

Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Property Committee Meeting

The Property Committee of the McLean County Board met on Tuesday, April 2, 2002 at 4:00 p.m. in Room 700, Law and Justice Center, 104 West Front Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

Members Present: Chairman Salch, Members Hoselton, Nuckolls, Selzer, Owens

Members Absent: Member Bostic

Other Board Members

Present: None

Staff Present: Mr. John M. Zeunik, County Administrator; Mr. Terry Lindberg, Assistant County Administrator; Ms. Martha B. Ross, County Administrator's Assistant

Department Heads/

Elected Officials

Present: Mr. Jack Moody, Director, Facilities Management

Others Present: Mr. Greg Koos, Executive Director, McLean County Historical Museum; Mr. James B. Meek, Felmley-Dickerson Company; Mr. Jeff Koerber, Wiss Janney Elstner Associates, Inc.

Chairman Salch called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

Mr. Jack Moody, Director, Facilities Management, stated that during the March 2002 Property Committee meeting, the Committee requested that Mr. Jeff Koerber, author of the October 3, 2001 Preliminary Cost Estimate Report on the Old Courthouse, appear personally before them to speak specifically about the details of the report. Mr. Koerber, an historical architect with the Chicago firm of Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc., ("Wiss, Janney") was also the author of the report done for the Committee dated May 14, 1992.

Mr. Koerber stated that he would address the basic condition of the Old Courthouse structure, outline the preliminary scope of the proposed repair and restoration work, and present the preliminary cost estimates. He remarked that there are two condition surveys that provided the information for his reports. The first survey was conducted in 1992 by Wiss, Janney in conjunction with the Office of John Vinci ("OJV", now Vinci/Hamp Architects). The second survey was more of a reappraisal of the building's condition, done in mid-September, 2001. It was a brief condition survey of two days duration. Both interior and exterior conditions in the Old Courthouse were examined.

Mr. Koerber noted that such a condition survey was considered a first step, prior to doing a more extensive investigation. He further noted that the condition survey and the subsequent

investigation are the two steps to accomplish in order then develop a more defined scope of repair work for the structure, which could then be placed out for bids.

Mr. Koerber remarked that the previous McLean County Courthouse was destroyed by a catastrophic fire at the turn of the nineteenth century. The courthouse structure which is currently standing, was built in 1900 to replace that previous structure. Mr. Koerber commented that the exterior of the current building is intact and still retains most of its architectural detailing. The balustrade along the edge of the roof and the copper dome are intact, but will require special attention.

Mr. Koerber presented a timeline delineating the sequence of steps taken to date in order to prepare the Old Courthouse for needed repairs. He noted that in August, 2000, he was contacted by Jack Moody with a request to update the 1992 condition survey, as well as to provide some preliminary cost estimates. The 1992 report did not have cost estimates attached to it.

In September, 2000, the condition survey was updated, and a partial close up inspection of the building using a personnel lift was conducted. Using the information gleaned from the condition survey and inspection, a preliminary cost estimate was prepared, based upon a preliminary prioritized outline scope of repairs. The prioritization was developed with the idea that not all the repairs may be accomplished in one single phase. It may be necessary and desirable to break down the scope of work, to be accomplished over a period of years.

Mr. Koerber noted that there are many parts of the building that require repair, although the exterior is, for the most part, intact. He commented that the moon-shaped spalls, which have been occurring over time, are caused by the original ferris steel clamps that hold the cladding onto the building. The exterior façade is made of Indiana limestone, but beneath that veneer, the bearing walls are some type of masonry. It is thought that those walls are made of brick.

Several slides were shown to illustrate various points throughout the building requiring repair. Stress on the walls, created by the corrosion of the imbedded metal anchors, was noted as a particular concern. This stress has created cracks in the exterior walls, which is potentially dangerous. It was noted that the mortar joints have deteriorated. The exterior steps, particularly on the north side, show signs of moisture infiltration. There are also signs of slight displacement of the north exterior steps.

Mr. Koerber commented that observation of the top of the building reveals both mortar joints and the cornice that are deteriorating. There has already been some cracking and spalling between adjacent stone units. The dome presents particular problems. The drum shows corroded steel anchors and mortar patches that have peeled off. Dentils located along the cornice are eroding. All of the mortar joints on the dome are damaged to the point where moisture is becoming invasive, which is a condition of considerable concern.

Flat roof areas near the drum of the dome show evidence of waterproofing deterioration. This material has reached the end of its service life. The balustrade around the perimeter of the building, at the top of the walls, shows evidence of movement and free spall action. Observation of the top rail, as well as of the balustrade itself, reveals cracking. Detached pieces have been found around the perimeter of the building.

Mr. Koerber stated that, despite the current conditions exhibited in and around the Old Courthouse structure, most of the building is salvageable. Many pieces would have to be replaced, but there are still several that could be reused. Many areas will need to be dismantled. The original ferrous steel anchors must be removed, and replacement stainless steel anchors will be installed.

East and west vestibules of the building have a thin veneer of stone cladding the interior area. Those areas exhibit cracking and displacement of that thin stone veneer. Additionally, one soffit panel on the west elevation of the building fell at some point in the past. It will need to be replaced.

Interior wall panels that have cracked are recommended for replacement. The material used to make the original panels is a mixture of plaster and other ingredients, which is then finished to look like marble. This material is known as scagliola. Cracking and displacement of many of these wall panels has occurred, but the cause is not readily apparent. Further investigation is needed to determine the cause.

Mr. Koerber commented that the roof of the building does not exhibit many signs of water infiltration, which was also noted in his October 2001 report. However, by the time that all of the other repairs on the building are completed, it is anticipated that the roof will have reached the end of its service life. Therefore, it is recommended that the roof be replaced. This is especially recommended in view of the fact that repairs on the dome and surrounding area will be done.

Mr. Koerber stated that a closer inspection of the limestone balustrade is needed, in order to document the different conditions that exist in that part of the building. This area was not readily accessible during the inspection that was conducted in September 2001. The close up inspection should be done prior to completing construction documents for any of the prioritized phases of work. A close up inspection of the copper roof and the drum of the dome is also recommended.

Wiss, Janney often does such inspections using specialized equipment. Inspection openings, in which portions of the façade will be opened to allow visual examination of the material underneath, are recommended. Trial repairs on the façade may be attempted in order to learn how certain materials will react and blend with the existing building material. This inspection

and experimentation process will aid in the development of an accurate set of construction documents.

It is anticipated that inspection openings will be needed at the north steps so that repair materials and techniques can be tailored for all four sets of steps on the building's exterior. Laboratory testing of original mortar will be conducted, so that a repair mortar can be developed for pointing and resetting stone that is compatible with the masonry and existing construction.

Mr. Koerber explained that certain items should be considered at the top of the prioritization hierarchy. The most urgent item to address is the removal of existing spalls on the exterior of the building and on the drum of the dome. Another urgent item that requires timely attention is the stabilization of the balustrade until it can be permanently repaired. "Dutchman" repairs are recommended for spall locations, which would range from approximately six square inches to a half or full stone. The extent of repair would depend on the level of distress that has occurred. Dutchman repair is defined as a repair to a unit of stone, which addresses only the actual damaged area, rather than a replacement of the full stone. Finishing to blend the repaired area with the remaining stone completes the repair.

Mr. Koerber listed pointing and repointing of the main cornice and cornice moldings, as well as the cornice moldings on the drum of the dome, as another Priority One repair. A more extensive repointing phase is planned for Priority Two repairs. However, stopping moisture invasion is necessary at present, requiring some work on selected areas to be done at the Priority One level.

Approximately three-fourths of the flat stone work at the drum of the dome is a Priority One level repair. Mr. James Meek asked whether the stone located at the dome is curved or straight small sections. Mr. Koerber responded that the limestone in this location is curved.

Mr. Koerber recommended replacement of the handrails and the posts that go into the ground that support them. The handrails are not currently accessible under the requirements of the Americans With Disabilities Act ("ADA"), and this deficiency must be addressed.

The limestone knee walls and the granite steps at the north building entrance are considered a Priority One repair recommendation. Repairs to the other three entrances are scheduled as Priority Two, which consists primarily of resealing the paving joints.

Pinning of the mosaic soffit panels and the stone veneer panels, as well as the interior scagliola panels are listed in Priority One. In the case of a mosaic panel, this process would consist of several steps. First, the tesserae would be removed, then the pin would be inserted, and finally, the tesserae would then be reset. Appropriate grout or finishing material is needed for this process.

Mr. Meek asked how this process would be accomplished. Mr. Koerber stated that there is steel structure above the mosaic panels, but there is also masonry vaulting above the panels. So, pinning into the masonry is a possibility.

Mr. Nuckolls asked what are the most pressing safety concerns. Mr. Koerber responded that most of the Priority One items are imminently necessary, as they are public safety issues. However, an emergency stabilization of some areas could be accomplished if deemed necessary. Some of the methods for those emergency stabilizations are not aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Koerber stated that items in the Priority Two category are meant to be implemented between the years 2003 and 2006. He noted that Priority One and Priority Two items could be included in the same contract. However, consolidation of the two Priorities may depend on how quickly funding can be allocated.

Priority Two items are likely to involve scaffolding of the entire façade of the building. Therefore, such repairs may need to be accomplished in stages, keeping both the budget and construction seasons in mind. Included in this level is repointing of the limestone façade. Roughly 50% of the façade is in need of repointing. Masonry distress that was not addressed under the first priority may also be addressed under this priority. That encompasses primarily flat wall cracking, which is not an immediate safety issue.

Also listed under Priority Two is the rebuilding of the knee walls at the other three entrances, having already addressed the north entrance in the first phase of repairs. In the dome, the Luxfer prism windows, which are original to the building, are now in need of repair. The putty between the glazing units, as well as the frames, should be replaced. Mr. Koos stated that some of the individual glass pane units have begun to crack. The mosaic panel located in the west vestibule, which fell and broke a number of years ago, would be replicated and replaced during Priority Two repairs.

Mr. Koerber introduced the Priority Three items, which are proposed for repair between 2006 and 2010. The roof should be replaced, and either a sheet metal roof or a replacement akin to what is in place at the present time is preferred. There is also an existing membrane system that lines the gutters. It is more appropriate to use a lead coated copper lining that could be flashed into the roofing system, as well as to provide more protection to the cornice by coming over the top portion of the stone.

The need for reroofing of the sheet metal dome is undetermined at this time. Upon inspection of the inside of the dome, there appears to be some moisture infiltration problems. The cause of the infiltration is yet to be determined, and is therefore, difficult to address. However, it is anticipated that a dome replacement will be necessary during Priority Three repairs.

Other Priority Three issues include: additional conservation measures for the interior scagliola panels and the marble wainscot. Many of the interior finishes are dirty and could benefit from an overall cleaning. The bronze entrance doors at all entrances will also require cleaning and conservation measures.

Mr. Koerber stated that cost estimates were included in the letter dated October 2001. He noted that he examined those estimates and determined to round them upward somewhat. There are also rough estimates on architectural amenities. Mr. Koerber estimated that the cost of Priority One work would include architectural engineering services, based upon doing an investigation of some of the previously mentioned items, as well as developing contract documents for Priority One work.

It is thought that perhaps Priority One and Priority Two could be incorporated together at a range of \$1,600,000 to \$1,800,00. Priority Three work would then be estimated at between \$1,100,00 and \$1,300,000.

Mr. Selzer asked whether the numbers presented should be considered more of a minimum, rather than a maximum amount. When the investigations begin, much more could likely be found that was not originally anticipated. He further asked what amount would need to be spent in order to determine the amount that will be ultimately spent on repairs to the Old Courthouse. Mr. Koerber responded that there is currently an assumed contingency of 20%. The unit costs, which were used in estimating the different costs for repairs outlined in the preliminary scope, were conservative. More specific numbers will be available upon closer inspection of the building.

Mr. Selzer asked what the total cost would be for the needed inspections in order to arrive at repair estimates. Mr. Koerber responded that developing a set of scope documents might cost approximately \$30,000. This would include inspection openings and the contractor fees to assist with such work.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether Priority One work entails the general contractor doing the necessary removals and replacements to determine the state of the building, while Mr. Koerber observes and inspects, noting what work actually needs to be done. Mr. Koerber responded that during the inspection openings and investigation process, typical areas will be targeted. However, most historic restoration work provides an element of surprise, and the Old Courthouse is not expected to be an exception. Mr. Koerber further responded that the construction of the building is fairly standardized, and therefore, the inspection is not expected to reveal an excessive amount of unanticipated surprises.

Mr. Hoselton commented that he had examined the blueprints of the building and noted how it is secured. He further commented that the blueprints are non-specific with regard to intricate construction techniques that are contemporaneous with the building. He noted that his roofing firm applied the current roof over the existing roof. The drawings were non-specific as to the base material for this portion of the roof, and will therefore, need to be part of the inspection process. Mr. Hoselton expressed doubt that the \$30,000.00 cost estimate would be adequate once a roof inspection was included.

Mr. Koerber stated that there are some areas of the building that do not reveal their inner construction. However, the lower exterior limestone walls and the balustrade are not complicated in their construction and should be relatively easy to evaluate. He further stated that the drum of the dome will need to be closely inspected, as will some of the interior wall panels, the marble veneers in the vestibule, and the scagliola panels on the interior of the building. Those areas are much less self-revealing in terms of their construction.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the interior scagliola panels are imminently hazardous. Mr. Koerber responded that most of the panels have been pinned to assist in their support, but that measure is temporary.

Mr. Hoselton then asked whether an additional Priority Four category could be added, and such lower priority items as those interior panels could be assigned to that priority. Mr. Koerber responded that this item was assigned a Priority One status due to the fact that there were concerns about the stability of the scagliola material and how reliable the temporary measures were. He further responded that if the condition of the panels were in immediate need of repair, he would have notified Mr. Moody to take action at the present time. A number of spalls were removed and, therefore, anything that was imminently hazardous was addressed.

Mr. Owens asked whether interior work in the stairwells and rooms is included in the preliminary cost figures. Mr. Koerber responded that Mr. Koos had expressed some concern with more minor repairs, such as stair treads and wall coverings. However, those items were not included in the preliminary cost figures cited at this time.

Mr. Owens then asked how long the in depth inspections would take. Mr. Koerber responded that he anticipated being on site for approximately one week, but that the final cost estimates and report would take 2-3 months to develop.

Chairman Salch asked whether there was a cost benefit to doing the repairs in phases, as opposed to doing them all at once. Mr. Koerber commented that doing the repairs in stages, over a period of years, will likely cost more. This is due to the fact that materials and services are expected to increase in price. However, if repairs are coordinated carefully, potential savings could be

realized by doing similar work concurrently. One thing to note is that the building should not be too extensively renovated at one time, if the Museum of History is to remain open.

Chairman Salch asked whether Mr. Koerber could provide a statement of how much renovation work could be done in during the remainder of the 2002 calendar year. Mr. Koerber responded that this time of the year is appropriate for doing inspection openings. Chairman Salch then stated that he was more concerned about the amount of actual work that could be accomplished. Mr. Koerber responded that, given the scope of work in Priority One alone, bids may not be accepted until early summer. Construction could then commence in July or August. He noted that there would be a hiatus over the winter, with construction resuming in the spring.

Mr. Zeunik asked how long it would take to prepare a minimal set of documents after the preliminary inspections are completed. Mr. Koerber responded that 3-4 months for Priority One work is a reasonable time. If Priority One and Two are to be combined, 4-5 months is expected.

Mr. Moody asked whether the building would need to be rebuilt, one stone at a time, in order to replace the ferrous steel anchors. Mr. Koerber responded that in this case, that situation is unlikely. He explained that such an extensive project is not included in the current cost estimates.

Mr. Koos asked how replacement pins would be inserted. He expressed concern regarding potential damage to interior walls. Mr. Koerber commented that interior walls should remain undisturbed. Inspection of the limestone cladding should reveal how far back into the wall any corrosion might go, and the extent of the damage would dictate how extensive the repair work would be.

Mr. Koos asked how the clamps have failed. Mr. Koerber stated that limestone is fairly porous, and the joints between the stone joints are deteriorating. He noted that many joints were inspected, and few were in good condition. He suggested that a lead coated copper flashing could be applied as a prophylactic measure, which would not be seen.

Chairman Salch asked whether the work would be bid in unit pricing. Mr. Koerber responded that the bid would be consistent with whatever County regulations dictated. He explained that his firm typically recommends that unit prices be received along with the bids. This practice is helpful in the event that other conditions requiring attention are uncovered during the course of the repair work. There is then a unit price for materials that can be utilized as a reference for pricing the additional work.

Mr. Koerber suggested that the County prequalify the contractors who are expected to bid on the work. They should be experienced in working on historic buildings. He noted that his firm could assist with preparing prequalification documents that would be submitted prior to the acceptance of bids.

Mr. Hoselton expressed concern over the extensive use of ferrous metal throughout the building, and the potential for its replacement. He noted that this one situation could have a significant impact on the overall cost of the renovation project.

Mr. Selzer asked for a clear prioritization regarding what work absolutely needs to be done. He noted that the 1992 report is now out of date, and priorities may now differ significantly from those in the 1992 report. He expressed that financing the project is a concern, and before financing can be addressed, a clear prioritization of proposed work needs to be developed. Mr. Koerber replied that the work delineated in the October letter from Wiss Janney remains the same at the present time. Some of those items were even included in the 1992 report.

Mr. Selzer commented that the City of Bloomington (“the City”) is planning restoration work in the downtown area during the upcoming summer months. He suggested that the County coordinate its work on the Old Courthouse with the City so that neither entity’s repair work nor schedule is disruptive to the other.

Mr. Nuckolls asked how much is the contingency. Mr. Koerber remarked that it is 20%. He noted that there had been concern expressed that a 20% contingency would be insufficient.

Mr. Hoselton stated that, although he questioned the sufficiency of a 20% contingency, he was focused on overhead and profit for the contractor. He did not question the contingency in terms of Wiss Janney’s costs.

Chairman Salch stated that, at this time, the Committee should formulate its recommendation to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Selzer remarked that the next objective should be to pursue a set of biddable plans. This would entail doing estimates with inspection openings and developing a detailed scope of work. He further remarked that the contractors should be prequalified. He noted the necessity of obtaining a firm cost amount for the renovations.

Chairman Salch asked whether Mr. Selzer was proposing that the work be accomplished in phases. Mr. Selzer proposed that the work be done as one project, disbursed over a period of years. He stated that he preferred to approach the work cycle as being done in “stages,” rather than in “priorities.”

Chairman Salch asked whether the amount of \$75,000.00 was still the amount estimated to cover the necessary work to inspect the building, determine its renovation needs, and prepare Priority One construction documents.

Mr. Selzer remarked that he would then be willing to propose a motion stating that the detailed estimates with inspection openings be completed, in order to prepare the detailed scope of work, and present the Committee with biddable plans. Specified within that motion would also be an amount of \$75,000.00, which would be specified as a “not to exceed” amount.

Mr. Nuckolls asked whether Mr. Selzer was referring to only Priority One work, or the entire project. Mr. Selzer responded that his intent was to include the entire project.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the \$75,000.00 amount includes having a contractor remove wainscoting and discovering site conditions. He stated that there were also other areas of the building that should be inspected. Mr. Hoselton then asked whether the \$75,000.00 included the contractor’s fees. Mr. Koerber responded that he would need to review his proposal to determine whether the contractor’s fees are included.

Mr. Hoselton suggested including the roof area as a separate category. It may prove problematic and should be addressed as its own category.

Mr. Selzer asked, in the event that he made a motion to get the Committee biddable plans, would Mr. Koerber feel comfortable in being given a “not to exceed” amount. Mr. Koerber responded that he could do the investigation, check into construction costs, and then approach the Committee for its direction on how to next proceed. Based upon the construction cost estimates, \$75,000.00 is adequate for now. About midway through the inspection process, and it is determined that additional work is indicated, the \$75,000.00 amount could be amended to reflect a more accurate cost.

Mr. Selzer remarked that for the \$75,000.00 amount, Wiss Janney would complete a detailed estimate with inspection openings and prepare scope of work documents. Mr. Koerber emphasized that a detailed estimate can only be prepared from a set of construction documents, and those would not be available. He stated that a set of scope documents would be prepared for the contractor or cost estimator to utilize.

Mr. Selzer remarked that he wanted to be certain that the Committee requests a broad enough range of work to result in an accurate information and an accurate cost amount so that bidding can begin.

Motion by Selzer/Hoselton to request allocation of funds, not to exceed \$75,000.00, based upon the estimate given by Wiss, Janney Elstner Associates, Inc. This amount would provide estimates to include inspection openings, which would then provide the Property Committee with a more detailed scope of work with recommended stages of implementation to do all of the work necessary at the Old Courthouse Building.

Mr. Hoselton stated that the motion should include all the priorities in the investigation. Mr. Koerber remarked that the proposal would have to be revised, as the way it is currently written only examines Priority One items. However, he stated that \$75,000.00 should be sufficient. Mr. Koerber stated that, in its present form, the scope of his proposal is different than what is now requested.

Chairman Salch asked whether there were any further questions regarding the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion.

Motion carried.

Chairman Salch stated that the Property Committee's recommendation should now be presented to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Zeunik stated that, at this point, the action of the Property Committee would go directly to the full County Board. He explained that financing for the entire project is not sought at this time. Rather, only financing for the inspection openings and detailed scope of work report is sought at this time. Mr. Zeunik noted that it is now incumbent upon Mr. Koerber to provide the Property Committee with either a standard AIA contract or a special contract that would delineate the services that the Committee is requesting.

Mr. Selzer asked whether a Stand Up Property Committee meeting would be in order, immediately prior to the April County Board meeting, to examine the contract in order to then report accurately to the Board.

Mr. Hoselton requested that Chairman Salch be copied on any correspondence that takes place between Mr. Moody and Mr. Koos. Mr. Selzer remarked that this would be helpful in disseminating information to the other Committee members.

Mr. Zeunik stated that it was his understanding of the motion that the inspection work would be done, followed by a report to the Property Committee detailing any additional costs that may become apparent as a result of the inspection. Mr. Selzer commented that he is requesting a detailed scope of work, which delineates what needs to be done, and in what order it needs to be

accomplished. He stated that he also requested construction estimates, or at least a document that could be sent to contractors to obtain the estimates.

Mr. Koerber remarked that he typically conducts an investigation to produce a set of scope documents. There will be some schematic detail, but not full construction details. Mr. Selzer stated that he would like to see the cost estimates so there is a clear idea of costs and the amount of work. It could then be given to contractors.

Mr. Zeunik remarked that the cost estimate would return to the Property Committee for its decision on the total scope of work to be completed. Once the scope of work is outlined, the issue would then be referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Zeunik asked how long the inspection phase is expected to take. Mr. Koerber responded that the time frame to conduct an inspection, develop a set of scope documents and estimated prices would be approximately three months. Mr. Zeunik reiterated that July 2002 would be the time that the Property Committee could expect to receive the scope documents and cost information. Mr. Koerber agreed.

Mr. Owens asked whether the motion that was made by Mr. Selzer and seconded by Mr. Hoselton would be presented to the full County Board at its April 16th meeting. Mr. Zeunik responded that it would be presented as an Item for Action.

There being nothing further to come before the Committee at this time, Chairman Salch adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha B. Ross
Recording Secretary