the Public Defender's office so he was all for this. Mr. Klein stated it was not a code violation because the first floor of the existing Courthouse had two exits, they met the letter of the code from the previous modifications and what they did was going a little beyond that. The letter of the code is a good minimum baseline but in some cases there is good reason to go beyond.

Request approval to let bids for roof replacement

Mr. Inman explained the roof is approximately 20 years old and is nearing the end of its life cycle. This project, in consultation with Mr. Beckett and Mr. Weibel, was put on the local projects for stimulus package money list and they would like to put it out for bid now, before the stimulus money is released hoping to keep that pricing because they are certain prices will go up once the stimulus money is out. They would like to run the project through our contractor, Roessler Construction, and the roofer would be a subcontractor to them.

Mr. James asked what part of the Courthouse this covers. Mr. Inman explained it is the old part and they are looking at shingles with a 50 year warranty. Mr. James asked about the gutters. Mr. Inman explained there is some gutter repair already in the project and they have looked at the down spouts and discovered four of those need to be replaced.

Mr. Bensyl asked if the final letting of this project is contingent on the stimulus money or if we have funds to move forward if we don't get that money. Mr. Inman explained we may have funds available but it will depend on how the project moves forward.

Mr. Beckett stated just because we let the bid doesn't mean we have to do the project and asked when we will know about the stimulus package funding.

Mr. Weibel stated they are aiming for a President's Day signature on the bill if the senate and the house can agree, then we will hopefully have an idea.

Ms. Cowart and Mr. Richards arrived at 7:07 p.m.

Mr. Sapp stated if you look at what was submitted this doesn't rank in the top tiers of where the money would go first. Mr. Bensyl asked, assuming we don't have an answer on the stimulus package and we don't have any other funds available out of the project, if we will be able to do the project. Mr. Beckett stated the stimulus funds and the construction budget are the only funding sources available.

Mr. Jay stated if the money isn't there when it needs to be, we just say the money isn't there.

MOTION to recommend approval of letting bids for roof replacement.

Motion carried.

Project Spreadsheet

This item was addressed during the project update discussion.

Request for additional A/E Professional Services for Security Camera System

Mr. Inman stated while they were going through the different options for the tower, they did not include the security cameras which were part of the original courthouse project. This request is to put a finalization to the exterior security system. The county will do most of the interior work; this is just designing where they will be installed on the building. It is \$7,456.07 for the engineering fees, the Sheriff is paying for most of the equipment and we will use our labor to run wiring back to the lower level control center.

MOTION by Weibel to approve the additional A/E Professional Services for security camera system; seconded by Sapp.

Mr. Beckett stated this money is coming out of contingency.

Motion carried.

Fleet Maintenance/Highway Facility Report on Project Cost: Spreadsheet

MOTION by Richards to receive and place on file the report on project cost spreadsheet dated January 2009; seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried.**

BLDD - Request for additional compensation

Mr. Beckett explained there was a committee that negotiated the fee with the architect which consisted of himself, Mr. Weibel, Mr. Inman, Mr. Sapp, and Mr. Jay. As the project was winding down they received a request from BLDD for \$62,738, so in the fall that original committee had a meeting with BLDD to have them explain what they were looking for and why.

The first item was \$45,000 they felt entitled too under the terms of the contract because the dollar amount spent on the building was larger than the amount of budget they projected therefore they believe they had received a fee based on a percentage of the overall cost and were entitled to a greater fee because the project cost was larger. He remarked he did not think it had much merit but would talk to our attorney. The second item was billed based on the rates under the contract for additional onsite observation they had done and turned in the time for but had not billed, then there were a series of items that represented things we had asked for during the construction that required either engineering or architect work to get done, some of them had been billed for some had not. BLDD left the meeting and the committee talked and he and Chair Weibel both believed they did the work had a contract and should be paid. Mr. Jay and Mr. Sapp asked why they didn't they bill us before and why they are coming to us now and both believed BLDD wasn't entitled to anything. He never received the information from the attorney so he couldn't bring this item back in November, and this would have been the only item on the January agenda but it wasn't ready for our regular meeting so the committee met before the board meeting to address this. His position hasn't changed, the \$16,988.60 they are asking for is because of work they did do.

Mr. Sapp stated there was some additional discussion and he believes they should not be paid the \$45,000. When the project was originally bid we wanted to get to the lowest cost possible so they did some things in design to lower cost, then after the project was approved we went to them and asked for changes and it cost us more money. He feels they shouldn't put something somewhere just to get costs down while making it unusable, and that was part of what he was upset about.

Mr. Jay stated he still will not support this, he believes those fees may have been owed at one time but not at the end of the project. BLDD needs to assume some of the responsibility and he doesn't feel this is fair or right.

MOTION to approve the request for additional compensation failed with a 5/4 roll call vote. Voting no was Bensyl, Cowart, James, Jay and Richards. Voting yes was Beckett, Sapp, Smucker and Weibel.

Mr. Beckett stated we are going to end up getting a notice of arbitration and end up with legal fees. He doesn't like to see anything killed in committee and this vote says we are not going to let the board decide and he doesn't think that is right.

MOTION to reconsider the original motion by Richards, seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried** with a 6/3 roll call vote. Voting yes was Beckett, Cowart, Richards, Sapp, Smucker and Weibel. Voting no was Bensyl, James and Jay.

MOTION to move the item to the full board without recommendation by Sapp, seconded by Weibel. **Motion carried.**

Current & Future Stimulus /Recovery Projects

Current identified local projects

Mr. Inman explained he, Cameron Moore, and Mr. Weibel went to Chicago then Springfield, meeting with the Illinois Infrastructure Task Force to get a handle on what the stimulus package means to Champaign County. Prior to that, there had been a call to local government agencies to create a list of ready to go projects and he provided the list to the committee. Originally, we had two projects within the top 18 since then some have come forward and we have been bumped down the list so it is now the top 24 projects considered ready to go. It is our understanding that there will be money for transportation that will have its own formula, there will be money for sewer that will have its own formula, education facilities which has a separate funding and there will be energy and technology so in theory the local government money will come from either the federal money or the promise from the state to create their own capital stimulus package. The state believes the federal government will act within the next 65-70 days once it gets here the state process starts which adds another 45 days.

Mr. Smucker stated there is nothing on the list which looks at renewable energy projects, such as geothermal power or the County owning a windmill. Mr. Beckett stated he is trying to identify someone from the University of Illinois to come talk to the committee about renewable energy and it will be a future agenda item. Mr. James stated the Township Officials have been meeting to try and gain some groundwork to tackle the wind energy issues.

Mr. Bensyl asked about item 30 on the list, Nursing Home HVAC. Mr. Inman stated it is to implement the correct fix for the nursing home HVAC system because what we had done was just suitable.

Future projects - jail replacement

Mr. Beckett stated there is no consensus for a new jail in our county, no consensus right now to even add a pod to our jail but his opinion is if we could close the downtown jail and had the opportunity to build replacement beds at the satellite there is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Sapp stated it is a stretch to think a 30 year old building is reaching the end of its life cycle and asked if the downtown jail can be redone for less than the cost of building new and he hopes that is considered.

When asked if we could pursue both avenues Mr. Beckett stated yes but we have to get the Sheriff to agree with us and he doesn't want to be in that building because of a number of things, it's not just the building there are also policy issues.

Ms. Busey stated if we are looking at both options a good capital plan should look at operational impact. Try to quantify the financial impact of operations in two facilities versus one because over a period of years it could be substantial. Mr. Beckett reminded the committee that this is the first meeting and if anyone has any agenda items to please let him know.

Energy Action Report

Mr. Inman stated he is bringing this back for consideration and direction. Our counterparts at the Cities and the University of Illinois have proceeded past us from where we were originally and are looking at ways to conserve energy. Many things listed are common sense items we could implement quickly and inexpensively, another portion of this not included are the grants now becoming available. Our goal is to spend nothing out of the general corporate fund. When asked who the energy action plan group is made up of and who they will report to, Mr. Inman stated there are Department Head meetings on Wednesdays and it would probably be that group and he and Deb will create the report and bring it to this committee and if they need something they will let the committee know.

Mr. Sapp stated there are simple things we can do now and encouraged Mr. Inman to work with the Department Heads about what can be done now, what is needed to result in a policy and move forward. After discussion regarding space heaters Mr. Beckett asked if they need to amend the report to say with approval of the department head.

Mr. Inman stated he requests the committee approve the energy action plan in spirit and let them come back with a more formalized plan. Mr. Beckett asked if there was a consensus that this is the direction we want to go and we look for a new document at the next meeting. No objection stated.

Mr. Beckett stated there is no money for this and if we adopt a policy we could maybe vote it into next years budget.

Physical Plant **Monthly Reports**

No discussion

Other Business **Approval of Closed Session Minutes: November 12, 2008**

MOTION by James to approve the closed session minutes of November 12, 2008; seconded by Jay. **Motion carried.**

Designation of Items to be placed on County Board Consent Agenda

No items will be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda.

Adjournment

Chair Beckett declared the meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Talbott
Administrative Secretary

