



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

MINUTES – Approved as Distributed 5/7/13

DATE: Tuesday, March 5, 2013
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E Washington, Urbana, IL 61802

Committee Members

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

County Staff: Alan Reinhart (Director of Facilities), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Robert Kirkland (Buildings/Ground Manager), Beth Brunk (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 6:01 p.m.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Approval of Minutes

A. February 5, 2013 – Regular Meeting

MOTION by Mr. Kibler to approve the minutes for the February 5, 2013 meeting as distributed; seconded by Ms. Schwartz. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

B. February 20, 2013 – Special Meeting

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to approve the minutes for the February 20, 2013 meeting as distributed; seconded by Mr. Kibler. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

IV. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Reinhart had two changes to the agenda:

- VIII – should read “Approve Courthouse Exterior Maintenance RFP” as it does not need to go to the Finance Committee.
- IX – should read “Recommendation to Finance Committee to apply for Department of Commerce & Economic Opportunity (DCEO) grant for Public Sector Energy Efficiency Program” – it is for informational purposes only.

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

V. Public Participation

None

VI. Communications

Mr. Hartke noted that he has created a draft agenda of the 3/26/13 Study Session on Energy Efficiency and would welcome any edits or comments.

VII. Approve Recommendation to Finance Committee for Funding Roof Replacement Projects

Ms. Busey explained four funding scenarios for roof replacements on County buildings as outlined in the memo. She recommended Option D which would equalize the costs for only the roof replacements needed in FY2014, FY2015 and FY2016. In FY2017, the schedule would start to fully amortize for all the remaining roof systems.

Mr. Rosales entered the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Ms. Busey confirmed that the Courts Construction Fund has an approximate balance of \$830,000 which is leftover money from the construction of the Courthouse. That money has been set aside for any facility-related construction expenditures for the Courthouse. As the fund is drawn down, it is not being replenished. Ms. Schwartz asked if we could borrow the money from this fund to help with the costs for roof replacements. Ms. Busey affirmed that it could be done. Mr. James stated that the County Board has looked at using the Courts Construction Fund in 2010 and 2011 but decided that it should stay allocated for the maintenance costs at the Courthouse.

Mr. Hartke inquired if other line items would need to be cut to appropriate money for roof replacements. Ms. Busey replied that at this point that would not be the case. Mr. Hartke was concerned that this fund is dedicated for roof replacements only. Ms. Busey clarified that the Capital Asset Replacement Fund in the Facilities Department Budget is not specifically for roofs. She is hopeful that the County Board will decide to build the reserve for not only roof replacement but also HVAC and maintenance needs as well.

Mr. Kibler wanted to consider Option A which provides a reserve for future roof replacements starting in FY2014 if financially feasible. Ms. Busey commented that it would be highly unlikely that the General Corporate Fund would be able to afford Option A (\$624,711) of new expenditure appropriation in FY2014 based on other budget demands.

MOTION by Mr. Kibler to recommend to the Finance Committee that direction be given in the preparation of the FY2014 budget, that Option A, \$624,711, or at a minimum Option D, \$313,908, be budgeted in the General Corporate Fund as a transfer to the Capital Asset Replacement Fund Facilities Budget to provide initial funding for a Capital Improvement Plan, specifically for the replacement of roofing systems; seconded by Mr. Hartke.

Mr. Maxwell expressed his concern that even with new growth in the General Corporate Fund; Option A would eventually require dipping into other line items. Mr. Quisenberry pointed out that with Option D, there would be nothing in the reserve at the end of FY2016 for future roof replacements. He asked if the County could spend General Corporate Fund balance with the commitment that it would be replenished over time. Ms. Busey responded that there is no Fund balance to spend. Currently, \$1.5 million is borrowed from the Public Safety Sales Tax Fund to cover cash flow in the General Corporate Fund until property taxes are deposited in May or June.

Mr. James was in favor of Option D because he felt it was attainable as a starting point. Ms. Schwartz would feel more comfortable with equalizing the payments over 5 years. She agreed with maintaining a

flatter amount for budgetary considerations but would like to see higher payments than Option D. Conceptually, Ms. Schwartz would like to see two numbers: what we should have and what we can have. Mr. Quisenberry preferred Option D to leave room for additional HVAC equipment replacement expenditures. Mr. Kibler would like to be proactive and have something in reserve for roofs after FY2016 like increasing the annual payments to \$400,000.

Ms. Busey explained that the Capital Asset Replacement Fund also covers technology, vehicles and other large capital needs for all County Departments – it not just for Facilities. Since 2009, the County has largely depleted this fund. Ms. Busey would like to build the reserve fund for all these needs. The Capital Asset Replacement Fund is managed so every item carries a balance and is carefully tracked for auditing purposes.

Ms. Petrie hopes there will some flexibility in the prioritization of facilities projects. At the study session on March 26th, one of the speakers, Don Fournier, will discuss grant opportunities which may shift the project order emphasis. Ms. Petrie understood the constraints on the cash flow and pressures on the reserve fund but thought it prudent to give consideration to using the money in the Courthouse Fund if and when grant opportunities come along. The rate of return may be higher to invest in the grant than the small interest accrual that the fund will earn in a bank account.

Upon vote: Aye – Kibler

Nay – James, Quisenberry, Schwartz, Hartke, Rosales, Maxwell

MOTION Failed.

MOTION by Mr. Quisenberry to recommend to the Finance Committee that direction be given in the preparation of the FY2014 budget, that Option D, \$313,908, be budgeted in the General Corporate Fund as a transfer to the Capital Asset Replacement Fund Facilities Budget to provide initial funding for a Capital Improvement Plan, specifically for the replacement of roofing systems; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

VIII. Approve Courthouse Exterior Maintenance Request for Proposal (RFP)

Mr. Reinhart introduced Robert “Kirk” Kirkland, the County Buildings and Grounds Supervisor, who will assist in the presentation. In photographs provided by Mr. Reinhart, small portions of the “old” Courthouse’s south and west exterior walls have mortar missing between the brick joints. Water infiltration is occurring in these parts. These fissures are in approximately the same location as the cracks that needed to be repaired before the restoration was completed three years ago. Mr. Reinhart explained that it may be due to the inferior consistency of the mortar or it is possible that there is movement of the structure. He would like to contact the Architects of Record from the restoration work, White & Borgognoni Architects or IGW, Inc. to assess the situation as consultants.

Mr. Reinhart recommended using \$125,000 that is in the FY2013 budget for capital projects specifically for the exterior maintenance of the Courthouse. He recommended issuing a RFP for the cleaning, tuck pointing and applying water repellent for the exterior of the “old” Courthouse. While the exterior of the newer Courthouse addition is not showing premature signs of failure, it should also be cleaned, caulking joints checked and water repellent applied.

Mr. Quisenberry asked if the headers above the windows were insufficient thereby causing the mortar to crack. Mr. Reinhart replied that the headers are superficial. The interior building is a steel structure and the separate brick/stone exterior was built from the foundation up.

MOTION by Mr. Hartke to authorize Mr. Reinhart to consult with the Architects of Record for their recommendations on the repair of the Courthouse’s exterior then issue the RFP; seconded by Mr. Quisenberry.

Mr. James commented that it is important to contact the architect that bid the job since he had insight

from the restoration work. It needs to be done soon to protect the building and get the job bid in the spring as 2013 work is being scheduled by contractors. The least that needs to be done is to have the bricks tuck pointed and resealed. Mr. James noted from past minutes that the repellent coating should extend the life of the brickwork for approximately 50 years.

Mr. Kibler left the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

Mr. Maxwell suspected that this could be a foundation problem. Mr. Hartke commented that he thought the problem is bigger than just tuck pointing. The first step is to contact the architects and prepare the RFP. Once the responses are in from the RFP, we can refuse to issue the contract if need be.

Ms. Petrie commented that if the original architects did not correct the problem, we should get another opinion that will be unbiased. The University of Illinois has the third-ranked Civil Engineering Department in the country. We could get advice from them before writing the RFP. Mr. James noted that another engineering/architect firm would have to do much of the preliminary work all over again which would cost more money.

Upon vote: Aye – James, Quisenberry, Hartke, Schwartz, Maxwell
Nay – Rosales

MOTION Carried.

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

Mr. Reinhart detailed the Public Sector Energy Efficiency Program 2012-2013 – Double up Natural Gas from DCEO. He had evaluated the program last year and found the program rebates were not cost effective. In January 1, 2013, DCEO increased the incentives of the program. Three boilers that qualify for this program due to lower efficiency ratings are located at the Adult Detention Center and ILEAS. They will be tuned up by an outside mechanical contractor for approximately \$4,085. With the projected grant rebate from the program, the County will have invested \$1,257 which should be recovered within six months from the saving in natural gas usage. The application deadline is May 15, 2013.

The Committee members were supportive of forwarding this grant application to the Finance Committee.

X. Downtown Jail Priorities

Due to busy schedules, Mr. Reinhart was not able to talk the Sheriff about the prioritization of the remaining four projects. He will bring it back to the Committee once he has conferred with the Sheriff.

XI. Other Business

None

XII. Chair's Report

Mr. James reviewed past minutes of the Facilities Committee and saw in 2010 a discussion about putting money aside for a Capital Improvement/Replacement Plan. Three years later, this Committee is still talking about it. Mr. James feels like a little start is better than nothing. The fund will grow over time.

XIII. Semi-Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes

Ms. Busey referenced the memo from the State's Attorney recommending the opening of seven closed meeting minutes which is consistent with both the statute and the County Board's resolution about when to open closed session minutes.

MOTION by Mr. Maxwell that pursuant to the statutory requirement to conduct a semi-annual review of all closed meeting minutes that the closed meeting minutes of the County Facilities Committee be

maintained as closed to protect the public interest or the privacy of individuals, with the exception of the minutes from:

- April 26, 1990
- November 6, 2001
- December 10, 2002
- January 6, 2004
- May 4, 2004
- June 8, 2004
- August 11, 2009

which may now be determined as open session minutes; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

XIV. Adjournment

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

There being no further business, Mr. James adjourned the meeting at 7:08 p.m.