

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD  
COMMITTEE MINUTES

---

**COUNTY FACILITIES COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, May 5, 2009

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Beckett, Bensyl, Cowart, James, Jay, Richards, Sapp,  
Smucker, Weibel

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Denny Inman, Deb Busey, Jenny Putman, 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 James to approve the agenda; seconded by Smucker. There was no addendum for the meeting. **Motion carried.**

**Approval of Minutes – April 7, 2009**

**MOTION** by Weibel to approve the minutes of April 7, 2009; seconded by Richards.

Mr. Weibel stated the wording in the first paragraph of page 11 needs to be changed to reflect the passage of the amended motion.

**Motion carried.**

**Public Participation**

There was no public participation.

**Courthouse Masonry/Bell Tower Project**  
**Project Spreadsheet**

**MOTION** by Cowart to receive and place on file; seconded by Weibel.

Mr. Beckett pointed out that this spreadsheet does not give the allocation of as built cost between tower budget and overall project budget and at some point they will need that information.

When asked about a finish date, Mr. Inman stated the tower is scheduled for the 28th and the contract date is the 29<sup>th</sup>. The restoration on the sides of the facility is scheduled for August 21<sup>st</sup>. They have lost about 45% of their work days since February 7<sup>th</sup> because of rain so now they are working weekends and possible 10 hour days.

**Motion carried.**

**Request for Additional Professional Services**

**Amendment Number 5**

**Amendment Number 6**

**Amendment Number 7**

**Amendment Number 8**

Mr. Beckett explained these are a series of requested amendments and asked Mr. Inman to explain each one individually.

Mr. Inman explained amendment number 5, in the amount of \$10,129.12, is for unforeseen work that took place last fall. In particular the shifting of responsibility to the general contractor for the removal, restoration, and installation of the clock faces. This was never in the original bidding documents and it had been assumed the Citizens Committee was going to take care of it. In addition, there were unforeseen conditions with existing stone in the west arch and foundation and the final issue was the redesign of the lightning protection system. They took a look at it and discovered it was grounded to nothing and to do it according to new standards they had to come up with a new design.

**MOTION** by Weibel to approve Amendment #5; seconded by Sapp.

When asked about the issue with the clock face removal and reinstallation, Mr. Beckett explained from the Clock Tower Committees position they had no idea someone expected them to do something with the faces of the clock. The documents said nothing about that issue.

Mr. Sapp stated this amendment should say we are just adding the responsibility of the clock face removal and reinstallation to this contract, we are not shifting responsibility.

**Motion carried** with Jay opposed.

Mr. Inman stated amendment number 6, in the amount of \$2,845.00, entails the replacement of the existing bollard security system throughout the Courthouse Plaza and the incorporation of new fixtures at the new north exit. Salt and weathering combined together eroded the foundations of the existing bollards and that system is failing. The proposal is to replace with a cast aluminum system.

**MOTION** by James to approve amendment #6; seconded by Bensyl.

Mr. James asked Mr. Inman to look into having rubber sleeves put on the new system and Mr. Jay pointed out that salt can also erode aluminum so this might not fix the problem. Mr. Inman explained when this came up they asked Scott Wachter to find the best solution he could at minimal cost; they can ask him to revisit the issue.

**Motion carried** with Jay opposed.

Mr. Inman explained that the scope of work with amendment #7, which is in the amount of \$23,388.00, entails the masonry reconstruction of the existing south entrance with security enhancements, incorporation of south corridor space in the Public Defender's office suite, retrofitting of existing temporary Jury Assembly Area into functional communal space, security and HVAC energy efficiency modifications to all spaces. The temporary Jury Assembly area will become a press conference area, and phase II of the Lincoln exhibit will bring artifacts to the area.

**MOTION** by James to approve amendment number 7; seconded by Weibel.

When asked about funding for this, Mr. Inman stated it is coming from contingency and the plan is that this is the end of it. **Motion carried** with Jay opposed.

Mr. Inman addressed amendment #8, in the amount of \$11,738.20, explaining the scope of work includes the design of the exterior pedestrian pathways, final landscaping plan for the north side of the Courthouse, and the replacement of the existing paver system on the Courthouse Plaza. The existing paver system in the plaza, which will connect to this, is heated and they have had 4 claims within the last three years where by with the transition from winter to spring the concrete is warming up with the bricks staying cool and the bricks get slick.

They are going to remove those bricks and replace the bad ones with colored concrete.

**MOTION** by James to approve amendment #8; seconded by Weibel.

Mr. Sapp stated this is the only amendment that caught him off guard as to why we didn't plan for this stuff. In the future he hopes these are areas we think about and know the costs for upfront.

**Motion carried** with Jay and Bensyl opposed.

### **Champaign County Nursing Home**

#### **Update regarding Illinois Department of Public Health Life Safety Inspection Plan of Correction**

Mr. Inman distributed information to the committee which explained each of the items from the inspection and described the current status. The items that don't have an action listed in red are those issues they were able to accomplish with our own labor. Mr. Weibel asked what it means when an item says IDPH removed from their list for this year. Mr. Inman explained the smoke barrier issue, stating there is enough smoke barrier drywall in the building so there shouldn't be any problems. They started investigating the issue and IDPH then sent a memo to Mr. Buffenbarger stating that most of the deficiencies were gone. In a follow up conversation they learned that the inspector sighted the wrong standard, so we were correct but told they were going apply a new standard on the smoke barrier. Mr. Glerum has been provided the new standard to take a look at to see what we can do to avoid an expensive investment.

### **Physical Plant**

#### **Monthly Reports**

**MOTION** by James to receive and place on file; seconded by Smucker.

Mr. Smucker stated he is interested in seeing numbers for the animal control building. Mr. Beckett stated these reports are of no benefit if they have no historical data.

**Motion carried.**

## Chair's Report

### **Jenny Putman Meeting Room Pictures**

Mr. Beckett reminded the committee that in March he shared Ms. Putman's request to consider the décor in the former Meeting Room 2, now the Jennifer K. Putman meeting room. The committee arrived at no consensus to support the request so he then asked Ms. Putman to come to a meeting to discuss the issue.

Ms. Putman presented the committee with a letter as an expression of gratitude for renaming the former Meeting Room 2 the Jennifer K. Putman Meeting Room. She explained that currently there are three framed pictures in that room which don't carry a theme to bring the room together. She would like to begin the tradition in that room of displaying photos of County Board Chairs; starting with the first she served under, honoring them with framed portraits. She would contact the families of the chairs to obtain the pictures and would pay for the cost of having them framed.

Ms. Cowart stated she feels this is a good idea. Mr. James stated all members of the County Board serve because they want to and there are pictures of the full board in Lyle Shields Meeting Room. He suggested having photos of historical buildings throughout the County in that room, or something that could show people when they walk into that room what the County is about.

Mr. Sapp stated he is glad they voted for the re-naming of the room and believes there should be a portrait of Ms. Putman in that room but he has concerns about honoring people like that because there have been a lot of good people in this county and once they start something like that it is difficult to draw the line.

Mr. Smucker stated he agrees the room doesn't currently have a theme and he believes the idea of County Board Chair photos is fine and because that room has a lot of wall space there is room for other portraits as well.

**MOTION** by Weibel to allow Ms. Putman to move forward with displaying photos of County Board Chairs in the Jenny Putman Meeting Room, starting with the 76-78 term; seconded by Smucker.

Mr. Beckett stated he is opposed to this, but not because of the pictures. They named Meeting Room 1 the Lyle Shields Meeting Room and he doesn't believe Mr. Shields realized he could come forward with a plan to decorate it because no one told him it was his to decorate. He believes it is honor enough to get a room named after you and this is going one step further.

**Motion carried** with a 5/4 roll call vote. Voting yes was Cowart, Jay, Richards, Smucker, and Weibel. Voting no was Bensyl, James, Sapp and Beckett.

## **County Administrator**

### **Energy Policy**

#### **Approval of Energy Policy**

Mr. Inman reminded the committee that at the last meeting they vocalized the changes they wanted made to the policy and he believes he has captured those changes in what is before the committee tonight.

**MOTION** by Smucker to approve the energy policy; seconded by Richards.

Mr. James questioned the wording on item 8G, individual appliances, asking if it reflects what the committee requested. Mr. Inman explained he tried to make the language as strong as possible. Mr. James asked about the motion sensors and if that would be at the County's cost.

Mr. Sapp stated they will have to tweak this policy as they move forward, now they still have some liability by allowing people to use those types of appliances in the facilities and they need to know what will occur if something happens. He has concerns about the wording used there and our liability.

Mr. Smucker stated currently we are saying we will try to reduce energy by 50 cents per square foot by 2010 but it may make more sense to say reduce it by 15%, then we can look at our bills and see if our costs went down by that percentage.

Mr. Inman explained his understanding, when it comes to applying for grants, is that once we are tied into a system we will want to stay with it for reporting purposes. 50 cents per square foot should be achievable and by using this formula we will be able to document the savings each month and report it to the committee. Mr. Smucker asked if they could get the information broken down by square foot in their monthly report.

Mr. Beckett stated once they set up a formula it should be simply plugging in a number to get a report.

Mr. Beckett stated SEDAC will help us at no cost and they have assigned a representative to us and the energy council may be willing to look at our bills to give us an idea if we are in the ballpark of where we need to be with our reporting.

**Motion carried.**

## **Request for Professional Services required for Energy Grant Funding**

Mr. Inman explained that going through all the different grants that are available they all have one similar component in them and that is an Engineer is needed to calculate savings before an agency will look at an application. He talked with Jim Gleason, provided him with all the grant information and asked him to come up with a proposal. The letter before the committee tonight reflects Mr. Gleason's understanding of the grants and what it would take for his firm to work with us. The Courthouse could be covered through the Courthouse Construction Fund and funding for the others we would have to work on. He would like concurrence to forward this to Finance and at least apply for the Courthouse Complex and that would give time to look at other sources for funding. A second set of grants will be coming out later this year.

When asked if it is possible to put some of these costs into the grant, Mr. Inman stated it is and in any grant they apply for they will include those costs.

Mr. Smucker asked about the Animal Control building which may be the most inefficient one we own. He asked to have that building put on the list to be reviewed by the engineer for potential grant money.

When asked about the range of grants, Mr. Inman explained the first range is up to \$250,000 then up to 1 million and so on. Mr. James asked if we could tell GHR to use a certain formula for us.

Mr. Inman stated all grants ask the question, how much is going to be saved and that answer requires calculations from an engineer. Mr. Sapp stated it doesn't make sense that we have to spend money before we even know if we are going to be awarded a grant. He asked Mr. Inman to email him the grant for him to review.

Ms. Busey stated grants are supposed to go through Finance and whatever portion of this is for the Courthouse can come from the Courthouse Construction Fund but whatever portion of these fees will be required for other buildings would have to come from the General Corporate Fund so it will have go to Finance for a decision.

Mr. Smucker stated he would like to add the Animal Control building to those that will be reviewed for grant money. Ms. Busey stated because this item cannot be added to the Finance agenda, she will present this information to Finance under other business asking them to forward it to the full board.

**MOTION** by Smucker to move adoption of a resolution to apply for an energy reduction grant pursuant to the proposal submitted by GHR Engineering Associates dated May 5, 2009 for the Courthouse, Brookens Administrative Center, Sheriffs Office and Animal Control Facility; seconded by Richards.

A friendly amendment was made to the motion to include sending it to Finance with Facilities recommendation for approval. Mover and seconder concur.

**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.

### **De-lamping Plan for Courthouse**

Mr. Inman explained, at the last meeting, the committee requested that the process be streamlined so he has added language stating the Director of Facilities will report monthly to the Facilities Committee and reports will be viewable on the county website. The Director of Facilities or County Administrator can enact any changes that need to be made with concurrence of the committee and Department Head.

**MOTION** by Smucker to approve the De-lamping plan; seconded by Weibel.  
**Motion carried.**

### **East Urbana Interceptor Sewer Project Berns, Clancy & Associates Proposal for Professional Services**

**MOTION** by Bensyl to approve the East Urbana Sewer Project Proposal for Professional Services; seconded by James.

Mr. Richards asked if we are paying the cost for this. Mr. Beckett stated this is \$18,800 we got out of the agreement with Sanitary District that was approved last month and these costs were included within the project. Mr. James stated he has looked at some of the charges here and on vehicle mileage he asked if they can set what they want. Ms. Busey stated we pay the standard rate, and costs reimbursed would have to be consistent with County policy, that is what is typically included with contracts.

A friendly amendment was made to include the language; all costs reimbursed under this proposal must be consistent with County policy for cost reimbursements. Mover and seconder concur.

**Motion carried.**

### **Other Business**

Mr. Beckett reported that an email had been sent out regarding the County building code issue. Ms. Busey is getting, for the committee, the LaSalle County building code system but she believes this is an item that belongs with ELUC and not with this committee. He will talk to Ms. Wysocki about placing it on her agenda.

Mr. James explained this came about because they have been getting complaints in the rural areas and the codes are almost non existent.

### **Determination of Items to be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda**

Committee consensus that item C1 be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda.

### **Adjournment**

Chair Beckett declared the meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Talbott  
Administrative Secretary