



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

MINUTES – Approved 5/5/2015

DATE: Thursday, April 9 2015
 TIME: 6:30 p.m.
 PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
 Brookens Administrative Center
 1776 E. Washington, Urbana, IL 61802

Prior to the Facilities Committee meeting, the committee toured the ILEAS building at 1701 E. Main St. in Urbana. The tour began at 5:25 p.m. and ended at 6:15 p.m. Committee members present for the tour were Gary Maxwell (chair), Jack Anderson, Josh Hartke and Jeff Kibler. The tour was conducted by Jim Page (Executive Director of ILEAS) and Mark Griffith (ILEAS Facility Manager). Also present was Dana Brenner (Champaign County Facilities Director).

Committee Members

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

County Staff: Dana Brenner (Facilities Director); Deb Busey (County Administrator); Sheriff Dan Walsh (Sheriff's Office); Linda Lane (Administrative Assistant)

Others Present: John Jay, (Champaign County Board); Chuck Reifsteck (Gorski Reifsteck Architects); Dennis Kimme (Kimme & Associates, Inc.); Jim Gleason (GHR Engineers and Associates, Inc.); members of the public

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair Maxwell called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Maxwell requested that item VIII be removed from the agenda as the lease is not ready. **MOTION** by Mr. Rosales to approve the agenda as amended; seconded by Mr. Kibler. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. March 3, 2015

MOTION by Mr. Anderson to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2015 meeting; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

V. Public Participation

Mr. Alex Pereira provided a handout of a critical analysis report of the Champaign County Jail Proposal. He noted the response to the needs assessment for mental health inmates was very thorough. He said the RFQ specified all reports should include a flexibility of the design to adapt over time. He felt there was a discrepancy between the RFQ and what the Sheriff's office allegedly later told the consultants and wanted to know why. He encouraged the board to ask the consultants. Mr. Pereira summarized his findings obtained through FOIA requests from the Sheriff's office. He noted that their findings contrasted with the consultants. He questioned how the consultants chose the 20 days for the snap shot because the information contrasts within their analysis and previous reports. He said they looked at previous Kimme & Associates reports and gave examples. Mr. Pereira said the questions raised from their study are the 20 day snap shot, and that operational costs were detailed but construction costs were not.

VI. Communications

None

VII. Sheriff's Operation Master Plan Q&A with Gorski Reifsteck and Kimme & Associates

Mr. Maxwell said the consultants had been asked to come back as a continuing effort to provide answers. He noted that he had received some questions from the public and other Board members. Mr. Maxwell said that the first question wanted to know why there was no executive summary and breakdown of costs. Mr. Kimme replied that they considered the PowerPoint presentation the executive summary. Mr. Reifsteck provided a handout with cost breakdowns showing each piece of the building or component. He stated it shows construction costs if bid today, soft costs, and an escalation of costs for a future bid. He noted contingencies were -5% to +15%. Mr. Maxwell asked if those figures were available. Mr. Reifsteck said if they want but they are only an educated guess this early in the process with no drawings. Mr. Quisenberry mentioned the downtown facility three year repair and maintenance plan and the Option 1 building envelope repairs. He asked if the \$52,313 for three years included envelope repairs needed. Mr. Reifsteck replied no. He said the approach they took was to either retire the downtown facility or totally renovate. He said the minimum maintenance was to keep the building dry. Mr. Kibler said they will need to do something with downtown no matter what, and asked if they wouldn't need to do the same thing in Option 2. Mr. Reifsteck said it depended on how long they were going to use it. He said the plan was to keep downtown for three years. Ms. Schwartz asked if they needed to do \$2.2 million in repairs at both facilities no matter which option they chose. Mr. Reifsteck said that is correct.

Mr. Maxwell said the next question was from a board member who wanted to know why they can't upgrade the satellite for the men, house the women at JDC, and renovate downtown to use for juvenile detention. Mr. Kimme said that with the classification system the current cells are good for general population but not for special needs, and it was their opinion that no housing unit at either facility would meet those needs. He noted that it was never in their scope to look at JDC but said initially the size seems appropriate and they could have separation. Mr. Kimme said they were looking at the impact of consolidating facilities instead of having separate facilities. He stated separate facilities are extremely staff inefficient. He noted that if it had been in the scope it is probably not something they would have recommended. He also said that if they can't renovate downtown to be good enough for adult inmates, it's not good enough for juveniles.

Mr. Maxwell stated the next public question wanted to know the cost to add the following scenarios: maintenance on both facilities to make serviceable for the next five years; a phased approach over an X number of years; and the use of prefab pods. Mr. Reifsteck said they can look at whatever time frame needs to happen for downtown, but the \$52,000 in repairs would grow after three years. He stated the key is to figure out how long they plan to utilize it and not keep guessing. He noted that many of the mechanicals will be in critical condition at that time. Mr. Gleason said the three years came from the assumption of having funding and they came up with a trouble list. He noted the list had the critical items but also a large number of things that will end up needing to be fixed on an emergency basis. Mr. Kimme commented that prefab pods, with all they are recommending be in the pod, aren't available. He said there are premade concrete and premade steel cells, but it is just the cells. He commented it's not just an

issue of cost but also of the quality of the environment. He said the prefab construction can pay off when there is a much larger economy of scale over 1,000 beds. He indicated the closest thing would be temporary housing trailers but those are normally only used during construction.

Mr. Maxwell moved to the next public question. He said they wanted to know if they can't get funding for the complete upgrade can the project be staged over 5-10 years and if so what a staged construction plan would look like, and what they would need to do with the downtown jail in the meantime. Mr. Reifsteck said the project can be phased and a simple way to look at phases is by the cost breakdown, but that doing one area may lead to costs elsewhere to support that renovation. He felt the large addition could also be done in phases, but they need to work with a financial plan. Mr. Kimme felt it was a priority to get special needs beds and replacement beds so they could close downtown as a jail. Mr. Anderson wasn't sure there was an advantage to phasing with regards to cost. He asked what pitfalls the consultant saw in phasing based on their experiences. Mr. Kimme said there will be some premiums to pay when phasing, including contractors and inflation. He also said that interest rates now are the lowest they will be and bonds in the future will have a higher interest premium. He said capabilities are denied during phasing so an operational and programmatic premium will also be paid.

Mr. Maxwell said the next question regarded cracking in the jail and deterioration in the showers. They want to know how much rehab will be needed to maintain the jail as is, or what is needed to build new pods and a Sheriff's administration pod and assure ourselves that both will last 50 years. Mr. Reifsteck said maintaining the jail as is would be the three year maintenance costs. He said the cracks in the floor have been there almost from the beginning and aren't structural. He said they didn't include the showers because that is a currently ongoing project. Mr. Reifsteck said new pods and an administration pod is what Option 2 suggests. Mr. Maxwell asked if they can fix the current jail to accommodate new pods and have a life expectancy of 50 plus years on both. Mr. Reifsteck said they will know more when the pre-cast panel investigation is in. He said the materials used should last 50 years, but noted that a roof will need replaced about every 20 years as well as other regular maintenance. He said from a material durability standpoint it should last.

Ms. Busey said she thought the consultants were prepared to address the issues raised in public participation. Mr. Kimme noted their scope didn't include a criminal justice system study that looks at ways to reduce the jail population. He commented that was part of the ILPP study. Mr. Kimme noted the student mentioned a discrepancy in his data analysis and Kimme's data analysis. He said both are correct but the student misunderstood how to use the jail data and how it affects population. He explained the fundamental difference between bookings and jail population. Mr. Kimme said they sampled 20 days because there were only a few months of classification data when they started. Ms. Schwartz asked why use booking data rather than looking at who is in jail and for what offenses. Mr. Kimme said they use it in order to calculate the average length of stay, and they need to know the intake volume when designing the booking area. Mr. Quisenberry noted the 20 days were during April through July and asked how the days were chosen. Mr. Kimme said they were chosen at random. He said they tried to spread it out and not have any consecutive days. Mr. Quisenberry wanted to know if they were concerned that the period picked isn't predictive of the rest of the year. Mr. Kimme said they are a little concerned but they only had the limited data at the time. Mr. Hartke asked if people staying for traffic violations were because they couldn't bail out. Mr. Kimme said he should refer to the ILPP study.

Mr. Rosales asked if there had been a discussion with the Finance Committee regarding where the money is coming from. Mr. Kimme said not with them. Mr. Rosales said unless the funds are there they aren't going anywhere but in circles. He felt the Facilities Committee needs to know from Finance if the money is available before Facilities can decide how to best spend that money. He felt there is no point in talking hypothetical.

Mr. Kibler said looking at metrics he would be interested to see the medians instead of averages. He felt medians and regression analysis might be better for making predictions. He noted that data has been collected for several more months now and he would like to see more current numbers. He mentioned

what Governor Rauner is doing with reduction of inmate population in the State and feared that may end up keeping inmates here longer before moving to state facilities. Mr. Kimme stated that some states have already kicked low level offenders to the county level and that impacts the facility dramatically. He said if he had a worry it would be that Illinois will do something similar and the state solution becomes our problem.

Mr. Kibler asked the Sheriff if after nine months of using the classification program things were better and the numbers weren't indicative of today. Sheriff Walsh noted that the classification system isn't about who goes into jail but what is done with them once they are in, but he felt the program was working.

Mr. Rosales asked Ms. Busey if they need to raise taxes or have a referendum and said he felt that wouldn't be discussed at this meeting but rather at Finance. He asked if they were going to continue bonding out and go further into debt. Mr. Maxwell responded stating they weren't going to put Ms. Busey in the position of deciding the finances. He said there are facilities funding issues other than the jail that appear further down on the agenda. Mr. Rosales asked if Mr. Maxwell was suggesting putting this in addition to all facility needs, then seeking funding for all buildings and projects, and then prioritizing that. Mr. Maxwell said that would be his ideal situation. Mr. Rosales asked what the consultants needed to move forward. Ms. Busey said looking at finances while looking at the buildings will occur and how the board decides to proceed will depend on the combined conversation of all the issues. Mr. Rosales asked if they were just going to handle things as they break. Ms. Busey said at this point the jail project doesn't have the finances for the next 2-3 years to issue that level of bonding without going to the voters. She also said they have financial limitations to deal with the other facilities issues, but they are hoping to get a finite financial plan. Ms. Busey said combining that information and then determining how the board wants to proceed is where they are now.

Mr. Maxwell stopped the meeting at 7:40 p.m. for a 10 minute break.

Mr. Maxwell reconvened the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

VIII. **Approval of Army Corp of Engineering Lease**

Removed from Agenda

IX. **Approval of Mental Health Board Lease**

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

X. **Approval to Release RFQ 2015-002 Facility Condition Assessment, Documentation, and Capital Planning Study for the County of Champaign Survey**

Mr. Maxwell explained the need to complete a needs assessment of all the buildings. He said the same architect will be lined up to do certification of any ADA work. Ms. Schwartz asked if there was any indication of the cost. Mr. Maxwell said he wasn't sure. Ms. Schwartz wanted to know if it is in the budget. Ms. Busey said they did something similar with the nursing home and the cost was about \$24,000. She felt the cost would be six figures and is hoping it is closer to \$100,000. Ms. Busey said it isn't in the budget and will require a budget amendment. She commented that the Board has talked about doing this for a decade and it is critical for moving forward. **MOTION** by Mr. Kibler to approve; seconded by Mr. Hartke.

Mr. Brenner explained that they had already identified MEP envelope costs at both detention facilities. He said all MEP work has been done at the nursing home. He said those are large parts of what the total cost would be. Mr. Quisenberry wanted to know how small of things were going to be looked at. Mr. Brenner answered the building envelopes, roof, bricks, etc. to make sure air and water are being kept out. He also said the mechanicals will be thoroughly investigated showing an estimate of life span. Mr. Quisenberry asked if sidewalks, pavement, and windows would be included. Mr. Brenner said they would.

Mr. Kibler said he would be interested in an IT audit at the same caliber and thought it would fall under this committee. Ms. Busey said it would fall under finance. Mr. Quisenberry said there was an IT audit done eight years ago and asked Ms. Busey if that would be something they take up with Finance. Ms. Busey replied either Finance or Policy.

Mr. Jay commented that he was glad to finally see this on the agenda. He felt in the past they have never taken the building responsibilities seriously. He said he doesn't like the cost. Mr. Jay also pointed out that they need to keep on it and fix things when they need to be fixed rather than waiting until they deteriorate. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

- XI. Approval to Release Invitation to Bid ITB 2015-003 Courthouse Window Replacement Project**
MOTION by Mr. Kibler to approve; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

XII. Facilities Director's Report

A. Update on the Satellite Jail Panel Investigation

Mr. Brenner said the project started on 3/31/15. He stated that Penhall cored holes in the concrete at the connection points and another company chipped out the core as well as some of the pre-stressed strands at ground level. He said that on Wednesday concrete was poured to fill the chipped away areas. He said he hopes to investigate the connection points on the roof next week. Mr. Brenner summarized preliminary findings, which were very positive. Mr. Brenner said he will have more at the May meeting, and hopefully the final report.

Mr. Rosales asked if all the work was done in-house. Mr. Brenner replied no. He said they had a contract with ERA, Penhall, and Duce Construction. He felt the costs for Duce and Penhall would be minimal.

Mr. Quisenberry asked if water was getting into the insulation pushing it out and causing the cracking, but not affecting the structure. Mr. Brenner felt that is correct. He said they need to find a way to keep water from getting into the panels. Mr. Maxwell said he saw some of the strands and came away optimistic about the overall integrity of the building.

B. Update on Nursing Home Water Heater Replacement

Mr. Brenner said they are working with GHR on the water heaters and stated that this project is being funded by the nursing home. He noted that the Nursing Home Board will meet Monday and will be presented with the bid. Mr. Brenner said they plan to post the bid on April 17, open bids on May 8, and have the contractor mobilize by June 15. He said there are five water heaters and they will need to be replaced one at a time.

XIII. Other Business

None

XIV. Chair's Report

A. Future Meeting – Tuesday, May 5 at 6:30 p.m.

B. Tour of the County Highway Maintenance Facility, 1605 E Main, Urbana at 5:25 pm prior to the May 5 Facilities Committee Meeting. Meet at County Highway at 5:20 p.m. The tour will begin at 5:25 p.m.

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

Mr. Maxwell stated that item IX is to be placed on the consent agenda.

XVI. Adjournment

MOTION by Mr. Kibler to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Quisenberry. There being no further business, Mr. Maxwell adjourned the meeting at 8:13 p.m.