

Minutes of the Property Committee Meeting

The Property Committee of the McLean County Board met on Thursday, April 1, 2004 at 3:00 p.m. in Room 700, Law and Justice Center, 104 West Front Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

Members Present: Chairman Bostic, Members Selzer, Harding, Dean, Ahart and Moss

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Mr. John Zeunik, County Administrator,
Ms. Karina Bak, Assistant to the County Administrator

Department Heads/
Elected Officials

Present: Mr. Jack Moody, Director, Facilities Management Department;
Mr. Bill Wasson, Director, Parks and Recreation

Members of the
Public Present:

Mr. Larry Stevig, SE, AIA, Senior Project Manager, Clark Engineers; Mr. Larry Feather, Site Engineer, McLeod USA; Mr. Jim Romba, Project Manager Midwest Region, Kajima Construction Services, INC; Mr. Jeff Koerber, AIA, Project Architect, Wiss, Janney, Elstner Architects, Mr. Bruce Kaskel, AIA, SE, Unit Manager and Senior Consultant, Wiss, Janney, Elstner Architects

Chairman Bostic called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Chairman Bostic called the roll and declared that was a quorum.

Chairman Bostic presented the Minutes of the March 4, 2004 Property Committee meeting. Hearing no objections or corrections, Chairman Bostic accepted and placed the minutes on file as submitted.

Mr. Jack Moody, Director, Facilities Management, asked the Committee if they would please adjust the agenda. Mr. Koerber and Mr. Kaskel were delayed due to a car accident on I-55. Chairman Bostic and the Committee did not object to the change and Mr. Moody proceeded with item 3, (A), 1, (b) and moved item 3, (A), 1, (a) to the end of the agenda.

Mr. Moody presented an update on the coffee kiosk proposal for the first floor of the Law and Justice Center. Mr. Moody was asked to research two items from the March Property Committee meeting. The first concern was does the County need to request bids for the project and the second concern was what type of costs are typically paid to building owners of similar coffee kiosks.

Mr. Moody sat down with Mr. Eric Ruud, First Assistant State's Attorney, and reviewed the concerns of the Property Committee. Mr. Ruud advised that the Public Building Commission (PBC) owns the Law and Justice Center and McLean County is the sole tenet of the facility. Mr. Moody stated that it is Mr. Ruud's opinion that the placement of a Coffee Kiosk in the lobby of the Law and Justice Center is not a County matter, it is a PBC matter. Mr. Moody said that the PBC owns the building and would be the one to decide whether or not they will ask for bids on the project. Mr. Moody stated that the PBC is not even aware of the coffee kiosk concept yet, and their next meeting is Tuesday May 4, 2004.

Mr. Selzer asked if the PBC is involved with the soda and other vending machines inside the building. Mr. Moody said that the PBC does not get involved with the soda/vending machines. Mr. Selzer and Chairman Bostic commented that the Property Committee oversees the Law and Justice Center pursuant to the maintenance agreement with the PBC. Ms. Bostic stated that the Committee should recommend the coffee kiosk idea to the PBC and let the PBC know that the Property Committee would be glad to do all the leg work and go to them with a final recommendation.

Mr. Selzer believes that the Property Committee is setting precedence by asking for bids on the coffee kiosk. He feels that they should do the same thing with the soda machines and that the soda machines should be placed for bids the same as the coffee kiosk. If the PBC did not get involved with the soda machines, Mr. Selzer believes that the PBC would not be interested in becoming involved with the coffee kiosk.

At the March meeting, Mr. Selzer asked if there was any other interest in placing a coffee kiosk in the Law and Justice Center. He asked Mr. Moody if had received calls from other coffee shop owners. Mr. Moody responded that he had not received any calls. Mr. Selzer said he spoke with two other coffee shop owners to see if they had any interest and if they did, he directed them to call Mr. Moody.

Mr. Moody received a copy of a letter from the City of Bloomington with four issues that Mr. Crutcher needs to address before they will allow him to continue with his project. Those issues are (1) he needs to hire a professional architect, and he must have stamped architectural drawings on his concept, (2) a three-compartment sink, (3) counters must be handicapped accessible, and (4) grease traps.

Mr. Selzer feels that if Mr. Crutcher can work out the four issues with the City, then the Property Committee should stand behind him and his proposal.

Mr. Zeunik stated if the coffee kiosk were to pass the Property Committee and there were no objections from the County Board, the PBC will not interfere with the placement of a coffee kiosk in the Law and Justice Center. Mr. Zeunik believes that the PBC will refer to their maintenance and operating agreement that they have with the County Board and say that the County Board is responsible for maintaining and operating the building. If the Property Committee were to conceptually approve the idea and encourage Mr. Crutcher to work with the City of Bloomington and the Health Department to develop his plans to the point where he can get the kiosk approved and then return to the Property Committee, Mr. Zeunik stated that the PBC would concur with the committee's decision.

Motion by Selzer/ Ahart to recommend approval of the coffee kiosk concept as presented by Mr. Crutcher provided that he continue negotiations with Mr. Moody on rent and that he meets all the other requirements as stated by the law.
Motion carried.

Mr. Moody presented a request by McLeod USA to install UPS batteries for back-up in the space they rent from McLean County at 200 West Front Street, Suite 500H. Consolidated Communications rented the same space from the County since 1995, and Consolidated Communications was bought out by McLeod USA.

The office space is currently filled with racks of computer equipment and back-up batteries. McLeod would like to increase their battery back-up power from 4-6 hours to 8-10 hours. The battery size is 2' x 3' x 5' and the total weight for a rack of batteries is approximately 4,200 lbs. The extra power will not increase the utility bill.

Clark Engineering preformed a structural evaluation on the space, on the floor framing the space, and reviewed existing drawings and plans. Based on their evaluation Clark Engineering determined that the space was structurally sound and able to hold the new weight that would be added.

Chairman Bostic asked if there would be any way to move the UPS back-up batteries to the basement. Mr. Feather, McLeod USA, stated that they currently have their own air-conditioning unit directly above them on the roof and many miles of fiber optic cable. It would be very expensive for them to move all the equipment. Mr. Moody noted that the basement is not air-conditioned.

Mr. Stevig, Clark Engineering, stated that they are comfortable with leaving the existing equipment on the fifth floor along with the new equipment. Clark Engineering believes that the weight disbursement will not harm the facility in any way. Mr. Stevig advised the committee that he looked at the ceiling on the floor below Suite 500H to see how many bolts were in the structural support beam. The drawings called for a six-bolt connection and Mr. Stevig stated that he wanted to make sure there were six bolts there; and there were.

Motion by Dean/Selzer to approve the request for McLeod USA to install UPS batteries in their tenant space located at 200 West Front Street, Suite 500H.
Motion carried.

Mr. Moody updated the Committee on the repairs on the Law and Justice Center. On April 1, 2004 the exterior brick wall was finished. The basement is complete and ceiling panels will be dealt with next week. The asphalt paving by the Sheriff's Department West entrance will be completed as soon as the asphalt company in town opens.

Chairman Bostic invited Mr. Bill Wasson, Director, Parks and Recreation, to present his item for action.

Mr. Wasson advised the Committee that Parks and Recreation would like to purchase a 72" front rotary mower from the Illinois Central Management Services Contract. The purchase price of the mower is \$10,720.00. The Parks and Recreation Department currently owns three of the mowers. The last time the Department requested bids was over 10 years ago and no one was less than \$11,000.00. John Deere offers a significant price reduction as part of the State contract.

The department has had minimal trade-in offers in the past. Facilities Management determined that the mower is too large for their use. Mr. Wasson requested approval to purchase a new mower through Illinois Central Management Services. Mr. Wasson recommended that the trade-in mower be auctioned in a sealed bid sale to local government agencies.

Motion by Selzer/Dean to approve the request by Parks and Recreation for the purchase of a 72" front rotary John Deere mower through the Illinois Central Management Services program and to auction the trade in mower by sealed bid sale to the local government agencies.
Motion carried.

Property Committee Meeting

April 1, 2004

Page 5

Mr. Wasson stated that Parks and Recreation is working with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources on the possibility of a group from Southern Illinois coming up to retrieve goose eggs and take them to Southern Illinois. It is a benefit to both parties.

Mr. Wasson stated that a grant the City of Bloomington applied for, with the help of the County, has been approved by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency to help with shoreline erosion control on Evergreen Lake over the next year. The City wants to maintain high water levels. They currently have other projects at Lake Bloomington under review, so they have not stated how they are going to do the shoreline work yet.

Mr. Moody stated that the work at the Government Center is on schedule. The 4th floor ceiling, walls, lights, and paint are finished; and the carpeting will be delivered soon. Mr. Moody extended an invitation to the Property Committee to tour the Government Center after the May Committee meeting.

Mr. Moody introduced Mr. Jeffrey Koerber and Mr. Bruce Kaskel from Wiss, Janney, Elstner (WJE), Architects and Mr. Jim Romba from Kajima Construction Services, Inc., Project Manager.

Mr. Moody stated that Mr. Eric Ruud, First Civil Assistant State's Attorney has reviewed the contract with Kajima, and the only comment he had on the contract was that there was not a completion date. That has already been forwarded to Kajima and their estimated completion date is November 1, 2004.

Mr. Koerber addressed the Committee in regards to a memo that he passed out at the meeting. The numbers Mr. Moody supplied him with one month ago were based on numbers he had developed based on discussions he had with Kajima Construction six weeks ago.

Mr. Koerber stated that in working out the final construction costs and making sure everything was included, a certain amount of money was added to the contract. The base bid number did not change, but the bid numbers for the alternates did. Mr. Koerber informed the Committee that he wanted to address why the construction costs are different from the bids, and how did we get from the bid numbers to the construction number. Another item that is different is how the work is to be done on the clock. Some of these items were not addressed properly in the original bid number, but they are now addressed correctly in the final contract numbers.

The next question that Mr. Koerber addressed was whether or not Kajima was still the low bidder. He said based on an analysis he performed they were still the low bidder. The last section of his memo reviewed the alternates that are recommended to be included in the contract. Mr. Koerber said that he understood, that a month ago, the Committee's desire was to include all of the alternates in the project. Mr. Koerber recommended against alternate number 6, flagpole, and alternate number 8, to rebuild section of limestone to the final construction contract.

Included in the base bid project is to replicate is there currently. Alternate number 6 is for a functioning flag pole. The alternate was to get a price on what a functional flagpole would cost. Mr. Koerber feels that is not a practical solution since there are currently flagpoles that function on the East Side of the building. He left the alternate in the bid because he wanted to see what the difference in cost would be.

Alternate number 8 is to rebuild a section of the limestone balustrade. Mr. Koerber felt that this is not something that money should be spent on at this time. Mr. Koerber advised the Committee that if the balustrade is going to be re-built, it is something that should be done when the main roofing membrane is replaced. He recommended that this item should be deferred until a future date.

Mr. Selzer asked if the other firms that bid on the project had the opportunity to adjust their bids for the alternates. Mr. Selzer asked why one bidder was at \$11,000.00 for item number 7 while the other two bids were at \$3,900.00. Mr. Koerber said he asked each bidder what was their understanding of the scope of work. Based on those discussions, he did not get any sense that they did not understand the documents presented or overbid the items in the project.

Mr. Selzer asked what Kajima's original bid was. Currently, there is only a \$10,000.00 difference between Kajima's current bid and the next lowest original bid received. The original bid from Kajima is listed on page two of the memo from Mr. Koerber; the price went up \$40,000.00.

Mr. Moody stated that Mr. Koerber verified the bids with all three contractors and they all came back with the same numbers. Mr. Koerber stated he posed two very specific questions to each contractor. The first question was, is there anything that is included in your bid that is not included in the bid document. The second question was, is there anything in the documents that is not in your bid. All three bidders had the same roofing contractor listed and they all had slightly different masonry contractors, and different scaffolding contractors. Mr. Koerber feels they had ample time to state that they did not understand the bid specifications.

Over the last month, Mr. Koerber, stated he has reviewed the cost estimate and scope of work that was included in the documents and compared the documents to the 2002 Report. The 2002 Report was based on the comprehensive investigation of the building. The cost estimate was based on a set outline scope of work and a set of design development repair documents. In looking back, Mr. Koerber advised the Committee that he should have met with the cost estimate and spelled out which parts of the work were going to be done. The way the estimate was structured was in phases of work, but not necessarily smaller portions of work. The cost estimate was not structured so that you could just pick something out of the estimate. Mr. Koerber informed the Committee that he underestimated the general condition cost.

Another factor that Mr. Koerber did not understand was if you were to extrapolate the work on the dome, then there should have been a certain amount of contingency added to the project for two reasons. The first reason was because instead of doing all the work on the roof of the building, the project is just doing part of the work so certain general conditions costs that apply to the whole project will also apply to this one element. The cost for installing the new sheet metal cladding for the dome was not in the original estimate.

By running through all the numbers again and by judging the items correctly, Mr. Koerber stated that the numbers for the project budget should have been closer to \$920,000.00 as opposed to \$400,000.00. By making the few errors of judgement at the beginning, all of this had compounded. He feels there is still a slight discrepancy between the contract amount of \$1.1 million and the project budget number, which is a difference of about 20%.

Mr. Selzer asked if the entire project is \$2.7 million in 2002 dollars, and we are currently at \$1.1 million now, does that mean that if the Committee decides to plan the rest of the project, will that bid come in higher than \$1.8 million. Mr. Koerber said the price should be in the same neighborhood. There are still general condition costs that are in the roof/dome project that will need to be repeated in other phases of the whole project. Mr. Selzer asked if Mr. Koerber knows if there might be any more surprises in the project.

Mr. Koerber stated he has a lot more confidence in the 2002 estimate at this time. He also said that he would sit down with his cost estimator and look at the rest of the scope of work and the number of phases desired to finish the work on the museum to make

sure the project is as close to budget as possible. Mr. Koerber asked the Committee for direction in the number of phases they wish to see the project completed in. He stated that the project should be completed in the most logical way to save on time and to be less intrusive in the operation of the museum.

Mr. Selzer stated that he feels there are three options the Committee needs to consider. The first option is to assume that by September, County can apply for another grant. If the County were to be awarded 1\$ million, his answer would be to do the project next year and finish it. The second option is the State is not able to award another \$1 million and then the project needs to be done in 1, 2, or 3 phases. Mr. Selzer does not feel stretching the project out over 7 years is practical. The third option is looking at private foundations for grants.

Chairman Bostic suggested that the Committee stay with what the original plan stated and keep the project in a staged manner.

Mr. Koerber stated that WJE would revisit the priorities and make sure there isn't something that needs to be reprioritized. He also stated that there might be a way to do smaller projects towards the end of a project with left over money.

Mr. Moss asked Mr. Koerber if he saw something coming out of reviewing the contract that might benefit the County. Mr. Koerber responded that he would produce a letter that outlines what they recommend to prioritize for repair and what the cost ramifications would be. He also stated if they come up with a different total than what has already been presented, he would explain why. Mr. Koerber said he would have the letter done within the next two weeks.

Chairman Bostic asked Mr. Romba if he was comfortable with the operating numbers that were being presented. Mr. Romba said he was comfortable with the numbers and that time is of the essence because of the good weather. He hoped that the contract would be forth coming and was ready to get started.

Mr. Moody said that Kajima would be able to begin within 30 days of the contract being signed. If the Committee were to approve the contract today, and the County Board recommended approval on April 20, 2004 the contract would then go to the PBC for their approval on May 4, 2004. If the PBC were to approve the contract on May 4th, Kajima would be able to start within the next 30 days.

Motion by Selzer/Harding to award the bid with the recommended alternates to Kajima Construction Services, Inc. pursuant to the recommendation of the project architect.
Motion carried.

Mr. Koerber informed the Committee that he will be leaving Wiss, Janney, Elstner (WJE) to attend Clark University to study for a Ph.D. in History. He will remain with WJE through July, and Mr. Ed Gerns will be replacing him as the Project Manager.

Chairman Bostic thanked Mr. Koerber for his all the work he had done on this project.

Mr. Zeunik explained that in pages 24 and 25 of the Property Committee packet is an updated summary of the financing for the old courthouse project, including the alternate pricing provided by WJE. There are a few funding options before the Committee, the net proceeds from the sale of the McBarnes Building and the availability of funds from the PBC. If the proceeds from the sale of the McBarnes Building are used, the County can borrow the balance from the PBC at zero percent interest. The annual payment to the PBC would be \$53,377.00. If the Committee chooses not to use the McBarnes proceeds and borrow the entire amount from the PBC, the payment to the PBC would be \$83,250.00. The PBC does have some concern about the larger number. Mr. Zeunik stated that the PBS's concern is that they are also up fronting the money for the grant and having to wait for the reimbursement from the state. The arrangement with the State is that the County has to spend \$250,000.00 before applying for reimbursement.

Mr. Selzer stated his fear is if the money from the sale of the McBarnes Building is not used and it is placed in the General Fund it will be used for something else. He believes that the Committee owes it to the taxpayers to put the money from the sale of the McBarnes Building back into a historical building.

Motion by Dean/Moss to use the proceeds from the sale of the McBarnes Building for the financing the Old County Courthouse: Dome and Roof Project and borrow the remaining amount from the Public Building Commission 0 % interest over a ten-year.
Motion carried.

Mr. Moss expressed his desire to have the proceeds from the sale of the McBarnes building go towards the renovation of the Old County Courthouse. He believes that this would be the best use of the money.

Ms. Harding stated she believes that the money gained from the sale of the McBarnes Building should go towards another capital asset.

Mr. Zeunik announced that the installation of the World War I plaque will be completed before the dedication on Memorial Day Weekend 2004.

Mr. Selzer asked that the McLean Post Veterans Group be offered the opportunity to carry the flag, he stated that they were the only local Veterans Groups that offered and raised money to aid in the project.

Chairman Bostic presented the March 31, 2004 Property Committee bills for review and approval as transmitted by the County Auditor. The Property Committee Fund total is \$303,275.76 and the prepaid total is the same.

Property Committee Minutes
April 1, 2004
Page 11

Motion by Moss/Ahart to recommend approval of the bills as of March 31, 2004, which have been reviewed and recommend for transmittal by the County Auditor.
Motion carried.

Chairman Bostic asked if there was any other business or communication for the Property Committee. Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karina L. Bak
Recording Secretary