

LIVINGSTON COUNTY BOARD
MINUTES OF May 30, 2018 MEETING OF THE COUNTY BOARD

OPENING

County Board Chairman Young called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m., in the County Board Room of the Historic Courthouse, 112 W. Madison, Pontiac, Illinois.

The clerk called roll with the following **present:** John “Jack” Vietti, John Slagel, G. Michael Ingles, Patrick D. Killian, Ronald L. Kestner, Paul A. Ritter, Carolyn Gerwin, Steven Lovell, Vicki Allen, Kathy Arbogast, Linda Ambrose, Daryl N. Holt, Mark Runyon, William Mays, David W. Heath, Bob Young, and John L. Yoder
Absent: Jason Bunting (arrived at 5:05 p.m.), Joseph D. Steichen, Tim Shafer (arrived at 5:40 p.m.), Robert F. Weller, James A. Carley, Stanley R. Weber and Marty Fannin (arrived at 5:12 p.m.)

Also Present: County Clerk-Kristy Masching, Executive Director-Alina Hartley, Farnsworth Group Representatives-Dave Burnison and Neil Finlan, Public Health Administrator-MaLinda Hillman, Mental Health Executive Director-Chris Myers and IHR Executive Director-Joe Vaughan

AGENDA

Chairman Young noted that Public Comment would be added to the agenda. He then called for approval of the agenda as amended. *Motion by Mays, second by Arbogast to approve the agenda.* **MOTION CARRIED ON UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.**

BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

Health & Education Building - Farnsworth Analysis – Chairman Young started off with thanking the board members for attending the meeting as well as to those who took the opportunity to tour the H&E building before the meeting. He also expressed his appreciation to The Farnsworth Group Representatives-Dave Burnison and Neil Finlan for coming back. Young hoped that they would delve into the questions and provide answers the board members needed so that they could better answer their constituents questions when asked. He also hoped that the members would feel that they had input into the decision which would be made.

Property Committee Chairman Mike Ingles addressed the board with the following insights regarding the issue. He hoped that everyone understood that we were not at the point of designing a building. He felt that the members had discussed the issue and had arrived at three options to address the concerns about the existing building: remodeling, to bring it up to compliance with building and accessibility codes and energy efficiencies; go elsewhere and remodel another building; or build a new building. Members had also looked into remodeling buildings at other locations, including the new nursing home (Good Sam) and ruled those options out for various reasons. Ingles commented that the options have been narrowed down to remodel, rebuild or do nothing. Ingles noted that if we chose to remodel, we’d have to vacate the building and find temporary housing for the employees.

Dave Burnison (The Farnsworth Group) presented additional cost overview information for the three options. He had a schematic drawing which showed the six steps of the project planning and design process and noted that we were in the midst of Step 2-Program Confirmation. Burnison commented that trying to look at costs at this step of the project was hard to do when it’s based on assumptions rather than a completed, detailed design.

Concept 1-Remodel Existing Building - Cost Review – For the cost review of Concept 1, Burnison noted that he used the 2010 Energy Efficiency Upgrades Study performed by Johnson Controls to structure cost projections together for items such as window replacement, attic insulation, electrical upgrades, access panels, utilities, etc. The projected cost for the energy efficiency upgrades totaled \$1.151million. Renovation costs were estimated at \$2.13 million and included items such as 20,000 SF (\$60/SF assumed) renovation, exterior repairs, new exit stair and elevator, sprinkler system/fire pump/generator, design fees and a contingency, for a total of \$3.8 million. The grand total also included allowances for temporary rental during construction, moving costs and asbestos abatement. The total cost projection for Concept 1 totaled \$3.801 million.

Concept 2-New Building - Cost Review - Burnison noted that projected costs associated with the demolition of the building were included in this review at a cost of \$714,000. This figure is based on recent results they have had for other projects. Allowances to patch the cut area of the existing IHR building were also included at a projected cost of \$399,000., but were not included in the totals for the new building due to there being a question of whether IHR is the county's responsibility or not. Projected costs for the new building and site development remained the same as in the first presentation and totaled \$5.2 million. This review also included allowances for moving and a contingency for unknown issues that might arise. The total cost projection for Concept 2 totaled \$6.056 million.

At the end of Burnison's presentation, a question and answer session ensued with board members asking many questions regarding the two plans and the additional information that was presented. Highlights follow. The two options being addressed are to build at a cost of approximately \$6.1 million or remodel at a cost of \$3.8 million or do nothing. The increase in the cost to build from the first presentation (\$4.6 million) to now (\$6.1 million) is due to the additional costs for demolition of the existing building, moving costs, a contingency allowance and an additional allowance for other project cost adjustments. There was some concern that there wasn't enough space allocated in the plan (going from 28,000/sf, includes basement space to 19,000) for storage, for items Public Health needed to retain for long periods of time. It was noted that at this stage, some areas in the layout may be too large and others too small, so when work on the detailed design stage begins, adjustments can be made and if that didn't accommodate what was needed there was a contingency which could be used depending upon how much space was needed. Ms. Hillman stated that she would be very interested in working closely on the building design and what would be most efficient since this was an overall concept. She commented that concerns about the boiler have been discussed for at least thirty-eight years. Ms. Hillman stated that a generator on their pharmaceutical refrigerators which store their vaccines is a must due to the expense of the vaccines in the event they'd have to be replaced. At this point, one board member commented on what the object of this meeting was and felt that many of the topics being discussed were items which should be decided on at a later stage. Burnison suggested that he'd like to see the problems get more defined by making decisions that would make it a simpler issue to address such as where the site should be, in Pontiac or another community. *Motion by Holt, second by Ritter to keep the building site in Pontiac if the decision to proceed with building is made.* Discussion highlights follow. Chairman Young explained that rebuilding or renovation of the H&E building had been included as a long term goal of the board at their long-term planning sessions which are held after the reorganizational meetings. It was felt that it would be better to pursue the H&E issue now, rather than to delay, in order to provide an efficient, easily accessible designed building for their clientele. Other on-going concerns are with the energy inefficiencies and maintenance of an old building. Burnison stated that building code allows the county to use the building as is as long as other improvements aren't made. **MOTION CARRIED ON ROLL CALL VOTE.**
Ayes: Vietti, Ingles, Killian, Kestner, Ritter, Lovell, Allen, Arbogast, Ambrose, Holt, Runyon, Mays, Heath, Young, Yoder and Fannin **Nays:** Bunting and Slagel **Abstain:** Gerwin **Absent:** Steichen, Shafer, Weller, Carley and Weber

After making this decision, discussion resumed on various topics with some highlights following. When questioned about the availability of buildings which might be renovated, Ms. Hillman responded that she was unaware of any buildings in Pontiac which would work. She also commented that one of her concerns was with staff time because someone goes to the Historic Courthouse offices weekly. She also wanted her staff in one location because it helps for supervision as well as for cross-training in the other programs they offer. Ms. Myers thinks that it's important to remain centrally located within the county otherwise SHOW Bus public transportation would have to reconfigure their routes. When asked about the ability of using the IHR building and adding on to it for a new building and having IHR rent from someone else, Ms. Hartley replied that even though they rent from us, it was built on county property and deeded to the county but it was built by IHR specifically for IHR with a grant obtained from the Humiston Trust. She noted that it wouldn't be right for the county to do that. IHR Executive Director-Joe Vaughan commented that IHR had purchased three more additions, all of which were deeded back to the county with IHR keeping their lease. They've rented this spot from the county for 44 years. Ms. Hillman reported the following in answer to questions: she and Ms. Myers worked with Farnsworth on the conceptual plan of 19,000 square feet; her staffing is down by ten employees due to a reduction in grant funding; records retained for 5-8 years and can be retained off site, just have to have access to them; and she reconfigured

clinic space. Ms. Hillman reviewed some of the services her department offers and what other agencies within the county they partner with, to fill in niches that aren't filled now. No other agency offers the services the Public Health Department provides. Burnison stated that the time frame for renovation would be six months. Ms. Hartley provided a brief history of what transpired in 2008 when Smart Watt came in and did some efficiency type upgrades. The H&E building is where you can see the most savings. At that time it was determined that the H&E building was one of the least energy efficient buildings the county had due to the windows, the boiler system and the individual air units in the facility. There are no fresh air returns so there's no fresh air circulating within the building. That became an issue when they talked about replacing the boiler and bringing in a new centralized air unit because of how they would have to run that system and how much it would cost. The estimate came in significantly higher than anticipated (around \$1.9 million) just for those renovations (new windows, boiler and A/C units). After reviewing the cost, the board said no because the building needed other modifications, so there was no reason to spend that kind of money on that building plus all the logistics and the fact that it still would not be accessible. Even though there are areas that are not accessible, we will not be cited on them. Burnison noted that the HVAC systems would allow for controllability of zones, but not have the elaborate operation system. Some members questioned what our return on investment would be because there were no figures provided for that. It was noted that when calculating the return on investment for renovating, the unused building space needed to be incorporated into the equation. Another member felt that the decision shouldn't be made on the basis of how much we'd save or the return on investment because there won't be any payback, the same as with the PSC and the L&J Center. It was noted that Ms. Hillman had stated earlier that some rooms aren't used due to mold.

At this time, Chairman Young announced that he had three potential motions that could be acted upon: 1) build a new building; 2) renovate; and 3) do nothing.

Motion by Bunting, second by Fannin is to not renovate the existing building. Bunting elaborated on his motion by saying that while they are currently in the building and general maintenance has to be done for them to officially run the building, then the board will do that repair work. No other type of renovation will be done in the existing building. **MOTION CARRIED ON ROLL CALL VOTE.** **Ayes:** Vietti, Bunting, Ingles, Shafer (arrived at 5:40 pm) Killian, Kestner, Gerwin, Lovell, Allen, Arbogast, Ambrose, Holt, Runyon, Heath, Young and Fannin **Nays:** Slagel, Mays and Yoder **Absent:** Steichen, Ritter (left at 5:45 pm), Weller, Carley and Weber

Motion by Heath, second by Vietti to build a new building. Ingles asked Heath if he would change his motion to include the Farnsworth Group to work on a design for a new building. With that request, Heath withdrew his motion. *Motion by Ingles, second by Heath to engage Farnsworth to move forward with the tenants, Chris Myers and MaLinda Hillman, on a design to meet the needs as they see them now and in the near future.* Discussion followed. Ingles stated his intent is so that everyone can understand and address and question the issues of square footage and cost more precisely and to design a building. A few members questioned whether all the buildings that were or were going to be available in the county had been thoroughly checked out. A few members stated that through the years the square footage had gone down due to a reduction in grants and staffing and thought it would be wise to take that into consideration when planning. Chairman Young also stated that there were two other county offices, the Coroner and VAC who they had originally planned to have in this building. Burnison reported that Step #3 (schematic design) phase would be about \$400,000. **MOTION CARRIED ON ROLL CALL VOTE.** **Ayes:** Vietti, Ingles, Shafer, Killian, Kestner, Lovell, Allen, Arbogast, Holt, Runyon, Heath and Young **Nays:** Bunting, Slagel, Gerwin, Ambrose, Mays, Yoder and Fannin **Absent:** Steichen, Ritter, Weller, Carley and Weber

PUBLIC COMMENT

IHR Executive Director-Joe Vaughan said he still didn't know where IHR stood in this issue, whether they were in or out of the process. Chairman Young said IHR wasn't included, that the county would work with them to come up with some sort of solution.

Harvey Zehr – He stated that he had been looking at some material that had been produced for this county several years ago. He said it was a comparison of our county to five other counties. According to the study Livingston County pays 65% more in social services and our tax levy is 25% higher than the other counties. His concern is that we are going to spend the money on a new building and he hasn't seen anything that says why we need this building.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m., on motion by Mays, second by Fannin. **MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES ON VOICE VOTE.**

Bob Young, Chairman

Attest:

Kristy A. Masching
County Clerk

Approved

Minutes Bd 05-30-18