



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

MINUTES – APPROVED 11/5/13

DATE: Tuesday, October 8, 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: Kirk Kirkland (Facilities Manager), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Linda Lane (Recording Secretary)

Others Present: John Jay & Patti Petrie (Champaign Co Board)

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair James called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Approval of Minutes

- A. September 3, 2013 – Regular Meeting
- B. September 19, 2013 – Special Meeting

OMNIBUS MOTION by Mr. Rosales to approve the minutes of the September 3, 2013 and September 19, 2013 meetings as distributed; seconded by Mr. Kibler. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

IV. Approval of Agenda

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

V. Public Participation

None

VI. Communications

None

VII. Facilities Director's Report

A. Brookens Northeast Parking Lot Repair Update

Mr. Kirkland reported that the estimates received for the parking lot repairs was a per yard price. He stated that the first vendor quoted a larger area than expected and added a mobilization fee, bringing the quote in at \$25,000. Mr. Kirkland stated that when questioned about it, the vendor explained that the patch needed to be 6" instead of 3". Mr. Kirkland said the second vendor quoted even higher, explaining the vendor said a 3" patch was good but that three times the area needed to be patched. Mr. Kirkland stated the third vendor said no money should be put into repairing because it needs to be milled and overlaid within three or four years. He did receive a price from the third vendor but it included a slurry mix, which the County would not be using. Mr. Kirkland noted that he was told by one vendor that this type of project isn't planned after mid-October but they could give a quote on the patch but not the seal coat or painting. Mr. Kirkland suggested it be put on hold until the spring. He said he would like to talk to the Highway Department and see if he can get some more detail on what actually needs to be done.

Mr. Rosales asked for an explanation of a slurry mix. Mr. Kirkland stated it is an oil base mixed with sand that grinds down quicker when used on parking lots. Mr. James pointed out that an estimate is just an estimate and to be mindful that if repairs are put off it could cost more in the long run.

Mr. Rosales asked if it was correct that any bids under \$25,000 didn't have to come to the board. Mr. James stated that a budget of \$15,000 was set for this project and anything above that would have to come to the board. Mr. Maxwell said there are two approaches to take, the get-by approach or to fix it to last a while. He noted there are several lots and it will be a major effort over a long period of time.

Mr. James said there needs to be a mechanism of review to be able to keep up with preventive maintenance and that there should always be money available for that. Mr. Rosales asked if there wasn't such a system currently in place. Mr. Kirkland said there isn't one currently, but they are starting to put one together for the roofs and equipment, and the parking lots will be added. He noted they currently have \$10,000 for maintenance upkeep but that it barely covers painting one or two lots per year. Mr. Kirkland said they are where things have deteriorated to a point that it will take a lot to bring it up where normal annual maintenance would take care of it. Mr. Rosales asked if this comes out of the same budget as the demolition at ILEAS. Mr. Kirkland replied no. Mr. James said a list was previously supplied with an overview of existing parking lots. Mr. Rosales stated they were getting something down for roofs but the Board did not approve the \$600,000 for property maintenance. He wondered what the effect would be if the funds aren't there but things need to get done in a timely manner so they would not progressively deteriorate. James responded that they will do as have done before; pull the funds from somewhere and either cut staff or find other means to get the money.

Rosales said he is still concerned about the mortar at the courthouse and which project is more important. Mr. James stated that money has already been budgeted for these projects and they will probably try to roll some of that over. Ms. Busey said this committee had already prioritized primary building equipment systems and roof replacements, sent to the County Board, and that is what is in the facilities budget for next year. She noted that some amounts had been cut. Ms. Busey continued saying that if the \$15,000 for the parking lot isn't used this year they may ask for it to be re-encumbered for FY14. She stated they are being presented with issues within a capital infrastructure plan. Ms. Busey also noted that they don't know what the projects will cost or how much of those projects they might be able to obtain grants for. Mr. Rosales clarified that if the \$15,000 is re-encumbered they will have to add another \$30-50,000 to do it correctly so they don't have to spend \$100,000. James said that is correct.

B. Timeline on demolition at 1701 E Main St. Urbana

Mr. Kirkland reported that the design is being done in the fall by IGW and demolition will be in the spring. He said they are looking for the asbestos report from 1998 on the east part of the annex. He said he found the documentation to do the study and where it was approved, but said can't find the study itself. Mr. Kirkland stated they have to have an asbestos study due to the clean air act to determine how much asbestos is there and what impact it will have. He also stated that if they are going to recycle the concrete that they may have to abate it first. Mr. Kirkland said he has one quote for \$6-700 for the study and has calls into a few other companies. Mr. Kirkland stated they had talked to PACO about taking some of the doors, handrails, etc., and will have them sign a waiver because of health issues they could run into. Mr. Kirkland said he wanted to get a firm quote on an abatement price.

Mr. Rosales asked when the demolition will be completed. Mr. Kirkland replied late spring to early summer depending on the weather. Mr. James commented that they aren't starting before spring because they would have to cap off the building.

Ms. Petrie asked if any analysis had been done as to the cost of the project versus building storage that the Sheriff has requested, and asked if there had been any discussion of using this 5,000 square feet for the storage. Mr. James noted that the demolition was part of the contract with ILEAS because of health hazards and felt if they spent money on remediation they would spend more than it's worth. Mr. Kirkland stated that the roof needs to be removed, there is mold, the HVAC would need some work and the cost would be \$7-800,000. Ms. Petrie stated that remediation doesn't have to be expensive because it just needs to be sealed.

C. Courthouse Exterior Maintenance Project Update

Mr. Kirkland stated they have the contracts from Otto Baum and hope to be able to start this fall. He said they hope to get the cleaning and sealing done this fall, and then do the repair work on the west side in the spring. Mr. Rosales asked if they were using any of the foundation money. Mr. James replied that money is strictly for the clock tower and is mainly set aside to keep the clock running and keep the tower in good condition. Mr. Rosales asked for clarification that the repairs were not on the clock tower. Mr. James answered that the repairs are on the entire building as part of regular maintenance and the money comes from the construction budget.

D. Illinois Energy Now Workshop 9/17/13

Mr. Kirkland stated he went to this workshop to hear about the available energy incentives. He noted things being offered are boiler tune-ups, money for reset controls, parallel positioning controls, missing pipe insulation, steam traps and low-flow spray nozzles. He noted that we already have reset controls on the boilers that qualify. He said parallel positioning controls are newer technology that allow independent control of the air/gas ratio. Mr. Kirkland noted they are expensive and not many places use them on older boilers because the cost payback is only 1-2%. Mr. Kirkland said to utilize the program to replace missing pipe insulation they would have to hire an outside contractor per regulations. He noted that he has people that can do this cheaper and the County only has 20-30 feet of missing insulation at the downtown jail. Mr. Kirkland said they currently are using low-flow spray nozzles at both the jail and nursing home kitchens. He stated the County has seven boilers that qualify for the tune-up incentive; four were at the recommended 80-85% level and that three were tuned up in May. Mr. Kirkland stated the increased efficiency is 1-7%. He said it cost \$5,000 to have it done, but that they are waiting for a check in the amount of \$3,355 to come back to the County. He stated that he is going to the Illinois Green Building Association Summit and hopes to find additional opportunities.

Mr. James asked if the energy savings can be measured of the boilers already done. Mr. Kirkland answered they could look at the gas consumption but is not sure how accurate that would be. Mr. James noted that in regards to energy savings grants it takes time to research, and if an outside contractor needs to be hired then it needs to be determined if there is money savings in the long run. He noted that it takes staff time to obtain grants and they don't want to overtax the staff. Mr. James said that he wants this board to look at grants, but also doesn't want to spend time getting them if they aren't going to save money in the long run.

VIII. Other Business

Mr. James turned the floor over to Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. Maxwell stated the chillers at Brookens are \$159,000 each, the satellite jail hot water heater is \$56,000 and the JDC water heater is \$46,000. He said they lend themselves to a common project. He stated that if the chillers go down they will have to hire an architect/engineer to replace them. Mr. Maxwell suggested once the new Facilities Director and Deputy Administrator of Finance are on board to develop a list, through the QBS process, of several qualified architects and engineers. Mr. Maxwell suggested the next step would be getting a design on the shelf and making applications for some grants. He said that you can't make a good grant application without already having a good set of plans. He said he would like everyone to think about it and possibly start in that direction.

Mr. Rosales asked how they would do this when the staff is already so pre-occupied. He stated it sounds like a good idea, but asked how to move forward. Mr. Maxwell talked about a needs study with a list of things that are essential and that hiring an engineer will relieve some staff time. Mr. James stated that

major jobs usually have an A/E firm anyway. He suggested getting the studies done and using them as leverage for the grants. He said the A/E firms should know the latest technologies. Mr. James said they should come up with an overall per-building needs list and then come up with a wish list. Mr. James stated that it will take steps to accomplish but thinks it can be done in three years.

Mr. Rosales stated that Mr. Kirkland has done a good job at reducing costs. He noted that a proposal on cost effectiveness and efficiency had been submitted by Mr. Hartke, that wasn't too expensive and would have saved money in the long run, had been shot down. Mr. Rosales felt that an A/E, a QBS and a consultant, etc. would just cost more and more money he didn't think this board was ready to approve since they had failed to approve other such measures that have been proposed. He suggested the job descriptions of the new people should include these types of things so the County wouldn't have to go outside. Mr. Hartke noted that he likes to be proactive and likes this plan, but sees Mr. Rosales's concerns about cost. He said he would like to see where this goes. Mr. James said the energy study done doesn't give some figures needed and said they are going to come in and look around the building, talk to employees, look at lights, thermostats and wall switches. He said they aren't going to get in depth. Mr. James noted that what Mr. Maxwell brought up is something they are going to need, and they will be mandated by state law to hire an A/E firm. He stated that he is in favor of Mr. Maxwell's idea because it gives a better handle on costs and newest technology.

Mr. Maxwell said the instructions to prospective engineers is the project will be designed with state of the art energy efficient equipment. He noted that he doesn't like to spend money on engineering, but they need to have plans on the shelf in order to get grant money. Mr. James noted that if they have an engineering firm they will have a package of items to look at. He noted that since it was something new it would be opened up for quotes.

Mr. Kibler asked what the cost estimate for this type of measure would be. Mr. Maxwell answered he still thinks 18%. Mr. Kibler asked the fastest time the chiller project could be done if they don't have plans on the shelf, and how much time could be saved with the plans. Mr. Maxwell, using the nursing home as an example, said engineering would be a month or more, design would take another month or more, and if it has to be bid that would add six weeks, totaling about 3-5 months.

Ms. Busey stated that Mr. Maxwell's idea is good. She thinks QBS allows for prequalification of several firms. She suggested doing an RFQ to prequalify a few architectural firms and a couple of engineering firms. Ms. Busey stated that a firm could then be chosen based on their expertise in the area needed and thought this could be done for a period of 2-3 years. Mr. James liked that this process would allow them to be one step ahead and would give a better handle on costs. He felt they should keep this discussion going. Mr. Rosales said the idea is good but his concern is monetary.

Ms. Petrie thanked Mr. Maxwell for his suggestion but said she would like to push it even further. She said it still doesn't look at an overall plan for the County though. Ms. Petrie felt they needed to look at a systems analysis of what they are doing with the buildings on campus. She said she would like to see what IGBA brings in first. Ms. Petrie also felt it shouldn't be just any engineer but a civil/environmental engineer. Mr. James noted that the study is currently for Brookens only. He stated that Mr. Kirkland identified the equipment that was aging and needed replaced. Mr. James said that whether the jail is expanded or not has nothing to do with the fact that the water heater needs replaced now. Mr. James said the work they have done is what they wanted, and they have to take care of what they have now before they can look at a bigger overview. He stated it is better to be prepared when equipment failures happen.

IX. Chair's Report

None

X. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda

None

XI. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. James adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.