



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

MINUTES – Approved 06/07/2016

DATE: Tuesday, May 3, 2016
TIME: 6:30 p.m.
PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington, Urbana, IL 61802

Committee Members

Present: Gary Maxwell (Chair), Jack Anderson, Josh Hartke, James Quisenberry, Giraldo Rosales, Rachel Schwartz

Absent: Jon Rector

County Staff: Dana Brenner (Facilities Director), Rick Snider (County Administrator), Andy Rhodes (IT Director), Tim Breen (IT), Linda Lane (Administrative Assistant)

Others Present: Patti Petrie (County Board Chair), Stan Harper (Board Member)

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair Maxwell called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Approval of Agenda

MOTION by Mr. Rosales to approve the agenda; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously.**

IV. Approval of Minutes – April 5, 2016

MOTION by Mr. Anderson to approve the minutes of the April 5, 2016 meeting; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously.**

V. Public Participation

None

VI. Communications

None

VII. Request Approval of Authorization for Courthouse Wireless Network Project to be Charged to the Court Construction Fund

Mr. Maxwell asked for a motion to approve. **MOTION** by Mr. Anderson to approve; seconded by Mr. Quisenberry.

Mr. Rhodes explained that they would like to install wireless access points throughout the courthouse for both the County's domain network and the public wireless network. He said this will accommodate several projects that are taking place at the courthouse, including: the language translation carts that the Circuit Court obtained through the AOIC; tablet computers in the courtrooms for judges, probation officers, Assistant State's Attorney's, Assistant Public Defender's; and give Physical Plant access to their Facility Tree software and building automation software.

Mr. Quisenberry asked if there isn't currently Wi-Fi in the courthouse. Mr. Rhodes replied there are only a few wireless access points in various places, but not in all the courtrooms where the wireless is needed for a few of these projects. He said it is only on the public side, that they don't have domain wireless, and they need domain wireless for some of the other projects. Mr. Quisenberry pointed out that phones can't be taken into the courthouse so wanted to know why they need public Wi-Fi. Mr. Rhodes replied the public wireless will support the language interpretation carts which have to be on our public network to access the remote interpretation sites. Mr. Rhodes explained they have several networks they call the public network and the domain network. He said the public network is the open network, physically separate from any County work resources. He said it's the same setup they have in the Shields room and at CCNH. Mr. Quisenberry commented that it looked as if they are doing a significant amount of additional power over Ethernet. Mr. Rhodes answered they are using POE switches to drive the power requirements but there will not be additional electrical needs in the computer room. Discussion continued regarding access points and power needs.

Mr. Anderson questioned the public access and wanted to know if he walked into the courthouse tomorrow and had some business, could he access the internet while he was waiting. Mr. Rhodes replied no because the public can't take phones, tablets, or laptops into the courthouse. Mr. Anderson assumed jurors couldn't have those devices. Mr. Rhodes said that is correct. Mr. Rosales asked if someone were representing pro se would they be able to bring a laptop in and access the network. Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Breen answered that would be up to the Sheriff and the judge.

Mr. Quisenberry asked when they learned about the need for this project. Mr. Rhodes responded it has been building for a while. He said it recently came to a head because the computers in the courtrooms are scheduled for replacement. He cited several items driving this project, including a new electronic jury system, wireless tablets, and the State project for the language carts. Mr. Quisenberry clarified that this is something they won't find in this year's budget. Mr. Rhodes said that is correct. Mr. Quisenberry also clarified the reason it's not a budget concern is because there's always the Court Construction Fund to dip into. Mr. Rhodes said they were planning to have it in the FY17 budget cycle, but it was suggested to them that the Court Construction Fund budgeted for this year hadn't been earmarked for anything and might be a funding source for this project. Mr. Quisenberry commented they may have found a gap in budget planning that they should think about in the future.

Mr. Rosales asked if this Wi-Fi system is connected to the UC2B fiber optic hubs. Mr. Rhodes answered the County is on UC2B, that it is currently how they get all of their internet, and the internet being provided through these wireless access points would also come through UC2B and ICN.

Mr. Quisenberry asked what is remaining in the Court Construction Fund. Mr. Brenner replied about \$230,000. Mr. Hartke commented that there is no continuing revenue source for this fund and when the money is gone, it's gone. Ms. Schwartz thought it had to go to Finance for a budget amendment. Mr. Brenner explained it falls under the purchasing limit that would make it go out for bid, and that this committee has approved such items in the past. Mrs. Schwartz felt if it hadn't been budgeted, it will have to go to Finance before being paid. Mr. Rhodes responded it's his understanding the Court Construction money was included in the FY16 budget, but wasn't earmarked for any specific projects.

Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously.**

VIII. Approval of Authorization for ITB #2016-004 Brookens Boiler Replacement for POD #200 and POD #300

Mr. Maxwell asked for a motion to approve. **MOTION** by Mr. Anderson to approve; seconded by Ms. Schwartz.

Mr. Brenner explained there are two boilers original to the building, one in the basement of Pod 300 and one that is in an outside closet near the chillers for Pod 200. He said there is visible rust and noticeable gas smell with both. Mr. Brenner estimated the cost at \$270,000-\$300,000. He noted that each unit will be replaced with two smaller units which will save on utility costs. He explained that they

are asking for separate bids for each Pod as well as a total combined price due to the cap on the capital asset fund. He said they're at about \$200,000 so far. Mr. Brenner said they would like to start the project in August and be complete in September before the cold weather hits. He commented that there is a pre-bid scheduled for May 19, and though it isn't mandatory, it is recommended. He said bids will be opened June 2, be brought to the Facilities Committee June 7, and to the County Board on June 23 if committee approves.

Mr. Quisenberry asked if putting two smaller boilers in place of one large one gives redundancy. Mr. Brenner replied yes and no. He said one will heat the area so no pipes freeze, but not to optimum levels where people won't have to wear a coat.

Upon vote, the **Motion Carried Unanimously.**

IX. Discussion of the Proposed 10-year Capital Maintenance Plan

Mr. Maxwell referred to the handout of the 10-year Capital Maintenance Plan. He said they needed criteria on funding so he and Mr. Brenner decided to assume the same funding levels they have now for FY17 and FY18. He stated after that, it would increase to the Bailey Edward recommendation of \$4.5 million per year. He pointed out that figure does not include the Sheriff's office, the jails, CCNH, or the old nursing home. He said IT needs and ADA issues also are not included. Mr. Maxwell summarized the priorities for projects.

Mr. Brenner referenced page one saying they budgeted for using all the dollars. He said in FY17 they plan to replace the Pod 100 roof that leaks almost as much as the one they are replacing this year. He said they would also like to replace the AHUs above Pod 100 with multi-zone units and install digital controls. Mr. Brenner noted they left a category called General Maintenance that appears in all fiscal years. He said for FY17 they don't have a specific project yet for the \$82,000. He pointed out that number is down to \$27,000 in FY18. Mr. Brenner said they are looking to replace the original multi-zone units in Pods 200, 300, and 400 in FY18.

Ms. Schwartz asked for confirmation that the ADA issues weren't part of the \$532,000. Mr. Brenner replied that is correct and that there is \$174,000 budgeted for ADA. He said Ms. Busey had talked about increasing it to \$230,000 this year.

Mr. Brenner stated that starting in FY19 they increased the budget to \$4.5 million, but are not budgeting all \$4.5 million every year. He noted that in the latter years of the plan, without CCNH, the Sheriff's office, and some of the older buildings they have taken out a large chunk of dollars. Mr. Brenner said they will put those back in and are looking for some direction from this committee and the new committee recently established.

Mr. Hartke inquired when talking about the \$4.5 million being 3% of the County evaluation, if that evaluation included the old nursing home, the downtown jail, and things not included here. Mr. Maxwell replied no. Mr. Brenner commented that if those buildings were included the number goes up to \$5.4 million.

Mr. Quisenberry said he was hoping to see knocking down the part of the old nursing home they don't need any more to reduce that valuation and asked for clarification that it was not in the plan. Mr. Brenner said that is correct, nor anything with the jails and others as stated in the beginning assumptions. Mr. Quisenberry said he was asking because one way to not consider the old nursing home would be to knock part of it down. He said they had talked about the cost of demolition and felt having that early in the program would be better. Mr. Brenner stated that on today's tour of ILEAS they did talk a bit about the cost of tearing it down. He summarized the steps that need to be taken regarding asbestos and lead. He said until those steps are taken they won't know the full cost of tearing the building down. Mr. Brenner said another thing they could do, but would lose rent if ILEAS is no longer using the facility, they could board it up, remove the utilities, and leave it alone until the County

has the ability to do something of that magnitude. He pointed out they have several other buildings with significant needs to the building envelopes and mechanicals and priorities will need to be decided.

Mr. Brenner reported that for FY19 they started using the \$4.5 million, trying to stay with the assumptions and priorities listed on page one. He said they are focusing on the building envelopes the first few years, noting they have old buildings that need new roofs. He said that if they decide to keep the downtown jail it will need a roof quickly. He noted those are big-ticket items. Mr. Brenner stated at the end of this proposal is re-roofing the courthouse, which is going to be a significant amount of money because the courthouse addition is a huge roof as well as the old courthouse. He stated both will probably hit in the same year, probably in the area of \$2 million. He said it's serious but it's not leaking a lot. He noted the addition is a ballasted roof and they are seeing holes punched in it due to being on the roof so much to repair the mechanicals.

Mr. Brenner explained that once the envelopes are improved they will move on to the mechanicals. He said they want to move from pneumatic to digital controls so they have the ability for setbacks on nights and weekends. He commented that if DCEO is still in operation they could apply for grants for the mechanicals. He said they will apply for the grant for the Brookens boilers, but the new DCEO business cycle doesn't start until May 20. Mr. Brenner noted that at half of the buildings there are T12 lights, which won't be made after this year, that they have been replacing with T8 bulbs. He said he would like to replace all the bulbs with LED bulbs that will fit into the existing fixtures. He said the price is continuing to go down. He said this should also qualify for DCEO.

Mr. Brenner stated this plan was put together with the help of Bailey Edward, Henneman, Berns-Clancy, and physical plant staff. He said most of the information came the initial facility assessment, with pricing coming in the past few weeks from Bailey Edward, Henneman, and Berns-Clancy. Mr. Maxwell said he and Mr. Brenner had discussed how much detail to go into with this report tonight. He said they felt they should touch on the highlights and have the committee take the plan, study it, and come back to discuss further in the coming months.

Mr. Anderson commented that it appears the courthouse is very expensive taking about 33% of the budget for about four years. He said he's not saying it's not needed, just that it's expensive. Mr. Brenner replied there are two facilities that are the largest, the courthouse and courthouse addition at 153,000 sq. ft., and ILEAS and the old nursing home, which ILEAS is only using a fraction of. He said the buildings require maintenance, which requires funding. He briefly summarized what needs to be done over time. Mr. Brenner remarked that the courthouse is probably the premier building for the County and is extremely well used.

Mr. Maxwell suggested they look over the plan and be prepared to discuss at future meetings. He mentioned there are the buildings not included in the plan that also need work, and said they will need to discuss that as well.

X. Facilities Director's Report

A. Update on GHR contract for Brookens Boiler Replacement Project – POD #300 & POD #200

Mr. Brenner stated that he contacted GHR about replacing the two existing gas-fired boilers with new high-efficiency gas-fired boilers. He said GHR gave a fixed price of \$20,900 to design, develop the bid documents, and oversee the project. He said GHR estimated the project to cost about \$270,000-\$300,000. Mr. Brenner said he felt good about moving ahead with a contract with GHR.

B. Update on the contract with Langlois Roofing, Inc.–ITB #2016-003–Brookens POD #200 Roof Replacement

Mr. Brenner commented that IGW sent a letter giving notice of award to Langlois Roofing along with a draft contract. He noted that the County Board approved the award of contract in the amount of \$172,107.00. He stated that they had roofers from all over the state respond, but only eight submitted bids. Mr. Brenner said that as of today Langlois signed the contract and mailed it back. He

noted that they are trying to schedule a kick-off meeting for next week and hope to have the project completed by the end of May. He said the project should take about two weeks.

C. Update on Champaign County Nursing Home Fire/Smoke Damper Project

Mr. Brenner reported that this project was completed before April 8 and documentation was sent to IDPH. He said GHR called IDPH to check on the delivery and our document was received by IDPH the week of April 11. He stated they are hoping to receive positive feedback soon. Mr. Brenner noted that the IDPH report format isn't useful for CCNH use, so GHR is putting a document together that CCNH can use for maintenance and scheduling of annual inspections of 25% of the dampers.

Mr. Brenner summarized the costs of the project. He stated that the access panels weren't included in the bid, and a few other issues were found during construction. He said there is a change order for these items and noted the cost. Mr. Brenner noted that A&R Mechanical hasn't submitted an invoice or pay application yet, but it will be passed to CCNH once received.

Mr. Maxwell asked what the expected annual cost to inspect 25% of the dampers annually might be. Mr. Brenner hoped it would be \$10,000-\$12,000 per year and having the documents showing where the dampers are should help with the cost. He said they will probably want to bid it out because it would be a four-year contract that would total more than the purchasing limit.

D. Update on Champaign County Nursing Home Lint Filtration Project

Mr. Brenner stated they are in the last two weeks of this project. He referred to the contractor meeting notes and said they were very intrusive to the wall and floor of the chapel, and a dust enclosure had to be inspected and fire rated, which put them behind schedule. Mr. Brenner said the contractor did a terrific job in allowing CCNH to have access to at least two dryers at all times during the project. He summarized the costs to date.

E. Update on Pre-Cast Concrete Wall Panel Repair Project

Mr. Brenner noted that this project started last summer and the Satellite Jail and JDC are complete. He said Highway was started but the weather turned and the project had to be stopped. He stated they restarted in April to complete the north face of the Highway building. Mr. Brenner said they finished that last week so the project is completed. He summarized the costs for ERA and Otto Baum. He said they will still need to do the pre-cast panels at the bottom where they meet the foundation. He explained the work involved and said it will happen when they have funding available. Mr. Brenner explained this doesn't mean they won't have to re-do the panel joints in 10 years, but it will be less expensive because they won't have all the cracks to repair.

XI. Other Business

None

XII. Chair's Report

Mr. Maxwell said the next Facilities Committee meeting will be Tuesday, June 7, 2016 at 6:30 pm. He noted there will be a tour at 5:15 pm of Brookens Administrative Center. Mr. Maxwell said anyone wanting to take the tour should meet in the Lyle Shields room by 5:10 pm.

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

Mr. Maxwell noted there were no items to be placed on the consent agenda

XIV. Adjournment

MOTION by Mr. Quisenberry to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Hartke. There being no further business, Mr. Maxwell adjourned the meeting at 7:34 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.*