



Champaign County Board Facilities Committee
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois

MINUTES – Approved as Distributed 6/4/13

DATE: Tuesday, May 7, 2013
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E Washington, Urbana, IL 61802

Committee Members

Present	Absent
Stan James (Chair)	
James Quisenberry (Vice Chair)	
Josh Hartke	
Jeff Kibler	
Gary Maxwell	
Giraldo Rosales	
Rachel Schwartz	

County Staff: Alan Reinhart (Director of Facilities), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Beth Brunk (Recording Secretary)

Others Present: John Jay, Patti Petrie & Jim McGuire (Champaign Co Board), Steve Beckett, Cassie Carroll & Ryan Wolber (Illinois Green Business Association)

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair James called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

II. Roll Call

A verbal roll call was taken and a quorum was declared present.

III. Approval of Minutes

A. March 5, 2013 – Regular Meeting

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to approve the minutes of the March 5, 2013 meeting as distributed; seconded by Mr. Quisenberry. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

IV. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Quisenberry asked that Item XII, Energy Efficiency Study Session – Next Steps, be moved after Communications to accommodate the guest speakers.

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to approve the agenda as amended; seconded by Mr. Kibler. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

V. Acceptance of Bequest to Citizens Committee for Restoration of the Clock & Bell Tower at the Champaign County Courthouse from Mrs. Elva Greeson

Steve Beckett gave a brief history of the Citizens Committee for the Restoration of the Clock & Bell Tower at the Champaign County Courthouse. The restoration work was funded entirely from private donations. Ms. Elva Hensley Greeson, who passed away in April 2013, included a bequest of an estimated \$75,000-\$100,000 to the Citizens Committee for the Restoration of the Clock & Bell Tower for its general charitable purpose. This bequest is subject to a provision which allocated \$15,000 to be used for the sole purpose of the on-going maintenance of the Courthouse clock. Legally, the Champaign County Board must accept this gift on behalf of the Citizens Committee. It was Ms. Greeson's wish that this money should go to the clock and bell tower and not any other county need. The Facilities Committee must recommend the acceptance of this restricted gift to proceed to the Champaign County Board for approval.

MOTION by Mr. Rosales to recommend to the County Board to accept the bequest from the Alva Hensley Greeson Trust and notify the executor that the County would create a separate designation of these funds to be used for the Clock and Bell Tower in accordance with the provisions of the Trust; seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

Ms. Schwartz asked if the money could be used to pay down the bonds issued to pay for the renovation of the Courthouse. Mr. Beckett responded that \$15,000 had to be used for maintenance but the remainder could be used to retire debt pending legal consultation. According to Ms. Greeson's attorney, she was worried about the maintenance of the clock and bell tower. Mr. James thought that based on the will, the money should be set aside for maintenance of the clock and tower as Ms. Greeson wanted. Mr. Beckett added that if any clock parts had to be replaced, they must be specially machined as the clock was built in 1877.

Upon vote, the MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

VI. Public Participation

None

VII. Communications

Mr. Quisenberry noted that Carol Timms who spoke at the Energy Efficiency Study Session wanted to clarify that the energy service companies guarantee the amount of energy that will be saved but do not guarantee the utility rates paid by the County.

VIII. Energy Efficiency Study Session – Next Steps

Cassie Carroll and Ryan Wolber from Illinois Green Business Association (IGBA) discussed their program and how it would benefit the County. Mr. Wolber described the IGBA Green Certification process which included a checklist assessment for energy and water conservation, waste reduction, landscape design, purchase awareness and community involvement for Brookens Administrative Center. A draft would be developed for sustainable green practices and policy assistance.

Ms. Carroll discussed the connectivity to incentive programs through the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) and other avenues like Illinois Energy Now. Additional initiatives may include integrating prairie landscape, solar panels or rain gardens. As part of the project, IGBA staff would evaluate the applicability and feasibility of some of these projects at Brookens Center to organize a multitude of different partnerships and collaborations throughout the community. Should the County decide to complete the certification process, IGBA will promote the County's effort for about 2-3 years in their marketing efforts.

Mr. Hartke explained that Brookens Center could be the initial focus but hoped that some of these practices could be used at other County buildings. Mr. James asked what the cost would be for this study. Ms. Carroll replied that certification of Brookens Center would cost \$1,500 for all services

including the checklist, implementation and resource connectivity. The feasibility studies like the rain garden would cost an additional \$1,000 to \$2,500. Mr. James inquired if the green products included maintenance supplies. Ms. Carroll stated that IGBA staff would look for low toxic, low pollutant alternatives. Mr. James would like to review a study developed for a local business to assess the savings.

Mr. Quisenberry thought that the \$1,500 cost for the study could be funded in this budget cycle if the County Board was interested. Mr. Hartke felt that this study will save more than \$1,500 in the long run. Ms. Busey asked for an assessment of expectations of the staff in Brookens Center as four of the offices in the building are administered by elected officials. Ms. Carroll responded that employee education and awareness are incorporated in the study. Mr. Quisenberry inquired about an estimation of the number of hours IGBA would need to analyze Brookens Center. Ms. Carroll replied that on average the checklist takes approximately 10-15 hours and the implementation 3-5 months.

Mr. McGuire commented that the County Board is looking at spending over \$300,000 in exterior maintenance for the Courthouse that was not expected. Not only does the \$1,500 impact the budget but also the time that County staff will have to do the study. Mr. Quisenberry noted that the \$1,500 is for advice, and funding for study's action recommendations will have to be figured out. Mr. James stated that an energy audit for the County was done in the past with many recommendations but no money was available to do anything. Mr. Reinhart needs to assess if he has the time and money in his budget to recommend this study to the Facilities Committee. Ms. Petrie asked for the Busey Bank documents so Mr. Reinhart could talk with a local entity to assess the value of this program for the County. She wanted to emphasize the value of looking at the savings in the long-term. Ms. Carroll will talk to Busey Bank about releasing their IGBA study to the County for review.

IX. IGW Architecture – Courthouse Masonry Report

Riley Glerum, Principal/CEO at IGW Architecture, explained that his firm was tasked with analyzing the cracking at the historic west portion of the Courthouse and identifying maintenance procedures needed on the newer Courthouse addition. The majority of the damage which includes cracking of the brick masonry and some open mortar joints is confined to the south and west facades. The damage is believed to be the result of thermal expansion and contracting of the masonry materials. The proposed plan to repair the damage is replacement of any cracked bricks and repointing of the mortar joints to prevent water infiltration. In addition, Mr. Glerum recommended the installation of vertical expansion joints to provide movement space.

Mr. Rosales wondered if the mortar was faulty or the heavy bus traffic vibrations were causing the cracking. Mr. Glerum noted the south and west sides have the longest uninterrupted facades which have the greatest potential for movement with the extreme fluctuations in temperature. In terms of the bus vibrations, Mr. Glerum thought that more homework needed to be done on the dynamics. However, if it is a structural shake, it would be unlikely to transfer to the face brick. Mr. James commented that this situation needs to be fixed before more damage occurs and the repair costs increase. Mr. Hartke inquired why vertical expansion joints were not used in the 2008 restoration. Mr. Glerum speculated that the architect did not want to disrupt the historic building aesthetic and thought the measures used for expansion would be adequate.

Mr. Kibler asked if there were any temporary solutions that could be employed that would not cost as much. Mr. Glerum responded that the only option to address the thermal contraction/expansion is to install expansion joints. Mr. Kibler wondered what the expense would be to patch the damage until more money was available. Mr. Reinhart stated that he would need to get price quotes from contractors to ascertain that cost. Mr. James commented that money is already available in the Courts Construction Fund that has been set aside for Courthouse maintenance. He was strongly against trying to patch the damage in that it would be just a temporary fix and more cost more in the future to repair. Mr. McGuire opined that it is necessary to pay for the repairs now than let more water infiltrate the building and cause catastrophic damage.

Ms. Schwartz verified that the money in the Court Construction Fund is from bonds issued for the Courthouse construction. These bonds are paid for by the safety sales tax fund. It is Ms. Schwartz' view that it should be used for whatever criminal justice facility has the highest priority for maintenance. Until all these priorities are outlined, Ms. Schwartz could not support the using the money for the Courthouse masonry repairs as presented. Mr. James noted that there would still be \$500,000 left in the Court Construction Fund for other priorities if needed.

Mr. Glerum stated that a conservative estimate of the repairs to the historic west portion of the Courthouse would be \$120,000. Ms. Petrie wondered why the mortar would crack now since the south and west walls would have been exposed to thermal contractions/expansions for many years. Mr. Glerum suspected that the walls had been cracking throughout the years – this is probably not something new. Ms. Petrie asked how the vertical expansion joints would affect the integrity of the historic façade. Mr. Glerum explained that part of the design process will be the semi-concealment of the joints so they would not be so apparent. He also noted that these joints installed on the west façade will be more carefully integrated in the historic appearance of the building due to its public visibility than the ones on the south side which is less historically significant. Ms. Petrie did not want a County Board in ten years to be facing similar issues.

With respect to the Courthouse's new addition which is now approaching ten years old, some masonry maintenance is required such as replacement of failed joint sealants to keep water out. Sealants have a serviceable life of approximately ten years. The project to remove and replace the joint sealants has an estimated cost of \$75,000.

The final project at an estimated cost of \$110,000 for the Courthouse new addition includes the minor masonry repair and masonry clean/seal. Mr. James asked what the shelf life is on the vapor permeable water repellent sealer. Mr. Glerum thought it was 5-10 years before reapplication is needed. Mr. Kibler inquired of the \$110,000 expense, what portion was allocated to minor repair. Mr. Glerum replied about \$5,000-\$10,000. Mr. Hartke noted that shade trees planted on the south side may mitigate the extreme summer temperatures on the Courthouse's south wall.

Ms. Petrie inquired if there was a relationship between a higher quality sealant and the extension of its life span. Mr. Glerum said that the life span of sealants have more to do with external factors such as temperature, UV exposure and humidity.

Mr. Reinhart recommended completing all the work outlined in the IGW Architecture analysis as soon as possible to minimize the damage. He would need to get an RFP out quickly to get the work scheduled for the summer construction season.

MOTION by Mr. James to recommend to approval of a contract not to exceed \$303,976 for Options A, B and C with IGW Architecture for the design, bid and construction phases of the Courthouse Exterior Maintenance Project; seconded by Mr. Rosales.

Mr. Maxwell commented that this situation at the Courthouse emphasizes the importance of accumulating money on an annual basis for the maintenance of the entire County building system. Mr. Kibler suggested funding Option A, B and \$10,000 of Option C for repairs only. Mr. Glerum stated that repairing, cleaning and sealing the masonry should be done as a complete process. Without sealing the brick, there is the risk that slight imperfections in the wall and/or mortar will allow moisture in thereby deteriorating the brick. If there are funding limitations, it could be done in a phased manner over time but that would lose some of the economy of scale with a larger job.

Mr. James noted that pending County Board approval, IGW Architecture will develop the all the bid documents and send out the bids. Mr. Kibler affirmed that the bids would come back to the Facilities Committee for approval.

Mr. Quisenberry called the question and requested a roll call vote.

Roll call vote:

Aye: 6 – Hartke, Kibler, Maxwell, Quisenberry, Rosales, James

Nay: 1 – Schwartz

MOTION CARRIED.

X. Department of Commerce & Economic Opportunity (DCEO) grant for Public Sector Energy Efficiency Program Update

Mr. Reinhart indicated that the application was submitted to DCEO. After a preliminary review, DCEO confirmed that all documents had been received. Mr. Reinhart anticipated that he will be notified of the grant awardees by the end of May.

XI. Rent versus Own for County Agencies in County Buildings

Ms. Busey reported that Champaign County lacks a consistent occupancy policy for various County agencies in County buildings. Since the Mental Health Board lease expired on March 31st, it would be appropriate to evaluate how the County Board manages this issue at this time.

As outlined in the memorandum, a comparison of two County agencies, the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and the Mental Health Board (MHB) highlights this discrepancy. Taking into consideration that RPC pays for its utilities, custodian services, remodeling/improvement projects and the lost opportunity to reinvest the interest on 0% loan to the County, the real rental rate is approximately \$11.18 per square foot. The MHB has been treated as a lessee similar to other non-County agencies like the Urbana Park District. The MHB's rent cost per square foot is currently \$14.46 which is all inclusive including utilities and custodial services.

In talking with other counties, Ms. Busey found that county offices and agencies that reside in county buildings are not charged rent but instead pay an occupancy cost. This alternative (Option 1) can be achieved when the facilities management maintenance plan has been developed with the knowledge of the pro-rata costs of the Brookens Building. Each of the County tenants will be charged their pro-rata share on an annual basis. So when a system needs to be replaced like a HVAC system, the money is in the fund to make that replacement. While there is not enough information for Option 1 at this time, Ms. Busey wanted to introduce the concept.

Option 2 is to renew the MHB lease at the discounted rate of \$11.37 per square foot which is more in line with what RPC is currently paying. Ms. Busey asked if the County needs to make money off County agencies' rent or should the County charge less rent in an effort to invest in the services these agencies provide.

Mr. James favored the rental Option 2 which charges a square foot price and raises it every year or two as costs go up. If using Option 1, Mr. James wondered what would happen if an HVAC system needed a replacement within a short time frame and a tenant decided to leave. Mr. Maxwell suggested timing MHB lease to expire at the same time as RPC's lease. At that point, the County Board will have time to work toward developing an Option 1 Policy. Ms. Schwartz liked sharing the risk of facility maintenance costs with the County agencies but wondered if these entities would have enough money in their budget to handle pro-rata maintenance costs.

Mr. Kibler preferred Option 1 since it is easier to budget and assess risk. He suggested doing research to determine a competitive market rate to be used for County leases. Mr. Quisenberry would prefer to have the MHB lease rate based on a competitive rate. Mr. James commented that a State worker who leases buildings stated that \$15 per square foot is a reasonable starting point. Ms. Busey responded that until the building costs are determined, it is difficult to assess that number.

MOTION by Ms. Schwartz to recommend the authorization to renew the lease with the Mental Health

Board at \$11.37 per square foot for the first year, and then adjust it by next year's Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the second year; seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. Hartke was concerned that the agencies like RPC and MHB would not be able to handle emergency budget situations as the County can. Ms. Petrie likened Option 1 to a condo arrangement where the lease could be structured so that each agency set aside 10% for potential special assessments. Also some consideration should be given about possible scenarios if some agencies decide to not renew their lease and go somewhere else.

Mr. Rosales was concerned that there are no opportunities to build reserves in Option 2 for major repairs at Brookens from the rent payments. Mr. James and Mr. Hartke agreed with Mr. Rosales but thought it should be a separate agenda item to recommend to Finance that all Brookens lease payments less the cost of utilities go into the Capital Facilities Replacement Fund instead of the General Corporate Fund. Ms. Busey noted that should this Committee approve this motion; the lease agreement will be included on the County Board agenda – not the consent agenda.

Upon vote:

Aye: 6 – Hartke, Kibler, Maxwell, Quisenberry, Schwartz, James

Nay: 1 – Rosales

MOTION CARRIED.

XII. Other Business

None

XIII. Chair's Report

Mr. James recommended that the June 4th meeting will be located at the new Champaign County Nursing Home with a tour of the building at 6:00 p.m. The Facility Committee meeting will begin at 6:30 p.m. The Committee agreed.

XIV. Adjournment

MOTION by Mr. Quisenberry to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Kibler. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

There being no further business, Mr. James adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.