



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

MINUTES – Approved 12/1/2015

DATE: Tuesday, November 3, 2015
TIME: 6:30 p.m.
PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington, Urbana, IL 61802

Committee Members

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

County Staff: Dana Brenner (Facilities Director); Deb Busey (County Administrator); Linda Lane (Administrative Assistant)

Others Present: Pattsy Petrie (Board Chair); John Jay (Board Member); Robin Whitehurst, Karla Smalley and Tom Kaczmarek (Bailey Edward); Chris Billings (Berns Clancy); Paul Bollin and Jim Bright (Henneman); Cassie Carroll (IL Green Business Assoc.)

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Vice Chair Rosales called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Approval of Agenda

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

IV. Approval of Minutes- September 1, 2015

MOTION by Mr. Anderson to approve the minutes of the September 1, 2015 meeting; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

V. Public Participation

None

VI. Communications

None

VII. Illinois Green Business Association – Brookens Administrative Center Certificate Presentation by Cassie Carroll, Executive Director

Ms. Carroll gave a brief background about what Brookens has done to achieve green certification accreditation. She thanked Mr. Brenner and the committee for all the hard work they put in. Ms. Carroll said that Brookens accomplished 110 green practices, out of 175, in nine different areas. She presented Mr. Rosales with the certificate of accreditation. She pointed out that Champaign County is the first county in the state to have a building certified.

VIII. Champaign County Facility Condition Assessment Project Presentation by Bailey Edward Architecture

Mr. Rosales turned the floor over to Bailey Edward for their Facility Condition Assessment Project presentation.

Mr. Whitehurst introduced himself and stated his role in the project. He asked each member of the team to do the same.

Mr. Whitehurst explained the report is only a summary of each building, and will provide insight for capital renewal and a facility master plan. He summarized how they gathered the information and how the report is set up. He discussed the rating scale and what factors were used to determine a building's rating. He also mentioned the deferred maintenance backlog. Mr. Whitehurst pointed out that 2-3% of a building's replacement value should be budgeted annually for maintenance, which is the national standard. Ms. Schwartz asked if deferred maintenance includes upgrades. Mr. Whitehurst replied that upgrades are replacing equipment past their useful life with an upgraded model and would be included in this amount. He said that redesigns of a complete lighting system would be an example not included in this amount. He also noted that only facility costs are included in this report and the accessibility issues are addressed in a separate report.

Mr. Whitehurst discussed how the issues were split by priority and gave examples. He also explained that some of the buildings, such as the garages, were divided because separate entities occupy it. He stated the courthouse was divided into the old courthouse and the addition. He said they gave the old courthouse a \$13.5 million replacement cost with annual maintenance costs of \$407,000. Mr. Quisenberry said he detected a discrepancy, and doesn't feel the \$13.5 million is representative of what we have, but more for a basic courthouse based on a model. Mr. Whitehurst replied that is correct. He said they could elevate the CRV but that will raise the annual cost to maintain the backlog. He said doing that will drive the data, but could be done in a drilldown at the next level, which would be in a facilities master plan. Mr. Quisenberry stated they need to take into account the \$407,000 is probably not representative of what it will take to maintain the building in the state that it's in with the enhancements. Mr. Whitehurst said there is a \$548,000 deferred maintenance backlog. He summarized the items by priority. Mr. Bollin said that a big part of this is energy consumption and they want the ability to do night setbacks.

Mr. Whitehurst said he agrees with the previous reports regarding the Sheriff's office. He said it would take \$11.7 million to replace the building and it should have a \$352,000 maintenance budget. Mr. Whitehurst said the priority issues have \$919,000 in deferred maintenance backlog, with the 0-5 at over \$2 million that needs to be spent on this building. Mr. Bollin noted the mechanicals have exceeded their lifespan. He complimented the maintenance staff for keeping things running as well as they have with their current resources. Mr. Whitehurst said interior finishes are past their lifespan as well.

Mr. Whitehurst reported the replacement value for JDC is \$6.6 million, with annual maintenance costs of \$198,000. He said the roof needs replaced, floor finishes need done, and there is a lot of peeling paint inside. He also said that renewing the lighting could result in energy savings.

Mr. Whitehurst moved to the nursing home and said they put the replacement value at \$30 million. He noted the annual maintenance budget should be \$889,000 and stated that the building shouldn't be at this point for its age. He said there is \$1.8 million in deferred maintenance. Mr. Quisenberry asked where the itemized list for the \$1.8 million could be found. Mr. Whitehurst replied that it is in the detailed report. Mr. Quisenberry asked what the most expensive items on the list are. Mr. Whitehurst replied the mechanicals.

Mr. Whitehurst next discussed the courthouse addition, noting that things like wall coverings and carpet are past their useful life. Mr. Bollin stated they are 15 years into the 40-year life and the mechanicals are nearing their halfway point. It was also noted that a lot of the distribution equipment has reached a point of non-replaceable parts. Mr. Whitehurst said there is currently a \$1 million backlog in deferred maintenance and \$865,000 should be budgeted for annual maintenance. He also noted the support system for the roof is starting to rust, but at this time is just a maintenance item.

Mr. Whitehurst explained that they divided ILEAS into three parts; the original structure, the boiler house, and the 1970's building. He said the original building is uninhabitable, the roof is so far gone the building structure is compromised, and there are water issues, mold, etc. He stated it would cost \$23.4 million to replace based on square footage, with \$702,000 needed to maintain the building annually. Mr. Whitehurst indicated that upgrading would cause code triggers, like accessibility issues, fire alarm, and sprinkler systems. Mr. Bollin explained that each room has its own fan and feels the building is probably one of the biggest energy consumers for the County. Mr. Whitehurst noted that there is \$10 million in deferred maintenance backlog. He pointed out that when you look at the model and are at 40% of replacement cost, you need to ask why you still have that building. He explained that there are numerous issues with the building including paint finishes, asbestos, and plant life on the roof. He noted this money does not include any of these items or the accessibility issues. Mr. Whitehurst said in contrast the 1970's part of the building has good structure and is generally in good condition. He said the replacement value is \$21.2 million, with \$637,000 for annual maintenance costs. Mr. Bollin said there is a lot of scalability and ease of replacement of items in this building.

Mr. Brenner asked Berns Clancy about the sidewalks, parking lots, etc. Mr. Billings replied that the site work is in good overall condition. He said it has been maintained well with only a few miscellaneous items that need to be addressed.

Mr. Whitehurst said overall that the score for all the buildings is poor. He said the total replacement cost for all buildings is \$186.5 million. He noted there is a \$22 million backlog of deferred maintenance and felt the County should think about a facility master plan. Ms. Schwartz asked what it would be without ILEAS. Mr. Whitehurst said the building envelopes are the biggest single item for all buildings, probably with ILEAS driving the data. He said what should be put into the buildings annually is \$5.6 million, but the County is currently only putting in \$825,000. He noted that the County is actually doing quite well and the staff is doing a phenomenal job with the resources they have. He showed a funding scenario of the backlog, a scenario of funding at the 3%, and another scenario that takes out the ILEAS original building, the ILEAS boiler house, and the downtown Sheriff's office. He noted the last scenario lowers the annual costs to maintain by \$1 million and he explained the cost to do that. Ms. Schwartz said the \$2 million is to abate and sell, but asked if they abandoned it would they have to spend the \$2 million. Mr. Whitehurst said they would have to spend money to

board it up and shut off the utilities to abandon, which creates a nuisance. He said their recommendation is to remove the building.

Mr. Whitehurst finished by saying that maintaining the buildings is important for performance, health, and the image of the County, and said there is a way to move forward.

Mr. Rosales opened the floor for questions.

Mr. Quisenberry said he is curious why the coroner's office and election supply aren't equal in CRV but are equal in square footage. Mr. Whitehurst replied they determined the coroner's office to be 24/7 critical. He pointed out that they don't have a generator and that it's also about interior finishes. Mr. Quisenberry said animal control is similar to election supply and wanted to know why there is a big increase in the priority to 0-5. Mr. Bollin said animal control has spot coolers, there is need for additional exhaust, and there are code deficiencies. Mr. Whitehurst pointed out that this is another 24/7 building without a generator. Mr. Quisenberry said there is nothing in the short description to indicate there is anything wrong with the HVAC. Mr. Bollin replied that when there are code deficiencies they have to look at costs to correct and said the thicker report gives the lists and details. Mr. Quisenberry asked why the salt dome had a big increase in priority to 0-5. He said he sees on the list a lot of metal corrosion and wanted to know what the \$146,000 increase is. Mr. Bollin replied the conduit is rusted through, and the electrical distribution for the lighting is bad. Mr. Whitehurst said there is significant metal degradation and many more maintenance items that add up.

Ms. Schwartz said that funding scenarios 1 has no additional funds, and funding scenario 3 doesn't say there are any additional funds. She wanted to know if it was scenario 1 without ILEAS. Mr. Whitehurst said yes, that they wanted to show what it would look like with the buildings removed, so he didn't put in any additional funding. Ms. Schwartz asked if it is actually 4.6% or 6.3% at 5 years. Mr. Whitehurst said the FCI is taking ILEAS and corrections off the books, meaning that at the five year mark the countywide deferred maintenance is decreased to get an FCI of 4.6%. Ms. Schwartz asked if they need to say funding scenario 3 with \$2 million to make the graph correct. Mr. Whitehurst replied that is correct.

Mr. Rector asked if the large report is prioritized and how. Mr. Whitehurst replied that items marked 0 and 0-5 need to be looked at in the next five years.

Mr. Rosales asked how to begin to get the most bang for the buck. He asked if there was a way to prioritize some of the low cost items. Mr. Whitehurst suggested they look at the buildings and what programs are in them. He said simultaneously would be looking at the building envelopes, then air handlers, boilers, etc. Mr. Bollin said they should start with the buildings that house people, such as the nursing home, JDC, and the jail. Mr. Whitehurst feels a plan needs to be developed, because staff time is affected to implement the projects as well as maintenance. He felt there should be a combination of programs and capital investment in combination with a facility master plan. Mr. Hartke suggested that if they take care of the high-energy items it will lower utility costs, creating more money for other items.

Mr. Rosales asked if they took into consideration the masonry work done at the satellite jail, and changes that might occur if they close the downtown jail, when they did their costs estimation for the satellite jail. Mr. Whitehurst replied they did and didn't include dollars for that. He noted that programmatic issues at the jail aren't part of this report but will have to be considered.

Mr. Rosales asked if there are any code and ADA violations that should be high priority. He wanted to know if those are included in the report. Mr. Whitehurst answered that no dollars for that are included and there will be a separate report with those issues and costs. Mr. Rosales asked if the consultant's work was done today or if there will be future reports. Mr. Whitehurst said they will

present to the full board on November 19 to wrap up. He said they will work with Mr. Brenner to get the database up and running. Mr. Whitehurst said they are still engaged for the accessibility component, and have turned in a report to the DOJ. He noted that there will be some projects as a result of that report. Mr. Rosales asked if there will be another assessment of building value once items are completed, or can Mr. Brenner do that. Mr. Whitehurst replied that they will turn the database over to Mr. Brenner and said they don't have services to manage the database after the handover. Mr. Bollin said the database is a working document that will update as information is entered.

Mr. Rosales thanked the Bailey Edward team for their presentation.

IX. Facilities Director's Report

A. Update on Courthouse Window Replacement Project

Mr. Brenner noted that the project is about 98% complete. He stated that there are a few punch list items remaining and thought those would be completed by the end of next week. He gave a rundown of the costs and felt that at the end the costs would not exceed \$214,500. Mr. Brenner commented that the windows should be in good shape for the next 35 years.

B. Update on Precast Concrete Panel Repair Project

Mr. Brenner felt that Otto Baum is doing a good job and noted that JDC is finished. He said all that was done there was to replace the joints. He stated that some cracks were found on a few of the panels that they will keep an eye on. Mr. Brenner commented that the most work was being done at the Satellite Jail. He said more time was involved due to the pre-stressed strands in the panels. He reported that there is a firm hold between the patch material and the panel concrete, and said they are starting to paint, which should take about 10 days. Mr. Brenner stated that work will begin on the Highway building next week and should be complete in three weeks, weather dependent. He explained that it is in the contract that no polyurethane can be applied below 50°. Mr. Brenner summarized the costs-to-date and said they are at \$261,179.

C. Update on CCNH Dryer Lint Project

Mr. Brenner reported that the CCNH Board approved to contract with GHR to design, bid, and administrate a bid document for a lint filtration project. He said they will present drawings and the bid document at the next CCNH Board meeting. Mr. Brenner said they hope to be under contract by the end of December and begin the project in February. He explained that they don't want to start the project until all materials are received in order to minimize the down time of the laundry facilities at the nursing home. He said they will have to outsource the laundry while the work is taking place. Mr. Brenner indicated that he would like to keep the project at six weeks or less.

D. Update on Department of Justice ADA Compliance Issues

Mr. Brenner explained that as part of the DOJ settlement agreement they had specific amounts of time to get items into compliance; three, six, or 32 months. He gave an overview of the handout and summarized how some of the items were brought to compliance. He said Bailey Edward documented the items and forwarded the information to the DOJ. He said that the materials are the only actual costs, but they are keeping track of labor for their records.

Mr. Anderson commented that the total on this document is about \$10,000. He asked if other costs are anticipated. Mr. Brenner replied these are the minor items, and said there are other issues in the next phase with increased costs. He said there are a number of items that will involve Bailey Edward to correct. He commented that he doesn't know estimated total cost, but that it won't be inexpensive. He said there will be a presentation in January explaining more.

Mr. Jay asked if the DOJ comes back once the corrections are made. Mr. Brenner explained that they have partnered with Bailey Edward, who will document the work when it is completed and send a report to the DOJ.

Mr. Rosales wanted to know when they anticipate all projects being complete. Mr. Brenner replied 32 months from the date the contract was signed. Ms. Busey said March of 2018. She stated what they will get is the end of the settlement agreement. She explained that once they have documented full compliance they will no longer be under a settlement agreement with DOJ. She said as they do major fixes, DOJ will probably send people to document what has been done with our independent licensed architect. Mr. Rosales asked if Bailey Edward was going to be around until then. Mr. Busey said they will be with us through March 2018. She stated that they will not know the costs in January because some of these things will have to be designed then repaired. She noted they have established a separate ADA budget so they will know what has been spent at the end. Mr. Brenner gave some examples of code violations that will need to be fixed.

X. Chair's Report

Mr. Rosales wanted to know if he should give the IGBA certificate to Ms. Busey so she can present it to Mr. Maxwell at the full board meeting. Ms. Busey responded no, that they will hang it someplace where the public can see it.

Mr. Rosales stated the next meeting will be Tuesday, December 1, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.

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

Mr. Rosales stated there are no items to be placed on the consent agenda.

Mr. Anderson commented that there was a lot of information to take in tonight, but felt they need to move forward and act soon. He felt there are some buildings that should be demolished to get it behind us. He thought the longer they put it off the more the costs will rise and there will be more damage to existing buildings.

Ms. Schwartz stated that ADA is a legal obligation and needs to be done first. She noted that they can't move forward because they have no budget.

Mr. Rosales thinks the report is a good tool to move forward. He said there has been talk about how much to set aside for repairs, but they needed to find out the scope and cost of the repairs before they could do that. Ms. Busey noted that 2016 will be the third year that the Facilities budget is \$532,261 for items in the report. She explained that the committee didn't budget specific projects because they wanted to wait until the Bailey Edward report was received. Ms. Busey felt the next agenda item for this committee is to receive recommendations from Mr. Brenner on where to focus the funding we have in 2016. She explained that they only have \$175,000 budgeted for ADA in 2016 in addition to the \$532,261. She agreed that there is a bigger issue that the full board needs to address.

Mr. Quisenberry said he would like Mr. Brenner and his staff to absorb the full report. He felt the cost to maintain the Courthouse is extremely under rated, and would like to hear the staff's opinion regarding that. He felt maybe that is balanced by the fact that what is recommended for ILEAS they probably aren't going to do. Mr. Quisenberry commented that this is a condition report, not a master plan, and felt this committee needs to prioritize the bigger picture. He said this committee needs to prepare a plan and push it to Finance to figure out how to pay for it. He said he was surprised to see the amount in the report that they need to spend in the next five years. He felt it was short and not a true replacement cost. He said they should create the roadmap and send it to the Board.

Mr. Anderson said he's heard twice tonight that the ADA cost is coming, and that they may have to take additional money out of facilities to help pay for that. He said he's listened to the consultants

evaluate our equipment and the condition, and felt we've done that long enough. He noted that money that should go to rehabilitate our buildings will now go to fix ADA and defer the maintenance. He said he is appalled by the condition of our facilities, but is amazed at the miracle work the maintenance staff does, and thinks it's time to quit thinking about how to defer maintenance to pick up a new cost that's come around. Mr. Anderson felt they should come up with a new mechanism to pay for the ADA and to find financing for the maintenance that needs to be done. He said that maintaining our buildings has to become a priority because it is costing us.

Ms. Schwartz asked if he was suggesting they don't comply with the settlement agreement. Mr. Anderson replied no, and felt there are other ways to finance the ADA. Ms. Schwartz asked how. Mr. Anderson suggested cutting some programs. Mr. Rosales said that it took a long time to get this assessment done, and now they can begin the discussion to move forward.

XII. Adjournment

MOTION by Mr. Quisenberry to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Hartke. There being no further business, Mr. Rosales adjourned the meeting at 8:22 p.m.

***Please note the minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.*