



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

MINUTES – Approved 7/15/2014

DATE: Tuesday, June 3, 2014
TIME: 6:30 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: Dana Brenner (Facilities Director), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Van Anderson (Deputy County Administrator of Finance), Linda Lane (Recording Secretary)

Others Present: John Jay, Patsi Petrie (Champaign Co Board), members of the public

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair James called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Approval of Minutes

A. May 6, 2014

MOTION by Mr. Rosales to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2014 meeting as distributed; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

IV. Approval of Agenda

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

V. Public Participation

Charlotte Green suggested the scope of a Facilities Master Plan also include the use of County owned buildings for re-entry program and a minimum security facility. She said it should also include community based programs for low level offenses. She summarized some of the programs. She felt the implementation of such programs would reduce the jail population and be cheaper than incarceration. Ms. Green would like the architectural firm to provide information about options for remodeling current buildings for the community based programs, and should also provide information about operating costs for comparison to operational costs at the jail. She also felt the firm should estimate the jail population reductions resulting from each of the programs.

Dorothy Vura-Weis suggested adding two items to the Sheriff's Operation Master Plan RFQ. She noted one of the strengths in the RFQ was that it asks to provide options for various configurations of housing. She would like the contracted firm to provide an evaluation on existing underutilized space in County owned buildings. Ms. Vura-Weis stated the cost of limited remodeling could be considerably lower than new construction. She felt programs such as the re-entry program would be more successful if physically located away from the jail. She also suggested looking at programs regarding mental health services, electronic home monitoring, and etc. that would lower the number of people in jail, and felt the firm should be asked to provide projections of a 25% lower jail population. Ms. Vura-Weis felt if these figures are provided that the Board would have better information to make decisions to plan programs and facilities for Sheriff operations.

VI. Communications

None

VII. Facilities Director Report

A. Update on the Brookens Administrative Center Chiller Project

Mr. Brenner commented that there was a kick-off meeting with the contractor last Friday. He said there is no firm schedule yet, but has confirmed that we are in line for chiller production. He said should have a schedule from the contractor as well as confirmation of the chiller manufacturer and delivery. He stated that the target date for the work to begin is August 1st.

B. Update on the ILEAS Demolition Project

Mr. Brenner passed out a schedule, stating they will have a meeting later this week. He reported that the contractor is currently on site and confirmed that the asbestos abatement work was completed last Wednesday. He reported that they are beginning work on removal of ceiling tiles, light fixtures, fire alarms, etc. Mr. Brenner explained that trees, fencing, and grass will be placed where the building was located when the weather is appropriate. He expected demolition to take about a week once the work actually begins.

C. Update on the Courthouse Tuck Pointing and Expansion Joint Replacement Project

Mr. Brenner handed out a document showing that two change orders had come in on the Courthouse tuck pointing project. He explained the first one for about \$2,500 was for stopping the project in November when the weather turned. The second change order has two items that were found when the work was being done. Mr. Brenner said the first is for a capstone that has a combination of mortar and poly urethane sealant where the sealant has failed. He felt the area should be tuck pointed and to use mortar instead of sealant when replacing the capstone. Mr. Brenner stated the second part is for angle iron between the second and third floor brick. He explained that the joint is a poly urethane based sealant that probably has a year of life, but felt it would be cheaper to remove and replace it now. He reported that even with the change orders they will come in under the contingency.

Mr. Maxwell didn't feel they should have to pay for the November work stoppage. He stated that with the severe winter they would have had to stop anyway and shouldn't have to pay the full bill. Mr. Brenner explained that he complained when they received the bill and that it had been reduced by 40%. He noted the bill is mostly for the lifts. Mr. Maxwell felt there is a certain amount of risk in doing business and the contractor chose to start the work when he did. Mr. Brenner indicated that it was the County that mandated the project begin in the fall. He explained that the project was designed to be split over two fiscal years.

Mr. James said that he isn't happy that during the study they didn't find the issues with the capstone and angle iron. He also felt that using mortar for the capstone wouldn't be the way he'd go since they had problems with it on the other side of the building. Mr. Brenner explained that most capstones he's worked with are done with mortar, and that the contractor and architect/engineer said the use of mortar for capstones is pretty standard, and that he feels they are doing it correctly. Mr. James mentioned that when talk about warranties and guarantees due to shifting they need to make sure the people doing the studies need to be held more accountable. He suggested that when specs are written in the future they need to look out more for the County and that the County needs to be able to have more say regarding changes.

D. *Update on Courthouse Clock Tower LED Lighting Replacement*

Mr. Brenner reported that two of the lights they were going to get for the Courthouse lighting are no longer available and they are now looking at other options. He stated that these are very heavy duty lights on the ground floor. He said he will have more information about the new lights at the next meeting.

E. *Update on Brookens Parking Lot*

Mr. Brenner explained that the parking lots being looked at now are the Brookens north side, Highway and ILEAS. He noted that each department will be taking care of sealing their own lots. He noted that he has worked with Jeff Blue at Highway to get prices from three companies, but have only received one to date. Mr. Brenner said his intention is to get the work done this summer. He reported that some areas of Brookens will have to be cut out, stamped, have new asphalt poured and sealed. Highway and ILEAS only have cracks that will be filled and resealed. Mr. Maxwell asked what type of seal they will use. Mr. Brenner said he will use whatever Mr. Blue recommends.

VIII. Other Business

Mr. Maxwell mentioned the RFQ for the Sheriff's Facility Needs Assessment and feels are in the process of doing the scope of services to come up with an agreement of what they are going to have done. He felt that when they started this they had an immediate problem and hopes that the scope addresses this as well as future expansion needs. He encouraged everybody to include the issues early in the process. He noted that there needs to be a good scope of services before costs can be assigned. Mr. James said this will be an issue as they process through it and hopes to get a mid-project report that can be reported to the Board.

Ms. Petrie expressed concern about the way the RFQ was written and noted that the scope of services was not well defined. She noted that she has received questions from constituents about costs because they have no comparisons or budget. Ms. Busey answered regarding costs that under the RFQ process you don't get to compare. You negotiate what is believed to be reasonable based on what is negotiated as the scope of services and who will be doing the work for that firm and whether the way they allocated costs is deemed to be reasonable by the County. She stated that under Illinois law when using the QBS system you will never be able to compare costs for these services. She noted that if it is determined that the costs are not reasonable they can move on to the second ranked vendor and negotiate. Ms. Busey also mentioned that some vendors have mentioned that the RFQ was ideal because it didn't have a specific scope of services. Mr. Anderson stated that the firms that mentioned the lack of scope also said it was one of the fairest processes they've been in. He said they go through the RFQ process to get the expertise that the County doesn't have to define the scope of services. He noted that the QBS process is designed so the process is done the way we did there is a scope of services of things that you feel you need, go through the QBS selection and once have firms ranked can sit with experts and refine the scope of services. He indicated that if they had put out an RFP then they would have been stuck with what the bidder understands the scope to be, not necessarily what was wanted. Mr. Anderson explained the result is a better cost. He also stated that this is a process laid out by the State that the County must follow.

Mr. Rosales said that he understood that this process wouldn't cost them anything and asked how much is budgeted. He also said that it appears if they move forward they will be incurring costs. Mr. James replied that no money has been spent yet except for advertisement. He noted that the process can't change. He stated that in the end the County Board can say no because of costs. Mr. James said they don't have any studies showing if any building is reusable or not. Mr. Maxwell asked if there was money budgeted for the studies. Ms. Busey responded that money was budgeted in the public safety sales tax fund for various initiatives arising from the ILPP study, and that it could be used for any follow up studies for what the Sheriff might request regarding his facilities.

Mr. Rosales stated they usually get three estimates for a project and asked if this is similar where they are getting the estimates for free. He said that they selected one and are only going to get one scope of work and asked if there are going to be options to choose from. Mr. James responded this firm was chosen and they will give information on designs, etc. and the County Board will choose, based on money available, what is the best option. He said they will pay for the study. He continued that the firm will then put out bids and get the numbers back to the County. Mr. James said this is just options and nothing has been decided. He said they will also be looking at the feasibility of using the downtown jail facility. Ms. Busey pointed out that a top ranked firm was selected pursuant to an RFQ, a scope of services and cost of those services will be negotiated and a contract with that firm to provide the services outlined in the RFQ. She noted it is only for the Sheriff's Master Planning services, not if they are going to use one item or another. She said there will be no specifics, just what the needs are. Ms. Petrie commented that Mr. James

implied this firm will do the work and wanted to know if the next step was an RFP. Ms. Busey said the next step after receiving the master plan is that Board will decide how it wants to proceed, which is not covered by this RFQ. Mr. Maxwell asked if they would have a not-to-exceed contract based on the scope of services agreed upon. Ms. Busey said she wasn't sure and recommended that if anyone had any concerns or issues that they wanted to be considered they should talk to Mr. James and Mr. Quisenberry. Mr. Kibler asked for confirmation that they have not spent a dime on this and that they have the July meeting to decide on spending money or not. Ms. Busey said that is correct.

IX. Chair's Report

A. *Amendment to the 2014 Calendar of Meetings for the County Facilities Committee – Cancellation of the July 8, 2014 meeting*

Mr. James stated that they will not be cancelling the July meeting because that is when they should hear about the RFQ.

B. *Future Meetings:*

Tuesday, July 8, 2014 – Lyle Shields Meeting Room, 6:00 pm

Tuesday, August 5, 2014 – Lyle Shields Meeting Room, 6:00 pm

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 7:27 p.m.