



**CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
FACILITIES COMMITTEE**
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois
Tuesday, September 3, 2013 - 6:00 p.m.

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

Committee Members:

Stan James - Chair

James Quisenberry – Vice-Chair

Josh Hartke

Jeff Kibler

Gary Maxwell

Giraldo Rosales

Rachel Schwartz

AGENDA

	<u>Page</u>
I. Call to Order	
II. Roll Call	
III. Approval of Minutes	
A. Facilities Committee Meeting – August 6, 2013	1-7
IV. Approval of Agenda/Addenda	
V. Public Participation	
VI. Communications	
VII. ILEAS Lease Renewal	8-9
VIII. IGW Engineering Services Contract for Demolition of ILEAS East Annex	10-14
IX. Capital Improvements Projections – County Parking Lots	15-20
X. Other Business	
XI. Chair’s Report	
XII. Special Meeting – Facilities Committee, 9/19/13 at 6:30p.m. in Meeting Room 3	
XIII. Semi-Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes	
XIV. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda	
XV. 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

MINUTES – SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL

DATE: Tuesday, August 6, 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 (Facilities Director), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Kirk Kirkland (Facilities Manager), Beth Brunk (Recording Secretary)

Others Present: John Jay & Patsi Petrie (Champaign Co Board), Mick McAvoy (ILEAS), Ryan Wolber (IGBA)

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair James called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call

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

III. Approval of Minutes

A. June 4, 2013 – Regular Meeting

MOTION by Mr. Maxwell to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2013 meeting as distributed; seconded by Mr. Hartke. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

IV. Approval of Agenda

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

Mr. Rosales entered the meeting at 6:01 p.m.

V. Public Participation

None

1 **VI. Communications**

2 Mr. James announced that Mr. Reinhart will be retiring in September and wanted to express his
3 appreciation for Mr. Reinhart’s hard work and professionalism.
4

5 **VII. Courthouse Exterior Maintenance project Update – IGW Report**

6 Mr. Reinhart referenced the letter dated 7/29/13 from Scot Wachter, Principal/President of IGW
7 Architecture. IGW has completed all on-site observation and the preliminary design of the project. Mr.
8 Reinhart noted one adjustment – the construction contingency was increased from 10% to 15%. The
9 total project cost is estimated at \$303,170 down from the original estimate of \$304,000. The project
10 schedule includes an issuance of documents for Bidding on 8/21/13 and Receipt of Bids on 9/11/13.
11 Since the bid opening will be after the Facilities Committee meeting on 9/3/13, there will be a short 30-
12 minute Facilities Committee meeting at 6:30 p.m. prior to the County Board Meeting on 9/19/13 to
13 recommend the award of contract for the Courthouse Exterior Maintenance Project. Approval of the
14 awardee will be at the County Board meeting on 9/19/13.
15

16 Mr. Reinhart reported that construction could begin as early as fall depending on weather but is
17 guaranteed to start in spring 2014. Mr. Quisenberry would like an explanation concerning the increase
18 in contingency fees. Mr. Reinhart will check with IGW and e-mail the response back to Committee
19 members.
20

21 Ms. Petrie noted that expansion joints were used in the Courthouse Addition (east portion) when it was
22 built 10 years ago and cracking has occurred. She wondered how installing expansion joints in the
23 Courthouse’s west portion will solve the problem of cracking mortar. She does not believe that the root
24 cause of the failed mortar joints has been established, and the problem will reoccur. Mr. James
25 commented that it will be difficult to ascertain the root cause due to all the variables (weather, climate,
26 traffic vibrations etc.) that come into play with a building. He felt that the repairs have been identified
27 by more than one engineering firm, and it needs to be done. Mr. Reinhart stated that the expansion
28 joints have done their job in that water has not infiltrated the Courthouse, and it is time to replace them.
29

30 **VIII. Capital Improvements Projections – Primary Building Equipment**

31 Mr. Reinhart explained the parameters that qualified the classification of primary building equipment:

- 32 • Replacement value would be a large capital expenditure
- 33 • Planning and design would require professional services
- 34 • Long lead time for replacement equipment before installation could start
- 35 • Failure of the equipment would cause the a large part of the building to become non-usable for
36 an extended length of time

37 Additionally, the ancillary systems to the equipment may compound the cost and complexity of the
38 design and installation which are not included on the spreadsheet. From the physical plant records, Mr.
39 Reinhart assigned original installation values to some of the equipment. Other values were derived from
40 estimates on similar equipment or from outside contractors.
41

42 Mr. Reinhart used a global life expectancy following the actual equipment replacement timeline over the
43 last 20 years with Champaign County. The estimated replacement value was calculated using a 3%
44 increase per year. As seen from the chart, some major costs are estimated to occur in 2021 and 2022.
45 Ms. Schwartz confirmed that the estimated replacement value is the total cost. Mr. James commented
46 that manufacturer warranties usually only last 5 years. Some of this equipment is probably not as
47 expensive due to changes in energy-efficiency, technology improvements and reduced labor costs to
48 install. Mr. James would also like to see a list of improvements needed to all the parking lots that the
49 County owns. Mr. Quisenberry would like to have a copy of the spreadsheet to organize it by cost,
50 replacement year, etc.
51

52 Mr. Quisenberry asked about the condition of the air handlers in Pod 300 that should have been
53 replaced in 1990. Mr. Reinhart replied that they are not energy-efficient but are still working. There are
54 other items that are more critical that need to be replaced.

1
2 A. Funding County Facilities Primary Building Equipment

3 Ms. Busey took the Primary Building Equipment spreadsheet and put it in financial terms. The two
4 potential funding sources for the replacement of primary building equipment systems include \$517,000
5 in the Courts Construction Fund and the General Corporate Fund. If the equipment had annual reserve
6 funding in place and was fully amortized, the cost to the General Corporate Fund would be \$318,185 per
7 year. Delayed action in funding the capital needs of the County building equipment has resulted in a
8 situation where the General Corporate Fund cannot presently sustain the cost to catch up to fully
9 amortize in FY2014. Therefore, five critical items have been prioritized from the list that needs to be
10 replaced in FY2014 as follows:

11	• Brookens Pod 300 Chiller	\$159,100
12	• Brookens Pod 200 Chiller	\$159,100
13	• Satellite Jail Water Heater	\$ 56,000
14	• JDC Building Automation System	\$ 15,300
15	• JDC Water Heater #1	\$ 46,700
16	Total	\$436,200

17
18 This amount is in addition to new appropriations requested by this Committee for roof replacements
19 totally \$313,000 for FY2014. Staff recommends that the Facilities Committee recommend to the Finance
20 Committee that this appropriation be included in the Physical Plant FY2014 budget as a transfer to
21 Capital Asset Replacement. The money would be spent as this Committee directs and any money not
22 spent would remain in the Capital Asset Replacement Fund. Ms. Schwartz confirmed that the money set
23 aside could be used for other equipment if something fails. Ms. Busey hoped that the Pod 300 and Pod
24 200 chillers would be replaced as the conditions in those areas are frequently very uncomfortable.
25

26 **MOTION** by Mr. Maxwell to recommend to the Finance Committee that direction be given in the
27 preparation of the FY2014 budget, that \$436,200 be budgeted in the General Corporate Fund as a
28 transfer to the Capital Asset Replacement Fund Facilities Budget to provide funding for a County Capital
29 Improvement Plan, specifically for the replacement of primary equipment at the Juvenile Detention
30 Center and Brookens Administrative Center in FY2014; seconded by Mr. Quisenberry.
31

32 Mr. Quisenberry noted that when the final ILPP study comes out, there may be some needs that will
33 adjust the priority list. These five items serve as a blueprint but is not meant to be set in stone. Mr.
34 Quisenberry would like to accrue more money for capital reserve but recognized the need for fiscal
35 responsibility. Mr. James thought that this is a good start to building up a capital reserve. The five items
36 listed on the priority list are not locked in. If an emergency arose, money would be used from the capital
37 reserve. However, sooner or later, that equipment will need to be replaced. Ms. Busey stated that most
38 of the equipment listed on the spreadsheet cannot be purchased until the Facilities Committee
39 authorizes the release of bids.
40

41 Ms. Petrie would like to see more due diligence to research grants that may be available for equipment
42 that may or may not be at the top of the list. In the past, Mr. Reinhart has always looks for grants that
43 may be available to address one of these projects, and staff will continue to do so.
44

45 Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

46
47 **IX. Illinois American Water (IAW) Water Main Easement along Art Bartell Rd – For Information**
48 **Only**

49 Mr. Reinhart reported that in 2007-08 as the Nursing Home was completed, a water main was installed
50 down Art Bartell Road. The County agreed to turn over the ownership of the water main to IAW so that
51 they will be responsible for its repair or maintenance. However, the documentation of this transaction
52 was never recorded. IAW has contracted Mr. Reinhart to complete this agreement so the

1 documentation will be officially recorded. Mr. Maxwell wondered if this agreement will require the
2 approval of the Champaign County Board as IAW may require that.
3

4 **X. Recommendation of Illinois Green Business Association (IGBA) Business Certification**
5 **Program**

6 **MOTION** by Mr. Hartke to issue a contract with Illinois Green Business Association for an amount of
7 \$1,500 to start the Business Certification Assessment on Brookens Administrative Center to begin in FY
8 2014; seconded by Mr. Maxwell.
9

10 Mr. Hartke explained that beginning this program in December 2013 will coincide with the start of the
11 new Facilities Director. Mr. Ryan Wolber of IGBA was present to answer any questions from Committee
12 members. Ms. Schwartz clarified that looking at energy-efficient options for the large chillers at
13 Brookens would be covered under the \$1,500 fee. Mr. Wolber affirmed that was the case as the
14 checklist looks at the entire complex. The checklist has 200 items, and 50% must be completed for the
15 client to receive certification. Some employers concentrate more on employee engagement but IGBA
16 will look at recommendations for the HVAC system if requested to do so. Ms. Schwartz commented that
17 employee engagement would be hard to manage with the elected officials' offices and the concentration
18 should be on what this Board can control. Mr. Hartke agreed that we should focus on what we can do
19 but there is also the potential to develop a policy that elected County officials will want to adopt.
20

21 Mr. James asked how much staff time would be involved in this study. Mr. Wolber responded that
22 typically he will meet with a manager of the business for one hour every two to three weeks. Mr. James
23 inquired if skilled technicians look at the equipment for example or an IGBA staff member will perform
24 the check. Mr. Wolber replied that if IGBA did not have the expertise, then a qualified partner would be
25 utilized to find the answer. Mr. James further clarified that an individual would come in to check the
26 overall operation of the HVAC without additional costs. Mr. Wolber affirmed that an individual would
27 come in to examine the system if the client requests it without additional cost. Mr. James asked if the
28 County gets certified, what would be the benefit to the County. Mr. Wolber stated that the answer is
29 somewhat ambiguous – what you put into the process will be what you get out of it. For example, Busey
30 Bank saved \$30,000 annually from the energy upgrades IGBA helped install. Mr. James thought it
31 sounded like additional money may be needed to implement some of the upgrades to be certified. Mr.
32 Wolber said that if more money is needed, IGBA will assist in trying to find grants or avenues of funding.
33

34 Mr. Rosales asked how long this certification process would take. Mr. Wolber replied that the average
35 project length is from 8 months to one year. Once a business is certified, IGBA will conduct check-ins
36 every 3-4 months to see if the strategies are working or if they need revising to be more beneficial for
37 the client. Certification includes a plaque and logos that can be displayed on any marketing material.
38 Ms. Schwartz would be surprised if Brookens could achieve certification considering the equipment in
39 the building but instead viewed this as an opportunity to see where we could improve. Mr. James
40 commented that he also thought that Brookens will not be certified. The County has done numerous
41 studies by specialists that point out shortcomings in buildings, but nothing is done due to a lack of
42 funding. Mr. Wolber stated that only one business was not certified due to the fact it went out-of-
43 business. All others qualify due to the flexibility of the program.
44

45 Mr. Hartke noted that the staff of IGBA is qualified professionals with a great deal of "green" knowledge
46 that many contractors do not have. The goal is not the certification plaque but to be environmentally
47 responsible, reduce carbon emissions and save some money on utilities. Mr. Quisenberry noted that the
48 reduction of the carbon footprint may be worth even more money ten years down the road. Ms. Petrie
49 thought it was prudent to pay \$1,500 so the County could be a model for the community on green and
50 sustainable practices.
51

52 Mr. Quisenberry called the question.
53
54

1 Upon vote:
2 Aye: 5 – Hartke, Schwartz, Rosales, Quisenberry, Maxwell
3 Nay: 1 – James

4 **MOTION CARRIED.**

5
6 **XI. ILEAS Lease Renewal**

7 Mr. Reinhart stated the ILEAS currently leases the County Building at 1701 E Main Street in Urbana. This
8 lease expires on December 31, 2013. Jim Page, Executive Director of ILEAS has expressed the desire to
9 renew the lease on the building at 1701 but has serious concerns about the east section of the Annex.
10 That section of the building has multiple roof leaks and is deteriorating rapidly. Mr. Page asked if the
11 County would consider the demolition of that area. Mr. Kirkland showed the Committee several
12 photos of the existing conditions of the east part of the annex showing extensive damage to the brick
13 exterior due to water infiltration, several roof leaks, loosened floor tiles that contain asbestos and mold
14 in the interior of the building. The flat roof would need total replacement. The demolition quote of
15 \$101,000-\$141,250 includes remediation of the asbestos in the floor tiles and mastic.

16
17 Mr. James commented that this damaged portion of the annex demonstrates what happens to a building
18 when it is not maintained. This situation is not just faulty bricks but the lack of funding allocated to keep
19 up the maintenance of this building. Ms. Petrie expressed her dissatisfaction with the lack of a
20 comprehensive plan for this County Campus as to what the space needs are. The County must spend
21 money to demolish this building because the County did not take care of it. Ms. Petrie asked where was
22 the leadership of past County Boards to allow this situation to happen.

23
24 Mr. James responded that at the time the building was vacated, strong opinion was to tear down the
25 whole building. The County was fortunate to find a tenant in ILEAS that was willing to do many building
26 improvements with their own money. Mr. Rosales asked if an RFP was put out to open bidding to other
27 architectural firms. RFPs are required for amounts over \$30,000 per the County's Purchasing Policy and
28 the design, bid and construction phases of this demolition will be an amount less than that. IGW
29 Architecture was recommended because they worked with ILEAS on a \$2.8-\$3 million remodel project
30 on the building at 1701 E. Main so are familiar with the building. The County Board will approve the
31 actual bid for the demolition project.

32
33 Mr. Maxwell remarked that he did not find the argument compelling that because IGW did the
34 remodeling and therefore they will give a more competitive bid. The bid for the Courthouse Exterior
35 Maintenance Project by IGW is similar to what other architectural firms would offer. Mr. Maxwell felt
36 that this unfairly excludes other firms in town from bidding on County projects. Mr. Hartke agreed with
37 Mr. Maxwell that the bidding process should be opened to all firms in the area. Mr. Rosales wondered if
38 some of the materials from the demolition could be recycled instead of putting it in the landfill.

39
40 Ms. Busey explained that to move forward with ILEAS for lease negotiations, a commitment for
41 demolition of the east part of the annex would be necessary. Mr. Quisenberry asked what would
42 happen to the improvements if ILEAS did not renew the lease. Ms. Busey affirmed that the County
43 would own the improvements. Mr. Quisenberry wondered if the cost of demolition would be
44 participatory with the tenant. Ms. Busey noted that if specific terms of the lease negotiations are to be
45 discussed, this meeting would need to go into closed session.

46
47 **MOTION** by Mr. Maxwell to direct the Facilities Director and the County Administrator to negotiate for
48 the demolition of the east portion of the Annex and issue a RFP for the architectural/engineering
49 services; seconded by Mr. Hartke.

50
51 Since this amount will be under the RFP bidding requirement of the County's purchasing policy, Ms.
52 Busey asked for an informal RFP process so that all the timeline requirements and legal publications
53 would not be necessary. She suggested sending out notice to all the local Architectural/Engineering
54 firms so it could be done more expeditiously.

1
2 Mr. Maxwell would like to amend his motion to include an informal RFP process. Mr. Hartke agreed to
3 the friendly amendment.
4

5 **AMENDED MOTION** by Mr. Maxwell to direct the Facilities Director and the County Administrator to
6 negotiate for the demolition of the east portion of the Annex and furthermore conduct an informal RFP
7 process by notifying local architectural/engineering firms of the project.
8

9 Mr. James asked when this could be done. Ms. Busey thought responses could be back in a 10 day
10 timeframe which would necessitate a special Facilities Committee meeting for approval to move
11 forward. Mr. Reinhart thought that the firms would need a tour of the building which may take more
12 than the two week timeframe to get responsible bids. Mr. Rosales stated that IGW may be willing to give
13 the County a discount since they are working on the Courthouse Exterior Maintenance Project.
14

15 Ms. Petrie suggested that PACA should be invited in the building before demolition to see if materials
16 could be salvaged before the engineering firms bid on the job. Secondly, perhaps storm water
17 management should be considered in the landscaping component after demolition. Mr. James was
18 concerned about a lawsuit without set standards on letting people into the building to savage materials.
19 Ms. Petrie countered that the University does it and has no problems. Mr. Quisenberry noted that the
20 cost of the demolition would go up with the additional salvaging effort.
21

22 Ms. Busey remembered that the Qualifications-Based Selection (QBS) process must be used if the
23 bidding for design of the demolition project is opened to all architectural/engineering firms. In this
24 process, a short list of firms is selected based on their qualifications. The County would select a firm, and
25 that firm would define the scope of services. Then the fee is negotiated for the contract. This differs
26 from awarding a contract to the lowest responsible bidder. Ms. Busey pointed out that legally and under
27 the County's Purchasing Policy, this Committee can negotiate with a firm with whom the County has an
28 established positive working relationship which is the case with IGW.
29

30 Mr. James asked Mr. McAvoy of ILEAS if there is a timeline necessary for the demolition. Mr. McAvoy
31 stated that there is no deadline by ILEAS for the demolition. ILEAS wants to continue to lease the
32 building but is concerned that the space on the east side of the annex is unhealthy and unsafe. ILEAS is
33 ready to commit to a 3-year lease extension but would like a good faith effort at resolving their concerns
34 about the annex.
35

36 Mr. Reinhart anticipated that demolition would begin in FY2014. Ms. Schwartz wondered if lease
37 negotiations could move forward if the square footage of the east part of the annex, 5,650 sq ft, were
38 removed. Ms. Busey felt that ILEAS would need a commitment from the County for demolition of the
39 area in question. Mr. Quisenberry reiterated that the QBS process is a state requirement and takes
40 approximately three months. He remembered that the last time the County went the QBS route; they
41 ended up selecting the firm they were going to choose in the first place. After listening to the discussion,
42 Mr. Hartke felt that QBS system was very complicated and may not save the County any money. He
43 would support the selection of IGW to design the demolition project.
44

45 **Mr. Maxwell withdrew his amended MOTION; seconded by Mr. Hartke.**
46

47 **MOTION** by Mr. Hartke to direct the Facilities Director and the County Administrator to negotiate the
48 scope of services and contract with IGW Architecture for the design, bid and construction phases of the
49 demolition of the east section of the annex complex located at 1701 E. Main Street in Urbana; seconded
50 by Mr. Rosales. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**
51

52 **MOTION** by Mr. Hartke to direct the Facilities Director and the County Administrator to negotiate a new
53 contract with ILEAS less the square footage that will be demolished; seconded by Mr. Rosales.

1
2 Ms. Petrie asked how this square footage that will be demolished was priced. Ms. Busey answered that
3 the 5,650 sq ft space was classified as part of the unfinished area in the 74,600 sq ft – it was priced at
4 \$2.08 per sq ft. Mr. Jay asked why the area to be demolished is halfway down a hallway. Mr. Reinhart
5 replied that the dividing area is where the two buildings adjoin. The cost to close the building up is
6 included in the RFP.
7

8 Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**
9

10 **XII. Other Business**

11 None
12

13 **XIII. Chair’s Report**

14 Mr. James would like the Facilities Committee to tour the Coroner’s building once the new Facilities
15 Director has been hired.
16

17 **XIV. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda**

18 None
19

20 **XV. Adjournment**

21 **MOTION** by Mr. Hartke to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Rosales. Upon vote, the **MOTION**
22 **CARRIED unanimously.**
23

24 There being no further business, Mr. James adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.
25
26
27

**Amendment to the Lease for Regional Law Enforcement
Training Center between CHAMPAIGN COUNTY, ILLINOIS as
Landlord and ILLINOIS LAW ENFORCEMENT ALARM SYSTEM
as Tenant**

**1701 E. Main Street
Urbana, Illinois 61802**

This Lease Amendment is made this _____ day of _____, 2013 between Champaign County, Illinois ("Landlord") and the Illinois Law Enforcement Alarm System ("Tenant").

WITNESSETH:

1. On September 1, 2007, Landlord and Tenant made a lease for approximately 23 acres and buildings, commonly known as 1701 East Main Street, Urbana, Illinois. The original three year lease period was from September 1, 2007 through December 31, 2010.
2. On April 9, 2009 the original lease was amended and extended to December 31, 2011 (first extension).
3. On November 1, 2009 the original lease was extended to December 31, 2012 (second extension).
4. On November 1, 2010, the original lease was extended to December 31, 2013 (third extension).
5. This Amendment extends the lease until December 31, 2016.

IN CONSIDERATION THEREOF, THE PARTIES COVENANT AND AGREE:

1. Pursuant to Section 2 of the original LEASE, entitled, OPTION TO REOPEN, and the LEASE SCHEDULE Sections Five (5), Six (6), Seven (7), Eight (8) and Nine (9), the parties hereby agree to extend the lease as follows:
 - a. This Amendment extends the lease until December 31, 2016.
 - b. In consideration for the Lease extension, Tenant will pay rent to the Landlord. The rent will be calculated as follows.
 - i. The premises include 52,600 square feet of office space. Tenant will pay \$5.25 per square foot of office space for the first year, totaling \$276,150.
 - ii. The premises include 68,950 square feet of storage / training space. Tenant will pay \$2.10 per square foot of storage / training space for the first year, totaling \$144,795.
 - iii. The first year lease shall include a \$16,000 payment for use of fiber lines on the premises for the duration of this lease and the options to reopen. This payment will be made only one time by Tenant; it is not a yearly increase in the rent.
 - iv. The first year lease payment shall be discounted by \$1,000 to accommodate the annual \$1,000 membership fee for the Champaign County Sheriff's Office to have access to the ILEAS training facility.
 - v. The first year lease payment will total \$435,945.
 - vi. In 2015, the rates per square foot will increase 2%. The lease payment will be discounted by \$1,000 to accommodate the Sheriff's Office membership fee. The 2015 lease payment will total \$428,363.90.
 - vii. In 2016, the rates per square foot will increase 2%. The lease payment will be discounted by \$1,000 to accommodate the Sheriff's Office membership fee. The 2016 lease payment will total \$436,951.18.
 - c. Each year's lease payment will be paid no later than December 31 of the preceding year.

- d. The parties acknowledge Tenant receives a significant portion of its annual budget from federal funding. In the event Tenant fails to receive at any time federal funding in amounts acceptable to Tenant, in Tenant's sole discretion, Tenant may terminate this Lease and, upon such termination, Landlord and Tenant shall be relieved of any and all further obligations hereunder.
2. The original OPTION TO REOPEN will continue in force, as modified in Section 3 of this Amendment, starting with two three-year options to reopen; the first three year option beginning on January 1st, 2017.
 3. Pursuant to Section 3 of the Lease Schedule of the original LEASE, the Landlord and the Tenant agree that the following modifications be made:
 - a. One wing of approximately 15 rooms, totalling approximately 5,650 square feet of training / storage space, situated on the south side of the originally described Building is no longer suitable for use. It is not included in the calculations made in this Amendment. Landlord will take reasonable steps to demolish the unusable wing.
 - b. Paragrah C. Tenant Duties of Paragraph 2. Option to Reopen is stricken. In recognition of the improvements to the premises that were funded by the original lump sum lease payment made by Tenant, the parties agree that Landlord will continue to pay gas, electric, and water/sewer expenses through the two three-year options to reopen.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, THE PARTIES HAVE EXECUTED THIS LEASE THE DAY AND YEAR FIRST ABOVE WRITTEN.

TENANT:
Illinois Law Enforcement Alarm System

LANDLORD
Champaign County, Illinois

By: _____

By: _____

Title: _____

Title: _____

ISAKSEN GLERUM WACHTER . LLC

114 WEST MAIN STREET T / 217 328 1391

URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801 F / 217 328 1401



File: 1332

August 27, 2013

Mr. Alan Reinhart, Facilities Director
Champaign County Administrative Services
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington
Urbana, IL 61802

Re: Partial Building Demolition
Old Champaign County Nursing Home Annex Building
Urbana, Illinois

Dear Alan:

In response to your request, IGW Architecture (IGW) is pleased to submit the following proposal for professional architectural and engineering services in connection with the referenced project.

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

Based on our recent meeting, we understand that the County would like to disconnect utilities, demolish a portion of the Champaign County Annex Building and restore the site to a graded and seeded condition. The portion of the building to be demolished (~5,650 SF in area) is the 1944 addition to the original 1941 Annex Building which is also connected to the 1971 addition to the Old Champaign County Nursing Home, now ILEAS. The scope of work will also include needed repairs and re-enclosures of the adjacent buildings to remain, a required wheelchair exit ramp at the east end of the 1941 Annex Building, and a 6' high privacy fence to secure the ILEAS outdoor training courtyard after building demolition.

An emphasis will be placed on sustainable demolition by first considering any salvage and reuse opportunities for the various building components and then by extensive recycling of any materials unfit for salvage in order to divert them from the landfill. Note that some pre-demolition abatement of hazardous materials (i.e., "hot" tile and mastic on the concrete floor) may be required to maximize the amount of recycled material. The inclusion of pre-demolition abatement to the project scope may tend to push the project budget towards its upper range.

Because of the complexities associated with the utility disconnects and re-enclosures of the existing buildings, it was agreed that the project would best be delivered by a general contractor who could provide the necessary subcontractors, coordination and single point of responsibility to the County for the project. Further, it was understood that the County would like to seek competitive bids from multiple contractors for the work and that design and construction activities should proceed as quickly as is prudent. For the scope of work described above, a total project budget of \$101,000.00 - \$141,250.00 has been estimated including all "hard" and "soft" costs.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

Based on the above understanding, IGW Architecture will provide architectural and engineering services as outlined in the following work phases:

- A. CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE - Prepare construction drawings and specifications setting forth in detail all of the requirements for the utility disconnects, building demolition, repairs and enclosures and site restoration work. The construction documents will consist of AutoCAD-generated drawings and a Project Manual including front-end documents (general and supplementary conditions) and technical specifications for bidding. They will indicate the location, type, extent and specification for all building systems materials and equipment, and provide sufficient information to develop accurate and competitive pricing. A statement of probable construction cost will be prepared based on the completed construction documents and current cost indices.
- B. BIDDING OR NEGOTIATIONS PHASE - Assist the County in obtaining competitive bids for the project including coordination and issuance of documents, organizing and attending pre-bid conference, answering contractor questions during bidding, evaluation of substitutions, issuance of any addenda necessary, review and evaluation of bids received, recommendations and assistance to the owner in the award and preparation of construction contracts.
- C1. CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION PHASE - After award of the contract, provide basic contract administration and coordination services including review and processing of project submittals, prepare necessary change orders, and review and process contractor payment requests. Conduct a substantial completion inspection, prepare a punch list and provide needed follow up leading to final completion of the project and consult with the County during the warranty period and, upon County request, inspect and report defects prior to the expiration of the warranty period.
- C2. ON-SITE OBSERVATION - Provide partial on-site representation to check the progress and conformance of the work to the requirements of the contract documents and endeavor to provide further protection to the County against defects and deficiencies in the work.

COMPENSATION

For phases A, B and C1 services above, we propose a stipulated sum fee in the amount of \$22,000.00, exclusive of reimbursable expenses, other County consultants, testing agencies and any required pre-demolition hazmat inspection/abatement. We propose that payments for phases A-C1 be made monthly based on a percentage of completion of the work in progress according to the following breakdown:

A. CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE	- \$ 13,640.00
B. BIDDING/NEGOTIATIONS PHASE	- \$ 1,760.00
C1. CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION PHASE	- \$ 6,600.00
Total Phases A-E1 (Fixed Fee)	- \$ 22,000.00

For Phase C2 services above, we propose compensation on an hourly basis according to the attached rate schedule with a total cost not-to-exceed \$1000.00. This allows for approximately 10 visits to the site by the Architect-Engineer during an estimated 10+/- weeks of construction. We propose payments for Phase C2 be made monthly based on the actual hours expended.

Total Phase C2 (Not-To-Exceed)	- \$ 1,000.00
--------------------------------	---------------

Total All Phases A-C1 & C2 (Not-To-Exceed)	- \$ 23,000.00
--	----------------

ADDITIONAL SERVICES

For any services requested by the County that are not included in the Scope of Services above, we would request compensation in addition to the Total All Phases A-C1 & C2 Not-To-Exceed above. Additional services shall be compensated on an hourly basis according to the attached rate schedule. The Architect shall identify any additional service requests with a separate fee proposal and schedule modification and obtain County approval prior to commencing any work resulting from a request for additional services.

REIMBURSABLES

In addition to the fee quoted above, IGW shall be reimbursed at 1.0 x cost for out-of-pocket expenses directly related to the project including reprographics, plotting, telecommunications, commercial ground transportation, travel and subsistence for business travel related to the project (**out-of-town only**), US mail, overnight courier services and other similar expenses. For this project, only minor reimbursable expenses are anticipated for bid document printing and handling.

CONSULTANTS

IGW Architecture anticipates employing GHR Engineers and Associates, mechanical and electrical engineers from Champaign, Illinois for portions of the work and has included their fees in our total.

If this letter accurately reflects the needed services at this time and the attached IGW Terms and Conditions, incorporated herein by reference, under which the above stated services are being provided and the attached IGW Rate Schedule meet with your approval, consider this letter to be our working agreement. Please print, sign and return one copy for our files.

Thanks very much for the opportunity to submit this proposal. If you have any questions or need additional information, please call.

Sincerely:

ISAKSEN GLERUM WACHTER . LLC



Riley D. Glerum AIA, LEED® AP
Principal/CEO

Att: IGW Rate Schedule
IGW Conditions of Agreement

ACCEPTED _____ DATE _____



Hourly Rate Schedule

Principals	\$ 145.00 - 195.00
Project Architect 1.....	\$ 135.00 - 145.00
Project Architect 2.....	\$ 100.00 - 135.00
Construction Administrator/Observer	\$ 85.00 - 135.00
Architect/Designer 1	\$ 85.00 - 100.00
Architect/Designer 2	\$ 70.00 - 85.00
Architect/Designer 3	\$ 60.00 - 70.00
Account/Contract Administrator.....	\$ 85.00
Clerical/Data Processing	\$ 60.00
Reimbursables.....	@ Cost x 1.1
Consultants.....	@ Cost
Mileage Rate.....	56.5 cents/mile

Effective **1 January 2013**, subject to annual adjustment.

ISAKSEN GLERUM WACHTER . LLC
114 WEST MAIN STREET T / 217 328 1391
URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801 F / 217 328 1401

IGW CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENT

1. **STANDARD OF CARE** – The Architect will perform the services under this agreement in accordance with generally accepted practice, in a manner consistent with the level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of this profession under similar circumstances in this locality. No other warranties implied or expressed, in fact or by law, are made or intended in this agreement.
2. **CONFIDENTIALITY** – The Architect shall hold confidential the business and technical information obtained or generated in performance of services under this agreement, and as identified in writing by the Client as confidential.
3. **DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS** – All original drawings, specifications, electronic data and other documents are instruments of the Architect's service for use solely with respect to this project and shall remain the property of the Architect. The Client shall be permitted to retain copies including reproducible copies of the Architect's documents for information and reference in connection with the client's use and occupancy of the project. Owner's reuse of documents generated by this Agreement shall only be permitted by written approval from the Architect.
4. **SURVEYS/TESTS** – The Architect shall recommend to the Client the appropriate investigation, surveys, tests, analyses and reports to be obtained as necessary for the proper execution of the Architect's services.
5. **AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY** – The Architect shall not have control or charge of, and shall not be responsible for, construction means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures, for safety precautions and programs in connection with the Work, for the acts or omissions of the Contractor, Subcontractors or any other persons performing any of the Work, or for the failure of any of them to carry out the Work in accordance with the Contract Documents.
6. **RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONSTRUCTION COST** – It is recognized that neither the Architect nor the Client has control over the cost of labor, materials or equipment over the Contractor's method of determining bid prices, or over competitive bidding, marketing or negotiating conditions. Accordingly, the Architect cannot and does not warrant or represent that bids or negotiated prices will not vary from any Opinion of Construction Cost or evaluation prepared or agreed to by the Architect.
7. **INSURANCE** – The Architect shall maintain comprehensive general liability and professional liability insurance coverage and the Architect's employees are covered by Workers Compensation Insurance. Certificates of Insurance can be provided to the Client upon written request. The Architect shall not be responsible for any loss, damage, or liability beyond these insurance limits and conditions.
8. **LIMITATION OF LIABILITY** – Neither the Architect, the Architect's consultants, nor their agents or employees shall be jointly, severally or individually liable to the Client in excess of the compensation to be paid pursuant to this agreement by reason of any act or omission, including breach of contract or negligence not amounting to a willful or intentional wrong.
9. **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** – The Architect and the Architect's consultants shall have no responsibility for discovery, presence, handling, removal or disposal of or exposure of persons to hazardous materials in any form at the project site, including but not limited to asbestos, asbestos products, polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) or other toxic substances. If required by law, the client shall accomplish all necessary inspections and testing to determine the type and extent, if any, of hazardous materials at the project site. Prior to the start of services, or at the earliest time such information is learned, it shall be the duty of the client to advise the Architect (in writing) of any known or suspected hazardous materials. Removal and proper disposal of all hazardous materials shall be the responsibility of the client.
10. **CLIENT'S CONSULTANTS** – Contracts between the Client and Client's consultants shall request the consultants to coordinate their drawings and other instruments of service with those of the Architect and to advise the Architect of any potential conflict. The Architect shall have no responsibility for the components of the project designed by the Client's consultants. The Client shall indemnify and hold harmless the Architect, Architect's Consultants and their employees from and against claims, damages, losses and expenses arising out of services performed for this project by other consultants of the Client.
11. **REMODELING AND RENOVATION** – For Architect's services provided to assist the Client in making changes to an existing facility, the Client shall furnish documentation and information upon which the Architect may rely for its accuracy and completeness. Unless specifically authorized or confirmed in writing by the Client, the Architect shall not be required to perform or have others perform destructive testing or to investigate concealed or unknown conditions. The Client shall indemnify and hold harmless the Architect, the Architect's Consultants, and their employees from and against claims, damages, losses and expenses which arise as a result of documentation and information furnished by the Client.
12. **AMENDMENTS** – This Agreement may be amended only by written documentation signed by both the Architect and Client.
13. **TERMINATION** – This Agreement may be terminated by either party upon written notice and the Architect will be paid only for those services and costs incurred to date of termination.
14. **MEDIATION** – In the event of a dispute, the parties shall endeavor to settle disputes by mediation in accordance with the Construction Industry Mediation Rules of the American Arbitration Association currently in effect unless the parties mutually agree otherwise. Demand for mediation shall be filed in writing with the other party to this Agreement. A demand for mediation shall be made within a reasonable time after the claim, dispute or other matter in question has arisen. In no event shall the demand for mediation be made after the date when institution of legal or equitable proceedings based on such claim, dispute or other matter in question would be barred by the applicable statute of limitations.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Stan James, Chair
Members of the County Facilities Committee

FROM: Kirk Kirkland, Interim Facilities Director

DATE: August 26, 2013

RE: Parking lot report

Champaign County owns a total of nineteen parking lots on the east and west campuses. Excluding two lots used by the Highway Department and two lots at the Nursing home, the Physical Plant is responsible for the maintenance and repair of 15 lots. Within those fifteen lots there are a total of 798 parking spaces comprised as follows:

29	Handicap
624	Public Spaces
145	Employee parking

The parking lots encompass almost 334,000 square feet (7.6 acres) with 20,000 of that being concrete.

In examining the general condition of the lots, I did not include conditions of the curbing or contiguous sidewalks. Of the 15 parking lots, 11 are in fair condition only requiring minimum maintenance and repairs such as filling of cracks, top coat sealing and restriping. These steps are the mainstay of basic asphalt maintenance and should be performed every 2-4 years depending on wear patterns. I have included the pricing for this for all of the lots.

There are portions in the 4 remaining lots that need to be cut and patched but the areas are not a significant part of the parking area and just cut and patch should suffice. After these repairs, the rest of the lot should be top coated and lines repainted. The 2 north lots at Brookens have been patched several times and may soon need more extensive repairs, especially if we don't do this patching in a timely manner. A good look at the condition of the sub base at these 2 lots and the one at 305 E Main will determine whether a future overlay would suffice or if more extensive work is needed. Please remember that when looking at the prices I have listed that these are estimates and that asphalt repair prices rise and fall with the price of petroleum.

Recommendation #1:

The County Facilities Committee recommends to the Finance Committee, at its September meeting, to approve a budget amendment to transfer money from the General Corporate Fund of approximately \$15,000.00 to the FY2013 Physical Plant budget to cover the repairs needed to the northeast parking lot at Brookens Administrative Center.

Recommendation #2

The County Facilities Committee recommends to the Finance committee that direction be given in the preparation of the FY2014 budget to include \$32,000.00 for the maintenance and repair of the north parking lot at the Brookens Administrative Center, the parking lot at 1905 E Main and the lot at 305 E Main.

Parking Lot Designation	Location	Handicapped Spaces	Public Spaces	Designated Employee Spaces	Approximate Area Sq.Ft. Asphalt	Approximate Area Sq.Ft. Concrete	Condition or Rating
A	1776 E. Washington (S)	2	22		14,360		Fair
B	(Park District Lot)						
C	1776 E. Washington (N)	4	224		54,470		poor
D	1776 E. Washington (NE)	5	67		33,300		poor
E	305 E. Main ST.		24		7,780		poor
F	101 E. Main St.	5	52	49	35,600		good
G	101 E. Main St. -Elm St.			4		4,570	good
H	204 E. Main-Walnut St.			4	1,900		fair
J	204 E. Main- Water St.	1		35	11,680		fair
K	502 Lierman Av.	4	18	28	44,960		good
L	Highway						
M	Highway						
SD	Highway Service Dr.		33		1,347		good
N	1701 E. Main	4	64	22	41,300		fair
O	1701 E. Main				2,200	5,420	fair
P	1905 E. Main		63	3	48,100		fair
R	210 Art Bartell Rd.	2	19		16,460	10,200	good
S	400 S. Art Bartell Rd.	2	38		20,525		fair
	Totals	29	624	145	333,982	20,190	
	Total Combined Parking	798			(7.6 acre)		
	Art Bartell Road				98,760		
	Bartell Service buildings				52,000		
	Total Bartel & Service Bldg.				150,760		
	Grand Total				484,742		
					(11.1 acre)		

Parking Lot Designation	Location	Fill Cracks Linear Foot	Cost \$0.73/LF	Seal Coat 2 Coats Square Yard	Cost \$1.40/SY	Restripe Lots	Cut/Patch Square Yard	cost \$55.00/SY	Total Lot Cost
A	1776 E. Washington (S)	657	\$479.61	1,596	\$2,234.40	\$313.50			\$3,027.51
C	1776 E. Washington (N)	1867	\$1,362.91	6,053	\$8,474.20	\$1,644.50	67	\$3,685.00	\$15,166.61
D	1776 E. Washington (NE)	1623	\$1,184.79	3,700	\$5,180.00	\$623.50	156	\$8,580.00	\$15,577.29
E	305 E. Main ST.	823	\$600.79	865	\$1,211.00	\$313.50	45	\$2,475.00	\$4,600.29
F	101 E. Main St.	1642	\$1,198.66	3,956	\$5,538.40	\$1,424.50			\$8,161.56
G	101 E. Main St. -Elm St.					\$165.00			\$165.00
H	204 E. Main-Walnut St.	238	\$173.74	212	\$296.80	\$165.00			\$635.54
J	204 E. Main- Water St.	683	\$498.59	1,298	\$1,817.20	\$407.00			\$2,722.79
K	502 Lierman Av.	1384	\$1,010.32	4,996	\$6,994.40	\$572.00			\$8,576.72
SD	Highway Service Dr.	200	\$146.00	150	\$210.00	\$357.50			\$713.50
N	1701 E. Main	1500	\$1,095.00	4,589	\$6,424.60	\$957.00			\$8,476.60
O	1701 E. Main	200	\$146.00	2,450	\$343.00				\$489.00
P	1905 E. Main	3000	\$2,190.00	5,345	\$7,483.00	\$616.00	30	\$1,650.00	\$11,939.00
R	210 Art Bartell Rd.	1200	\$876.00	1,829	\$2,560.60	\$313.50			\$3,750.10
S	400 S. Art Bartell Rd.	1200	\$876.00	2,281	\$3,193.40	\$385.00			\$4,454.40
							C & P total	\$16,390.00	
	Total								\$88,455.91



