



**CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
FACILITIES COMMITTEE**
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois
*Tuesday, July 15, 2014, 6:00 pm

*** NOTE NEW DATE**

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

Committee Members:

Stan James - Chair	Gary Maxwell
James Quisenberry – Vice-Chair	Giraldo Rosales
Josh Hartke	Rachel Schwartz
Jeff Kibler	

	AGENDA	Page
I.	Call to Order	
II.	Roll Call	
III.	Approval of Minutes	
	A. Facilities Committee Meeting – June 3, 2014	1
IV.	Approval of Agenda/Addenda	
V.	Public Participation	
VI.	Communications	
VII.	Sheriff's Operations Master Planning for the County of Champaign (RFQ 2014-005): Recommendation of Award of Contract to Gorski Reifsteck Architects, Inc.	5
VIII.	Facilities Director's Report	
	A. Update on the Brookens Administrative Center chiller project	
	B. Update on the ILEAS demolition project	
	C. Brookens generator project	
	D. Update Summary of Prioritized Capital Fund Projects for FY2014	
	E. Update on the Courthouse tuck pointing and expansion joint replacement project	
	F. Status and Update on Courthouse (original) windows	
	G. Update on parking lot repairs	
IX.	Other Business	
X.	Chair's Report	
	A. Future Meeting – Tuesday, August 5, 2014 at 6:00 pm	
XI.	Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda	
XII.	Adjournment	

Champaign County strives to provide an environment welcoming to all persons regardless of disabilities, race, gender, or religion. Please call 217-384-3776 to request special accommodations at least 2 business days in advance.



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

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

MINUTES – SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL

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, Pattsy 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.

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

54
55 **VI. Communications**

56 None

57
58 **VII. Facilities Director Report**

59 **A. Update on the Brookens Administrative Center Chiller Project**

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

64
65 **B. Update on the ILEAS Demolition Project**

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

71
72 **C. Update on the Courthouse Tuck Pointing and Expansion Joint Replacement Project**

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

82
83 Mr. Maxwell didn't feel they should have to pay for the November work stoppage. He stated that with the
84 severe winter they would have had to stop anyway and shouldn't have to pay the full bill. Mr. Brenner
85 explained that he complained when they received the bill and that it had been reduced by 40%. He noted the
86 bill is mostly for the lifts. Mr. Maxwell felt there is a certain amount of risk in doing business and the contractor
87 chose to start the work when he did. Mr. Brenner indicated that it was the County that mandated the project
88 begin in the fall. He explained that the project was designed to be split over two fiscal years.

89
90 Mr. James said that he isn't happy that during the study they didn't find the issues with the capstone and angle
91 iron. He also felt that using mortar for the capstone wouldn't be the way he'd go since they had problems with
92 it on the other side of the building. Mr. Brenner explained that most capstones he's worked with are done with
93 mortar, and that the contractor and architect/engineer said the use of mortar for capstones is pretty standard,
94 and that he feels they are doing it correctly. Mr. James mentioned that when talk about warranties and
95 guarantees due to shifting they need to make sure the people doing the studies need to be held more
96 accountable. He suggested that when specs are written in the future they need to look out more for the County
97 and that the County needs to be able to have more say regarding changes.

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

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

103
104 E. *Update on Brookens Parking Lot*

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

112
113 **VIII. Other Business**

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

120
121 Ms. Petrie expressed concern about the way the RFQ was written and noted that the scope of services was not well
122 defined. She noted that she has received questions from constituents about costs because they have no
123 comparisons or budget. Ms. Busey answered regarding costs that under the RFQ process you don't get to compare.
124 You negotiate what is believed to be reasonable based on what is negotiated as the scope of services and who will
125 be doing the work for that firm and whether the way they allocated costs is deemed to be reasonable by the
126 County. She stated that under Illinois law when using the QBS system you will never be able to compare costs for
127 these services. She noted that if it is determined that the costs are not reasonable they can move on to the second
128 ranked vendor and negotiate. Ms. Busey also mentioned that some vendors have mentioned that the RFQ was ideal
129 because it didn't have a specific scope of services. Mr. Anderson stated that the firms that mentioned the lack of
130 scope also said it was one of the fairest processes they've been in. He said they go through the RFQ process to get
131 the expertise that the County doesn't have to define the scope of services. He noted that the QBS process is
132 designed so the process is done the way we did there is a scope of services of things that you feel you need, go
133 through the QBS selection and once have firms ranked can sit with experts and refine the scope of services. He
134 indicated that if they had put out an RFP then they would have been stuck with what the bidder understands the
135 scope to be, not necessarily what was wanted. Mr. Anderson explained the result is a better cost. He also stated
136 that this is a process laid out by the State that the County must follow.

137
138 Mr. Rosales said that he understood that this process wouldn't cost them anything and asked how much is
139 budgeted. He also said that it appears if they move forward they will be incurring costs. Mr. James replied that no
140 money has been spent yet except for advertisement. He noted that the process can't change. He stated that in the
141 end the County Board can say no because of costs. Mr. James said they don't have any studies showing if any
142 building is reusable or not. Mr. Maxwell asked if there was money budgeted for the studies. Ms. Busey responded
143 that money was budgeted in the public safety sales tax fund for various initiatives arising from the ILPP study, and
144 that it could be used for any follow up studies for what the Sheriff might request regarding his facilities.

145
146 Mr. Rosales stated they usually get three estimates for a project and asked if this is similar where they are getting
147 the estimates for free. He said that they selected one and are only going to get one scope of work and asked if there
148 are going to be options to choose from. Mr. James responded this firm was chosen and they will give information on
149 designs, etc. and the County Board will choose, based on money available, what is the best option. He said they will
150 pay for the study. He continued that the firm will then put out bids and get the numbers back to the County. Mr.
151 James said this is just options and nothing has been decided. He said they will also be looking at the feasibility of
152 using the downtown jail facility. Ms. Busey pointed out that a top ranked firm was selected pursuant to an RFQ, a
153 scope of services and cost of those services will be negotiated and a contract with that firm to provide the services
154 outlined in the RFQ. She noted it is only for the Sheriff's Master Planning services, not if they are going to use one
155 item or another. She said there will be no specifics, just what the needs are. Ms. Petrie commented that Mr. James

156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178

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.



CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

1776 East Washington Street, Urbana, Illinois 61802-4581

*ADMINISTRATIVE, BUDGETING, PURCHASING, & HUMAN RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT SERVICES*

Debra Busey, County Administrator

To: Chair Stan James and the Members of the County Facilities Committee

From: Van A. Anderson, Deputy County Administrator of Finance on behalf of the RFQ 2014-005 Contract Negotiating Team – Stan James, James Quisenberry, Debra Busey, Van Anderson, Sheriff Dan Walsh, Chief Deputy Allen Jones, Dana Brenner, and Barbara Mann *V.A.A.*

Subject: RFQ 2014-005 Sheriff's Operations Master Planning – Report of the Contract Negotiations Team

Date: June 27, 2014

On Wednesday, April 16, 2014, the County Facilities Committee approved the release of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Sheriff's Office Master Planning for the County of Champaign, RFQ 2014-005. The RFQ was designed and conducted in compliance with the requirements of the Local Government Professional Services Selection Act (Chapter 50, Act 510 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes (50 ILCS 510/)). The outcome of the RFQ process and contract negotiations is the attached Gorski Reifsteck/Kimme & Associates contract to evaluate the Sheriff's operations and jails and develop a Sheriff's facilities master plan.

Out of six (6) teams submitting qualifications, the RFQ Selection Committee determined four (4) firms to be most qualified to provide the requested master planning services. On May 27, 2014, those firms presented their qualifications for the project and were interviewed and ranked by the members of the Champaign County Board, the County Facilities Committee, and the RFQ 2014-005 Selection Committee. The top-ranked team was led by Gorski Reifsteck Architects Inc. and Kimme & Associates Inc. (Gorski Reifsteck/Kimme).

Contract negotiations were conducted per Section 7 of the Local Government Professional Services Selection Act. The negotiating teams were as follows:

County of Champaign: Stan James, James Quisenberry, Debra Busey, Van Anderson, Sheriff Dan Walsh, Chief Deputy Allen Jones, Dana Brenner, and Barbara Mann

Gorski Reifsteck Architects with Kimme & Associates, Allied Correctional Services, GHR Engineering & Associates, Inc., and Engineering Resources Associates: Charles Reifsteck, Dennis Kimme, Robert Deichman, and James Gleason

Per Section 7 of the Local Government Professional Services Selection Act, a written scope of services, published in the RFQ, was used as the basis for negotiations. The agenda for the first negotiation session is attached. The agenda articulates the negotiations process, the scope of services, and reference materials identified as guidance for the development of the master plan.

The reference materials identify specific issues pertaining to Sheriff's facilities. Some of those issues were highlighted by the RFQ process and/or during the negotiations. The proposed contract will result in a master plan that addresses those facilities issues, answers the relevant questions pertaining to those issues, and provides a roadmap that can guide decision-making on the future of the Sheriff's facilities. Examples of the issues to be considered include, but are not limited to:

- ILPP Report
 - “In May of 2011, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) conducted an assessment of the county jail facilities. The NIC report declared the Downtown Jail facility to be in a “deplorable” state, representing risks of significant legal liability such as the many deteriorating structures requiring urgent attention, the infestation of vermin, and the lack of regular maintenance. These problems warrant the closure of the Jail and its facilities.”
 - “Champaign is strongly advised to pursue a facilities master plan for both county buildings and jail, to plan for the building, renovation, expected maintenance costs of criminal justice and other functions.”
 - Downtown Jail issues: The master plan will develop data on the facility issues identified in the ILPP report and factor it into the options that will be developed. Examples of the types of facility issues are:
 - “Major deficiencies include poor sight lines, antiquated locking and video systems, deterioration of critical building elements, and inefficient staffing. Collectively, these result in a facility that needs to be replaced or undergo major costly renovations that exceed its anticipated utility.”
 - “Antiquated systems (major HVAC and security systems) lack available parts for repair or replacement creating major deficiencies. Some equipment, like the video surveillance system, is in such poor condition that they do not adequately serve their function resulting in significant security problems and safety issues.”
 - “Ventilation is very poor in spite of numerous attempts to rectify deficiencies. Staff report excess heat during summer months and excessive cold during winter months including frost covered perimeter walls.”
 - “The current Downtown Jail design and supervision style limits the ability of staff to effectively manage the inmate population.”
 - “The Downtown Jail layout prevents staff from observing the interior of living units. The hallway vision panels are inadequate for inmate supervision. Adequate supervision in this environment is conceptually possible, but requires increasing staff and modifying practices to require that staff circulate frequently throughout the living units. The cost is impractical.”
 - Administrative space issues
 - “A lack of office space limits the department’s ability to expand investigations, hold conferences with over 16 people, provide training classes, and interview suspects or witnesses in an adequate setting.”

- “The evidence storage room is too small for the Sheriff’s current needs. The law requires the Sheriff to hold all sexual assault evidence for 20 years and all homicide evidence for life. As a result, four other rooms have been repurposed in order to provide the necessary evidence storage space. These four rooms are scattered throughout the facility and are not designed to secure evidence (which often includes drugs), do not have proper ventilation (either negative air flow or specific filtering) for drug storage, and do not have secure “drying rooms.””
- Satellite Jail issues
 - “The Satellite Jail does not currently have sufficient capacity to house all County inmates, but the facility design and large site can allow it to be expanded to meet new needs. Although the Satellite Jail has higher security housing for the segregation of special needs and maximum-security inmates, its design is not conducive to holding the full range of County jail inmates.”
 - “Storage at the facility is extremely limited and accommodated through the unsafe practice of storing things where prisoners are moved and staff circulates. These hallways are evacuation routes in case of a severe emergency requiring immediate and timely evacuation of inmates and staff.”
 - “Inmate property storage is inadequate for the current jail population, and could not sustain an increased population requiring some form of external storage or creation of new storage for inmate property.”
 - “ILPP found that the holding cell spaces in the booking area are in a legally indefensible condition. This “booking area” is primarily for segregated housing (suicidal, special watch, medical, and administrative segregation) rather than for the standard intake process. Policy requires that all booking area inmates be observed every 15 minutes, and all cells are monitored by video. “Recreation” occurs for an hour a day and permits inmates to leave their cells individually to watch television. Recreation is limited and disrupts the booking and intake process.”
 - “The intake area is being used to compensate for an ill designed living space. The facility is not designed to appropriately accommodate the mentally ill, the medically infirm, and those needing special segregation living arrangements. Currently, the intake area is being used to house special needs populations, and this severely impacts the operational function of intake and booking processes. The radical crowding of the intake area hinders management efforts and reduces the effectiveness of the intake process.”
 - “Crowding special needs inmates into cells designed for short-term holding results in inadequate care and custody of the special needs population and is disruptive to the intake process. Both special needs and intake populations are poorly served by the practice. The intake area, processing, and segregation of various classifications, are significantly

VQA

- problematic. New arrestees are often held in crowded cells where inmates sleep on the floor for days.”
- “The intake area is undersized for the existing population and anticipated demand. Crowding and lack of segregation options creates an unsafe environment that cannot accommodate inmate needs. Much of the equipment is simply old and past its useful life; much of it needs updating, better installation or simply improved organization. It must be noted that the Sheriff’s Office staff make the best of limited resources, and work around facility, equipment, and other limitations to deliver commendable services and care to inmates.”
 - Alan Kalmanoff follow-up letter dated February 11, 2014, to Sheriff Walsh and provided to the Champaign County Board
 - “(T)he downtown jail is substandard and **requires immediate closing**. You and your staff, the National Institute of Corrections Report and our review of the facility identified “deplorable conditions” and the need to accelerate the closing of the facility. **The continued use of the downtown jail should be considered only as a last resort under very special circumstances.**” (*Emphasis added.*)
 - “In addition to reducing the population numbers is the critical need to provide difficult segregation of various inmates types with the most demanding need for mental health, and those designated as dangerous requiring high security separations. Existing facilities lack the necessary segregation opportunities. Merely reducing population to below capacity does not satisfy the segregation issues. **So important are these segregation requirements that new construction is probably necessary in the immediate future.**” (*Emphasis added.*)
 - “One option we considered to decrease the number of inmates was the possibility of using the downtown jail for very low security inmates, only while programs and diversion options were implemented. Although we discussed this option, it became clear that this alternative would continue the current burden on short staff coverage and unnecessarily maintain work force to two facilities instead of one.”
 - “Additional housing modules are necessary to realize a satisfactory distribution of housing components (fulfilling the number of segregation separations needed for safe operation).”
 - “Without a significant decrease in the jail’s population, it is imperative that the County expedites planning efforts to increase the jail holding capacity by the addition of more living units at the satellite jail including segregation units to satisfy classification needs.”
 - “In closing, ILPP urges the immediate selection and retention of architectural planning resources to further develop the building options we presented in our report and plan.”
 - Champaign County Community Justice Task Force (CJTF) recommendations:
 - “(C)onsider gender implications regarding decisions made, since there is currently a disparity between facility conditions for women and men in the county jail.”
 - “Increase access to mental health services within the jail for all populations through screening assessment and treatment.”

- “Give high priority to appropriate space for delivery of behavioral health care in the jail.”
- “There is a desperate need for a one-stop, first-stop connecting point for those returning home, a place to communicate with people who understand their situation and are in a position to offer some assistance and a support group that will assist them to develop a life plan and carry it out. To this end, the Task Force recommends the creation of a reentry program for Champaign County.” The Champaign County Board has a one-year contract with Community Elements for a reentry program. The master plan will address the space needs of this and other programs that provide support programs to current and former jail inmates.
- Incorporating adequate facilities for support programs into the plan also would address an action item by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) in its May 2011 report update that recommended “the Jail Superintendent with the full support of the Sheriff, seek to expand the current programs (AA, NA, GED, Bible Study, Friday Prayer, Religious Services and Library) to include Anger Management, Domestic Violence, Thinking Errors, job Search, etc., provided by community program volunteers working with inmates while they are in jail.”

During the contract negotiations, the issue of using other existing County facilities for Sheriff’s programs was discussed for incorporation into the master plan. Specifically the old nursing home and the Juvenile Detention Center (JDC), were discussed as they had been mentioned in the ILPP report as potential sites for “minimum-security to low-security facility for drunk drivers, traffic offenders, and domestic violence offenders who are low-risk, but require custody by law” and “an ideal location for a women’s jail,” respectively.

Repurposing the old nursing home at this time is not an option since the approximately 23 acres and buildings, commonly known as 1701 East Main Street, Urbana, is under lease, in its entirety, through December 31, 2016, to the Illinois Law Enforcement Alarm System (ILEAS). The contract with ILEAS has two three-year options to reopen, the first beginning on January 1, 2017. Other negative factors include the deteriorated state of the facility, both in terms of the structural integrity and the mechanical systems, four buildings with thermal problems that “are likely more significant here than at the jails” (ILPP report), and the likelihood that it would cost more to make the facility secure enough for minimum-to-low security activities than it would to build a new facility for those activities. Office operations were determined to be the only viable option for repurposing such space but the lease and the physical deterioration of the facility either prevent or greatly increase the cost of pursuing this as an option.

Repurposing the JDC also was determined not to be feasible. Since the ILPP report, the rules governing juvenile detention have changed. Effective January 1, 2014, all juveniles charged as adults must be housed in juvenile detention centers not jails. This has increased the daily census numbers at the facility. The ILPP study reported “only about 12 detainees are housed” at the JDC. But the picture is much different now. That number has risen with a daily census of twenty or more (high of 25 in May) recorded in each month of the last year with the exceptions of November (high of 19) and December (high of 18).

Since the review of those options by the negotiating teams indicated that it would not be feasible to repurpose the old nursing home and the Juvenile Detention Center at this time, evaluations of those facilities were not included in the proposed contract to reduce the cost of the master plan. However, the proposed contract acknowledges that those services may be requested and indicates that the evaluations would be an additional service at additional cost.

The attached proposal provides for the development of a master plan of up to three conceptual facility options for review and discussion by the Sheriff, the County Facilities Committee, and the County Board. The proposal is written to allow for a review of the scope of work following the technical assessment and functional adequacy of the current facilities. At that time, if the County determines that certain conceptual facility options should not be developed, the scope of work and fee may be renegotiated. That is, if fewer conceptual facility options are chosen to be developed, the fees may be reduced. The County negotiating team felt this flexibility was important since the National Institute of Correction consultants and the ILPP report and follow-up letter have strongly recommended closure of the downtown jail.

Therefore, the County Facilities Committee is being asked to recommend Champaign County Board approval of the Gorski Reifsteck/Kimme & Associates contract to evaluate the Sheriff's operations and develop a Sheriff's facilities master plan.



Attachments

**AN AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION
OF ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

Date: 26JUN14

Architect:

Gorski Reifsteck Architects, Inc.
909 Arrow Road
Champaign, IL 61821
PH 217-351-4100

Client:

County of Champaign
1776 E Washington Street
Urbana IL 61802-4581

Project Description/Location:

RFQ 2014-005: Sheriff's Office Master Planning, Urbana IL

Project: 201423

1. Basic Professional Services to be performed:

Services as described on the attached letter and work plan dated 26JUN14.

2. Basis of Compensation:

2.1 For basic services as described in paragraph 1, basic services shall be computed as follows: As outlined in the attached letter dated 26JUN14.

2.2 For project representation beyond basic services as outlined in paragraph 1, compensation shall be computed as follows: To be negotiated.

3. Terms and Conditions:

3.1 The terms and conditions on the reverse of this form are a part of this Agreement.

3.2 DESIGN WITHOUT CONSTRUCTION PHASE SERVICES:

It is understood and agreed that the Design Professional's Basic Services under this Agreement do not include project observation or review of the Contractors' performance or any other construction phase services, and that such services will be provided by the Client. The Client assumes responsibility for interpretation of the Contract Documents and for construction observation and supervision and waives any claims against the Design Professional that may be in any way connected thereto. In addition, the Client agrees, to the fullest extent permitted by law, to indemnify and hold the Design Professional harmless from any loss, claim or cost, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of defense, arising or resulting from performance by such services by other persons or entities and from any and all claims arising from modifications, clarifications, interpretations, adjustments or changes made to the Contract Documents to reflect changed field or other conditions, except for claims arising from the sole negligence or willful misconduct of the Design Professional.

If the Client requests in writing that the Design Professional provide any specific construction phase services and if the Design Professional agrees in writing to provide such services, then they shall be compensated for as Additional Services as provided in section 2.2.

Offered by:



(Signature)

Charles R Reifsteck, president

(Printed name and title)

Gorski Reifsteck Architects, Inc.

Accepted by: *

(Signature)

(Printed name and title)

*The undersigned hereby states that they are the Client or duly authorized agent of the Client of the above described property and that the terms and conditions stated above are understood by them and herewith agreed to and accepted. You are hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the work outlined above.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

To assure an understanding of matters related to our mutual responsibilities these terms and conditions for professional architectural services are made a part of this agreement:

REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES:

The actual expenses incurred directly or indirectly in connection with the work including but not limited to the following: Transportation and subsistence, toll telephone calls, telegrams, and reproduction or printing. Reimbursable expenses shall be invoiced as the amount billed the architect, without mark-up. Mileage will be invoiced at \$0.55/mile. In office copies will be invoiced at \$0.10 each (b/w) and \$0.50 each (color). In office printing of drawings will be invoiced at \$0.20/sf b/w and \$1.00/SF color.

JOBSITE SAFETY:

Neither the professional activities of the Architect, nor the presence of the Architect or its employees and sub-consultants at a construction/project site, shall impose any duty on the Architect, nor relieve the General Contractor of its obligations, duties and responsibilities including but not limited to, construction means, methods, sequence, techniques or procedures necessary for performing, superintending and coordinating the Work in accordance with the Contract Documents and any health or safety precautions required by any regulatory agencies. The Architect and its personnel have no authority to exercise any control over any construction contractor or its employees in connection with their work or any health and safety programs or procedures. The Client agrees that the General Contractor shall be solely responsible for jobsite and worker safety and warrants that this intent shall be carried out in the Clients Contract with the General Contractor. The Client also agrees that the General Contractor shall defend and indemnify the Client, the Architect and the Architect's sub-consultants. The Client also agrees that the Client, the Architect and the Architect's Consultant's sub-consultants shall be made additional insureds under the General Contractor's policies of general liability.

TIME OF PAYMENT:

The Architect may submit monthly statements for services and expenses based upon the proportion of the actual work completed at the time of billing. Unless provided for otherwise, payments for architectural services will be due and payable thirty (30) calendar days from the issuance of the Architect's statement. If the Client fails to make any payment due the Architect for services and expenses within the time period specified, a service charge of 1 % per month will be added to the Client's account. This is an annual rate of 12%.

AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY:

The Architect shall not guarantee the work of any Contractor or Subcontractor. The architect shall not supervise nor have control over or charge of, nor be responsible for, the construction means, methods, procedures, techniques, sequences procedures, or for safety precautions and programs in connection with the Work since these are solely the responsibility of the Contractor. The Client acknowledges that the architect's presence at the site does not constitute supervision of the construction project. The Architect has no stop work authority.

TERMINATION:

This agreement may be terminated by either party upon written notice. Any termination shall only be for good cause such as for legal, unavailability of adequate financing or major changes in the work. In the event of any termination, the Architect will be paid for all services and expenses rendered to the date of termination plus reimbursable expenses.

REUSE OF DOCUMENTS:

All documents including drawings and specifications furnished by Architect pursuant to this Agreement are instruments of his services in respect of the work. They are not intended or represented to be suitable for reuse by Client or others on extensions of this work, or on any other work. Any reuse without specific written verification or adaptation will be at Client's sole risk, and without liability of Architect, and Client shall indemnify and hold harmless architect and his consultants from all claims, damages, losses and expenses including attorneys fees arising out of or resulting therefrom. Any such verification or adaptation will entitle architect to further compensation at rates to be agreed upon by Client and Architect.

ESTIMATES OF COST:

Since the Architect has no control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment or over a Contractor(s) method of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, his opinions of probable Project Cost or Construction Cost that may be provided for herein are to be made on the basis of his experience and qualifications and represent his best judgment as a design professional familiar with the construction industry, but Architect cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids or the construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable cost prepared by him if the Client wishes greater assurance as to the Construction Cost, he shall employ an independent cost estimator.

MEDIATION AND LITIGATION:

Should any claim arise between the Owner and Architect, the parties agree to submit such claims to mediation, as a condition precedent to litigation. Mediation shall be conducted by and under the rules of the Construction Industry Mediation Rules of the American Arbitration Association, unless the parties agree otherwise. Should the parties fail to resolve the claim through mediation, the claim may then be litigated. Nothing contained in the Agreement shall prevent the Architect from filing any lien arising out of the Architect's services to comply with notice and filing deadlines prior to resolution of the claim by mediation or litigation. The parties agree to be subject to the jurisdiction of Champaign County of the State of Illinois. All mediation and litigation shall be filed and take place in said jurisdiction, regardless of where the project is built.

CLIENT PROVIDED INFORMATION: The Architect shall be entitled to rely on the accuracy and completeness of any information provided to the Architect by the Client or the Client's consultant. The Architect shall not review said information for accuracies.

ENTIRETY OF AGREEMENT:

This agreement represents the entire and integrated agreement between the Client and Architect and supersedes all prior negotiations, representations or agreements, either written or oral. This agreement may be amended only by written instrument signed by both Client and Architect.

APPLICABLE LAWS:

Unless otherwise specified, this agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of Illinois.



GORSKI REIFSTECK
ARCHITECTURE - CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT - INTERIORS

Mr Van A Anderson, PhD, MBA
Deputy County Administrator of Finance
Champaign County Administrative Services
1776 E Washington Street
Urbana IL 61802*4581

Dear Mr Anderson,

The Gorski Reifsteck/Kimme & Associates team is pleased to provide this proposal to evaluate Sheriff's Operations and develop a Master Plan for facility improvements. Our goal through this process is to provide Champaign County with detailed information that allows the County to make confident, definitive and defensible decisions regarding the long*term development of its jail and Sheriff's facilities, associated costs, and a phasing plan for those improvements.

Our proposed team includes Gorski Reifsteck Architects, Kimme & Associates, Allied Correctional Services, GHR Engineers, Engineering Resource Associates, and Berns Clancy Engineers.

Per our discussions we attach a project work plan outlining the activities we propose to reach the goal of a feasible master plan. To summarize, we list groups of activities designated as A*F.

- Activity A simply sets the expectations, process, contacts, and milestones.
- Activity B reviews and evaluates data for application to jail planning and housing development.
- Activity C evaluates jail and sheriff's facilities for functional adequacy and a technical assessment of the existing downtown jail/sheriff's office facility and the satellite jail facility. As discussed, during the process we may find the need to evaluate other county facilities, such as the Juvenile Detention Center and/or the old County Nursing Home. These evaluations will be considered an additional service to our agreement.
- Activity D creates up to three conceptual facility options for discussion and review. The options will be based upon housing needs and characteristics in the jail, desired sheriff's operations, and technical upgrades to existing facilities. Presentations and meetings will occur with staff and the County Board with the goal of selection of an option for further development. An additional expense, outlined in D5, would engage a licensed commercial real estate appraiser if an option includes possible sale of the downtown property.
- Activity E develops the selected option in more detail. Costs and services in this phase, negotiated at a later date, may include a detailed space program and a schematic design.
- Activity F includes preparation of a draft report, modification of the report addressing client feedback, and final report and presentation.

We propose fees for work as outlined in the attached work plan as follows:

- Activities A*C: We propose a fixed fee of \$61,880. The following items are not included in that fixed fee:
 - Evaluations of other county facilities – to be negotiated at a later date if required.
 - Commercial Real Estate Appraisal – proposed as a reimbursable expense
- Activities D & F. We propose a fixed fee of \$82,120. The Scope of Work and Fee may be renegotiated for these services pending the results of work completed in Activities A*C. That is, fees may be reduced if the number of facility options is less than three as currently outlined.
- Activity E: Scope of work and fee proposal to be negotiated at a later date when scope of improvements is established.
 - For example, detailed programming of the selected option may range from a small addition or renovation at the existing facilities to programming a new jail addition at the satellite plus a complete new sheriff's facility. As such we could envision fees ranging from \$5,000 - \$40,000, or so.
 - Development of complete schematic design plans (if desired) for the selected option is generally 15% of the full architectural*engineering effort. The schematic design fee, like

the programming fee above, is dependent upon the selected option.

We propose an estimated limit of reimbursable expenses of \$10,000. Reimbursable expenses include scanning existing documents, printing review documents, draft and final reports and drawings, transportation costs, and the services of a Real Estate Appraiser.

Thank you for this opportunity. We look forward to beginning our services to the County.

Best wishes,



Charles R Reifsteck, President
Gorski Reifsteck Architects

26JUN14

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY, IL
SHERIFF'S OPERATIONS MASTER PLANNING
GORSKI REIFSTECK ARCHITECTS
PROJECT WORK PLAN & FEE PROPOSAL

26-Jun-14

Services & Tasks

A KICK-OFF MEETING(S)

- Finalize Tasks.
- Establish study goals and key expectations, and path to successful implementation of recommendations.
- Finalize Schedule milestones.
- Establish communication protocols.
- Establish/confirm contacts and working groups (executive, sheriff's).

B JAIL POPULATION DATA ANALYSIS

- Review and integrate ILPP data for useful to this study.
- Review, confirm and/or modify inmate classification system.
- Gather and analyze daily count and annual average data by inmate classification for housing impacts, (particularly for mental & medical health detainees).
- Project classification group and booking counts as necessary.
- Gather and analyze booking flow data.
- Gather and evaluate inmate transport data.
- * *Progress presentation to Board or Committee (or as directed).*

C EVALUATE EXISTING JAIL & SHERIFF'S FACILITIES

C1 FUNCTION/SECURITY/SPACE ADEQUACY ASSESSMENT

- Review and integrate ILPP data for useful to this study.
- Review/modify jail's operational mission and evaluate facilities consistent with that mission.
- Execute problem identification exercise with staff.
- Walk-through and functional/security/environmental evaluation of existing facilities.
- Evaluate staffing at both facilities for adequacy and coverage per safety/security/service objectives.
- Evaluate ability of facilities to be renovated, particularly housing.
- * *Progress presentation to Board or Committee (or as directed).*

C2 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

- Review and integrate ILPP data for useful to this study.
- Evaluate Existing Jail & Sheriff's Operations - Building Audit.
- Review original and/or as-built drawings of facilities (electronic & hard copy as available).
- Comprehensive walkthrough with attention to:
 - Mechanical, electrical, plumbing components,
 - Building envelope, roofs, windows, walls,
 - Site features; paved areas, landscape,
 - Building finishes; ceilings, paint, walls, flooring,
 - Doors, frames, hardware,
- Focused review of security systems (Bob and GHR).
- Review utility records.
- Review compliance with building codes.
- Written narratives of systems and their conditions.
- * *Progress presentation to Board or Committee (or as directed).*

Services & Tasks

D1 CREATE FACILITY OPTIONS, ESTABLISH FEASIBILITY

D1 JAIL OPERATIONAL AND SPACE PLANNING:

- Review ILPP data for utility to this study.
- Determine numbers of beds needed per inmate classification based upon average, high and low inmate counts with special focus on special needs inmates and flexibility of use; create a comprehensive housing plan.
- Determine key housing characteristics per classification: occupancy, supervision, density, etc.
-
- Estimate space needs per jail component (booking, visiting, programs, mental health, alternative support, et al).

D2 SHERIFF'S OPERATIONAL AND SPACE PLANNING:

- Review ILPP data for utility to this study.
- Establish existing and potential functions & proper organizational structure (for space organization).
- Estimate space needs per sheriff's component (evidence, investigations, patrol, et al).

D3 DEVELOP OPTIONS FOR REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

- Rough sketch initial concepts for up to three jail options (example possibilities: renovated downtown jail, expanded/renovated satellite, expanded satellite/closed downtown).
- Rough sketch initial concepts for up to three sheriff options (example possibilities: renovated downtown facility, addition at the satellite, independent new facility).
- Identify differences in jail transport issues and staffing per option.
- Estimate overall jail staff needs for each option (by position and shift).
- Identify functional/security/environmental pros and cons for each option.
- Develop construction/project cost estimates for each option.

D4 TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS:

- Based upon options considered, provide input on changes to existing facilities for the following:
 - building systems and components for all design options,
 - statement of probable costs,
 - statement on utility cost projections, and
 - incorporate information into design narratives.

D5 REAL ESTATE ANALYSIS OF DOWNTOWN JAILS' MARKET VALUE

- if desired, provided by outside sub-contractor as a reimbursable.

D6 ANALYZE OPTIONS WITH STAFF, AND SELECT AN OPTION

- Identify functional/security/environmental pros and cons for each option and discuss with staff.
- Develop comparative operational and facility cost analysis.
- Meet and discuss options with county teams; modify as needed, and make a recommendation as to the best long-term option.
- Hosted Tour to explain analysis and basis for option selection to Board members & other officials.
- Final modifications in selected option.
- * *Progress presentation to Committee.*
- * *Progress presentation to Board (or as directed).*
- Finalize the selection of an option.

E DEVELOP THE SELECTED OPTION

- Develop a detailed Space Program for the selected option.
- Update operational and project cost estimates.
- * *Progress presentation to Committee.*
- * *Progress presentation to Board (or as directed).*
- Develop complete schematic design plans of the selected option.
- Update project cost estimates at conclusion of schematic design.
- * *Progress presentation to Committee.*
- * *Progress presentation to Board (or as directed).*

Services & Tasks

F FINAL REPORTING

- Draft Final Report.
- Modifications due to Client input.
- Final report preparation.
- Prepare and make final presentation.



CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

1776 East Washington Street, Urbana, Illinois 61802-4581

Debra Busey, County Administrator

**RFQ 2014-005: Sheriff's Office Master Planning
Contract Negotiations: Development of the Scope of Services
June 2, 2014**

Contract Negotiations Teams

County of Champaign: Debra Busey, Van Anderson, Dana Brenner, Dan Walsh, Allen Jones, and Barbara Mann (Administrative Assistant: Beth Brunk)

Gorski Reifsteck Architects with KIMME & Associates, Allied Correctional Services, GHR Engineering & Associates, Inc., and Engineering Resources Associates: Charles Reifsteck, Dennis Kimme, Robert Deichman, and James Gleason

Agenda

1. Steps in the process to complete the contract
 - a. Develop a Detailed and Comprehensive Scope of Services
 - b. Project and Work Plan: Based on the agreed upon scope of services, Gorski Reifsteck/Kimme will be asked to submit a project and work plan. The plan should include a list of consultants and the roles and responsibilities of all members of the master plan team as well as the responsibilities of the County of Champaign.
 - c. Proposal for Compensation: Following agreement on the work plan, Gorski Reifsteck/Kimme will be asked to develop and submit a proposal for compensation for the project.
 - d. Agreement: Once both parties have the same expectations and understanding of the project requirements and the compensation is agreed upon, the contract will be finalized.
 - e. July 8, 2014: Review and Vote by the County Facilities Committee
 - f. July 24, 2014: County Board Vote
 - g. July 25, 2014: If contract approved by County Board, contract begins
2. Scope of Services Discussion (See Information Below)
3. Next Meeting

Scope of Services

The County of Champaign Currently operates two jails. The Sheriff's Office and operations and one jail, opened in 1980, are housed in downtown Urbana. The downtown jail can bed a maximum of 131 prisoners. The second jail, commonly known as the satellite jail, was built in 1996 and is located about a mile away on a large plot of land owned by the County and surrounded by other buildings owned by the County. This jail can currently bed 182 prisoners.

The County is interested in obtaining the services of a qualified criminal justice planning and architectural firm to assist the County and the Sheriff in determining the needs, exploring the options, and the approximate costs associated with the facilities housing the Sheriff's law enforcement and jail operations and support programs provided to inmates including, but not necessarily limited to:

- the facilities needs for prisoners
- personnel
- training space
- records and other storage
- secure evidence storage, and
- parking needs for the public, employees, and Sheriff's vehicles.

The County is specifically concerned with meeting the housing needs of prisoners with significant medical and/or mental health disorders as well as providing specific space for various programs the Sheriff and the County offer to inmates. The goal is to develop a facility master plan that will accommodate current and future operations, jail, and program needs and that will provide the estimated costs associated with the actions recommended by the master plan.

Anticipated service may include, but are not limited to:

1. Determining number of beds and optimal configuration (considering classification issues, existing structure and personnel needs) for normal housing units.
2. Determining number of beds, specific cell design and optimal configuration of housing for those with significant medical and/or mental health issues and adjacency issues with professional services needed or offered to those individuals. (Negative pressure and contagion issues need to be included in the medical needs.)
3. Determining space needs and configuration for office type functions of the Sheriff law enforcement and jail operations including personnel, training space, records and other storage, secure evidence storage, and parking needs for the public, employees and Sheriff's vehicles.
4. Determining space needs and configuration for programs offered to inmates, including office space for both professionals employed by or contracted with the Sheriff and those outside agencies that engage with the Sheriff to provide services to the inmates. (This should also include an analysis of the kitchen and laundry needs.)
5. Determining optimal design of book-in/ intake area.

6. Providing future projections as various populations and needs, if requested.
7. Provide very rough sketches and possible costs and engage in discussions as to options with the Sheriff and County to refine ideas and options so that the Sheriff and County can make informed decisions to give guidance as to what options should be included in #8 and #9 below.
8. Providing diagrams and schematic drawings (conceptual plans) and discussion as to possible design options of the facility, including recommendations and specific design options for the special needs housing. (All discussions should also include issues of necessary redundancies, serviceability, flexibility of the design to adapt to changing facility needs over time, and disaster/emergency operation & evacuation. Appropriate fencing-secure areas for evacuation should be included.)
9. Provide building cost estimates for the various design options.
10. Provide estimates as to operational costs, including personnel needs, as to the various design options.

Reference Materials

1. RFQ 2014-005 Sheriff's Operations Master Planning for the County of Champaign
 - a. Addendum 1
 - b. Addendum 2
 - i. Organizational Charts for the Sheriff's Operations
 - ii. County Jail Separation Needs: Presentation by Chief Deputy Allen Jones on Tuesday, March 4, 2014, to the County Facilities Committee
 - iii. Average Length of Stay in Jail and Yearly ADP by Gender
 - iv. Floor Plans
 - v. Mechanical and Electrical Drawings (Satellite Jail)
 - vi. Structural Evaluation for Remodeling Considerations, Champaign County Downtown Correctional Center, Urbana (October 2011)
2. Champaign County Criminal Justice System Assessment: Final Report, September 24, 2013, Institute for Law and Policy Planning (ILPP)
3. Recommendations: Champaign County Community Justice Task Force, June 21, 2013
4. Dennis A. Kimme, Gary M. Bowker, and Robert G. Deichman. *Jail Design Guide*, Third Edition. National Institute of Corrections, 2011.