

Note: These minutes are not official until approved by the Public Building Commission at a subsequent meeting. Please refer to the meeting minutes when these minutes are approved to obtain any changes to these minutes.



DEKALB COUNTY PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION

A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION AND BODY POLITIC ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE "PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION ACT." ILLINOIS REVISED STATUTES 1977 CHAPTER 85, SECTION 1031 THROUGH SECTION 1054 AND CURRENTLY UNDER ILLINOIS COMPILED STATUTES 50 ILCS 20/1 et seq.

MEETING OF TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2017

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of the DeKalb County Public Building Commission (hereinafter "Commission") was held Tuesday, February 7, 2017 at 8:30 a.m. in the Administration Building's Conference Room East in Sycamore, Illinois pursuant to written notice to each Commissioner as required by the By-Laws.

ROLL CALL

Commissioner Mr. Mike Larson called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and requested the secretary to call the roll. Those Commissioners present were Mr. Mike Larson, Ms. Cheryl Nicholson, Mr. Chuck Shepard and Chairman Matt Swanson arrived at 8:35. Vice Chairman Larry Lundgren was physically absent. A quorum was established.

Others that were present included: Commission Treasurer Gary Hanson, Jail Project Administrator Ed Harvey, County Facilities Management Director Jim Scheffers, Sheriff Roger Scott, Chief Joyce Klein, Mr. Brian Kerner with Dewberry, Mr. Jeremy Roling with Gilbane, John Fleming and Daniel Atilano from Dewberry, and Commission Secretary Tasha Sims.

It was moved by Mr. Shepard, seconded by Ms. Nicholson and it was approved unanimously to allow fellow Vice Chairman Larry Lundgren to attend the meeting electronically via phone.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Shepard moved to approve the minutes of the Tuesday, January 3, 2017 meeting and Ms. Nicholson seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Shepard made the motion to approve the agenda as presented and Ms. Nicholson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Kerner introduced John Fleming, Mechanical Engineer and Daniel Atilano, Principal at Dewberry Architects Inc. Both gentlemen were present to answer any questions that may arise during discussions later on in the meeting.

JAIL EXPANSION PROJECT

Construction Update:

Mr. Jeremy Roling of Gilbane gave a PowerPoint presentation for the construction status update on the Jail Expansion Project. Mr. Roling reviewed that the submittal and RFI (Request for Information) reviews are ongoing and coordination drawings have been submitted for most the MEPFP Contractors. There have been 113 RFI's that have been submitted to date and submittals are 85% complete. To date, there are 45 Request for Pricing (RFP's) and 17 Architects Supplemental Instructions (ASI's). Structural steel fabrication is now 100% complete, precast erection is approximately 75% complete and currently on sequence 4. Steel erection is underway on sequence 7 or 8, concrete foundations work is wrapping up on the east wall infilling at the crane access ramp, and temporary heating is ongoing in the basement with

heating of the first floor starting the week of February 6th. Mr. Roling additionally shared that the foundation waterproofing was able to continue with warmer temperatures, the main electrical gear was set in the room and protected prior to plank install, overhead electrical work is well underway in the west basement, and overhead sanitary waste and vent piping is underway in the west basement. Mr. Roling also added that the large crane is scheduled to be leaving in late February. Mr. Roling reviewed project progress photos with the Commissioners through the month of January.

Upcoming work activities that were explained included precast and steel erection for the building is set to be wrapping up in February, detailing into March, sally port and bridge precast and steel are scheduled for early March, concrete slab pours will be starting on the first floor west and moving up the west side, overhead plumbing and electrical will continue, underground electrical will be installed in the basement, underground plumbing will be installed in the east basement, foundation backfill will follow the first floor slab pour, and spray fireproofing and interior masonry is scheduled to start in late March, all weather permitting.

Mr. Roling shared that the allowance tracking logs showed that the current value to date is \$115,653.39 with \$325,956.17 left in allowances. He also reiterated that the allowance amount is completely separate from the contingency amount that is talked about later on during the change orders. Some of the largest additional expenses lately have been labor for pumping water and building temporary enclosures for grouting of the precast.

Jail Cell Duct Work

Mr. Kerner reviewed that as previously discussed, as designed, the location of the supply and return ducts in the cells are currently located on the back wall of the cell. That design has been further reviewed by Dewberry Engineers and the E-Cube the Commissioning Agent. DeKalb County staff would like to relocate the supply duct to the ceiling (opposite corner of the bunk) and lower the elevation of the return duct (closer to the ground by the toilet) on the back wall for a cost of \$35,000 and this change is coming forth to the Commission for their approval.

Mr. Scheffers added that he would like the supply duct in the ceiling in order for Officers to get a better view of the inmates who may try to tamper with the system. The reasoning for wanting to move the return duct (which is 100% exhaust) is the same, in order to make it a little harder for the inmates to tamper with.

Vice Chair Lundgren noted that he still wanted to pose the question to why this was not thought of during the design phase and he felt that not only would moving these ducts possibly alleviate tampering but he feels it would provide better air circulation.

Dewberry Mechanical Engineer John Fleming stated that he stands behind the original design and feels it would work properly as it is designed but if the Commission wants to change the positions of the ducts, as proposed, he feels it would still work fine as well.

Ms. Nicholson questioned that if the supply were moved to where staff proposes, would they really need to move the return down or could they leave the return alone. Mr. Scheffers noted that the reason for moving the return was to create a better circular airflow due to moving the supply higher. Mr. Fleming stated that the system would work either way and it wouldn't matter if the return was moved. He added if someone comes up with a plan that doesn't work performance-wise he will let them know but what is being proposed seems to be more of a convenience preference of where they are located in the cell to deter foul play.

The Commissioners continued to shared their thoughts and brainstormed different options. Mr. Shepard expressed that he was still having a difficult time justifying spending the money. Ms. Nicholson agreed

but also noted that if they did go with the change, they could help minimize Chief Klein's problems and Mr. Scheffer's operations.

Mr. Hanson suggested that a compromise may be to move one grille and not the other. Mr. Scheffers noted that if the Commissioners wanted to leave the return/exhaust where it is and move the supply to the ceiling, he would be fine with that. Mr. Roling shared that moving one, cost wise, it would come in at about \$24,000.00. The Commissioners briefly discussed their feelings on the compromise with Mr. Scheffers.

Mr. Shepard made a motion to move the jail cell supply ducts near the front of the cells, opposite of the beds, and to leave the return/exhaust ducts where they are shown on the original drawings in an amount Not to Exceed \$24,000.00. Mr. Larson seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mechanical Systems Changes

Mr. Kerner shared that a few weeks ago Dewberry staff and the Jail Team met and there were many questions raised regarding the mechanical system such as the function, the flow, and how it all worked. Through that meeting it was discovered that there are a few issues with the original design. The first was with the Isolation Rooms. The original design did not meet code. Dewberry has since obtained approval from the AHJ on a redesign and is proceeding with revisions to the drawings. A back-up fan was requested and that change will reflect on a future change order. Next, Mr. Kerner explained that Dewberry reviewed the exhaust fan selections and determined three units will need new selections. Two fans will be minimal cost, if any. The third fan will increase in size slightly to accommodate additional exhaust from the Property Room as requested and again, that change order will be coming next month.

The Air Handling Units (AHU) and the Rooftop Units (RTU) were looked at as well and Mr. Fleming explained that the issue that is being discussed with Mr. Scheffers right now is that originally there were to be two RTUs on the roof, one to serve the jail and the other to be a back up to the jail. There is also the empty shell space so the original design had RTU-1 serving the jail and RTU-2 (which is the same size as RTU-1) serving just the shell space. Then if RTU-1 were to ever fail, RTU-2 could serve the jail but that would leave the shell space unconditioned. In talking with Mr. Scheffers, Dewberry was thinking of a way to get this to work better and have the backups work more seamlessly. They are working right now on possibly upsizing the units on the roof so instead of 60 ton capacity they would be 75 ton capacity, that way one unit could serve the two floors of the jail and the shell space and the other one would serve as a backup. The problem with doing that is it would be a physically bigger unit than has already been designed. It would additionally be an upcharge to buy the bigger unit and would take some redesign time and labor to account for the weight and space. Mr. Fleming continued that the second option would be to leave the units as 60 ton and provide a third 17 ton unit just to serve the shell space. The Chairman inquired about the costs of these two options. Mr. Fleming shared that the 75 ton units cost \$32,000 more each for the units not including redesign costs and labor for reconfigurations. The additional 17 ton unit would cost \$16,000.

Mr. Scheffers stressed the importance of having 100% redundancy and noted that the smaller units wouldn't provide that because the shell space wouldn't be taken care of at the same time. The bigger units would provide for that 100% redundancy, one unit would run the whole building, if that goes down, they have another unit that they could keep running until they original is fixed. It was also noted that neither of these options would take care the future shell spaced built out.

Mr. Harvey questioned that if they have to add another unit once the shell space is built out in the future, would it be a rooftop unit and if so, asked if there was room on the roof for it and if the structural requirements in the current building have been done already. Mr. Fleming answered that there was room on the roof for it but depending on how the building is going to be laid out, typically they go back and reinforce the roof where the unit needs to be located in the future. Mr. Kerner noted that the second floor

structural steel was reinforced to account for the current future design layout but if that changes at all it will change everything.

Mr. Shepard questioned the increased operational costs of running 75 ton units instead of the already budgeted 60 ton units. He also expressed that he was having a hard time justify spending the money to increase the units when they could use temporary heating units in the shell space if needed and if it were to be summer, it shouldn't matter at all if it is conditioned. Vice Chair Lundgren also questioned the lifespan of the units and it was answered that with proper preventative maintenance they last about 20 years.

The Commissions and Mr. Fleming discussed the costs associated with the potential increase in units and all the other costs associated with redesign and labor. Ms. Nicholson noted that from her experience, if these are true design inadequacies and they need to have additional equipment, the costs for purchasing the new equipment she can see, but she questioned whether they should have to pay for the additional engineering design costs when it was something that should have been incorporated originally. Mr. Kerner reiterated that if the issue is Dewberry's issue the County would not pay, but if it a change in the scope of work from the original request then Dewberry will request additional fees.

It was clarified that the two 60 ton units would serve the jail only and the backup unit was going to run to serve shell space. If there was a problem with the main unit, the backup unit would turn on and serve the jail and would be less support for the shell space. The only part of the building that would not have redundancy is the shell space.

Chairman Swanson questioned how they can get past arguing if this was a design issue or a County request issue. Mr. Kerner answered that it is all in the occupation of the shell space because the initial intent of the design was for the shell space to be just a "shell space" which to them is an unoccupied space.

Chairman Swanson reviewed for clarification that the two 60 ton units would both be utilized at the same time in order to maintain the jail and shell space and if they had the 75 ton units, they would be alternating back and forth so one unit would run at a time as opposed to running two at a time. Mr. Fleming also noted both scenarios would cost roughly about the same to operate because you are only using as much energy that is needed to condition the space.

Mr. Fleming clarified that Dewberry's original design followed the intent that the shell space was an unoccupied space so they didn't design to have it conditioned like the rest of the jail. Chief Klein noted that there was obviously a miscommunication because there was never a differentiation of what space was occupied and or not occupied.

Ms. Nicholson reiterated that the two 60 tons would serve the jail and one would be used as a redundancy and if they were to add a 17 ton that would serve the shell space and in the future when the shell space is needed to be built out they would most likely be looking at the overall mechanics and doing upgrades at that time. It was also clarified that one 17 ton until would provide for conditioning of about 20 people if they were to occupy the shell space prior to it being built out.

Mr. Scheffers shared that in his opinion, if it would have been designed the way they had originally discussed they wouldn't be having this discussion right now. They talked about 100% redundancy for the whole building, including shell space, and looking at it now, in his opinion, it wasn't designed right.

Mr. Kerner shared that they started this project with one rooftop unit and two condensers, they then added another rooftop unit for redundancy for the occupied space and added another condenser for redundancy

for those spaces. Those drawings were shown and reviewed by staff and E Cube throughout the process. Dewberry provided the system that was requested.

After further discussions on the miscommunication regarding the shell space, Mr. Shepard from his experience, he sees the design was done to condition a certain number of cells and shell space. He noted that he sees shell space as minimally conditioned. He additionally suggested that he would offer as a compromise to use and alternate the two 60 ton units, in order to stay on schedule, and spend the additional money to purchase a 17 ton unit for the shell space if Dewberry will throw-in the design engineering to make everything work properly at no additional cost. There was also an understanding that there would be extra labor involved along with the purchase of the \$16,000 unit. Mr. Shepard expressed that yes he understood that and he was saying they could allocate about \$20-25,000 to this upgrade and let the professionals make it work for that.

Mr. Daniel Atilano stated that he appreciated the comments and discussion and the intent of Dewberry was certainly not to not listen to what Chief Klein and Mr. Scheffers wanted but they will make it right now and would accept the County purchasing the unit and Dewberry would absorb the additional design costs. It was agreed all around that this issues was a big misunderstanding.

Mr. Larson moved to proceed forward with the two 60 ton units they currently have, and approve to purchase a 17 ton unit in which the County will absorb the costs of as well as the costs for making the unit operational with the further understanding that Dewberry will absorb the design engineering costs for the revisions. Mr. Shepard seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. **See March 7, 2017 Minutes for Final Decision on This Issue**

Change Orders

Mr. Kerner referred to the color-coded version of the Change Order Log and began by defining the first three columns as follows: RFP is a Request for Proposal, ASI is Architectural Supplemental Instruction and PCI are changes coming from Gilbane. Mr. Kerner said to further simplify the report he has color-coded the columns as follows: gray indicates items that have been approved or are closed, yellow signifies items that are a work-in-progress and blue are the current items that require approval by the Commission. Additionally this month, an orange color was added to represent an update for final pricing when something was approved with a not to exceed condition. Mr. Kerner reviewed the following items with the Commission requiring approval: RFP #39R: a credit for deleting detention windows in three holding cells and a change in a latch; RFP #41: adding a talk through communicator in the amount of \$3,162.24; RFP #43: revisions to the Fire Alarm System discovered through code review many positive revisions were made for a total amount NTE \$21,256.00; RFP #44: shower revisions for plumbing fixtures to front access in an amount of \$448.80; RFP #45: beam penetration for MEP routing for 30 locations in an amount NTE \$3,144.35; PCI #80: relocation of clean out locations in the basement in an amount of \$4,808.82; RFP #48: roof beam connection to precast panel an amount NTE of \$3,961.10. Mr. Kerner reiterated that from the items in blue, they are asking for a total of \$35,485.31, and it is really a not to exceed cost.

Mr. Larson moved to approve RFPs #39R, 41, 43, 44, 45, 48, and PCI #80 for a not to exceed total of \$35,485.31. Ms. Nicholson seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Parking

Mr. Hanson shared that he just wanted to provide the Commissioners with a head up that once the outside of the building is complete and the inside work ramps up, the number of onsite workers is expected to go from about 20-25 to 60-70. Which means it is going to be extremely crowded on the campus even more than it is now and he is looking into way to alleviate parking issues in the surrounding area. The number one issue he is hearing complains on his parking and he is trying to find solutions before April when it is expected to get worse.

Loan Update

Mr. Hanson shared that there was another round of loans done in January so there has now been \$11 million internally borrowed. They are still on track to sell the bonds mid-June.

OLD BUSINESS / NEW BUSINESS

There were no items presented.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Larson, seconded by Ms. Nicholson and passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.


 Tasha Sims, Secretary


 Matt Swanson, Chairman



<u>Commissioners</u>	<u>Expiration of Term</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Original Appointment</u>
Mr. Mike Larson	September 30, 2020	Commissioner	November 17, 2010
Mr. Larry Lundgren	September 30, 2019	Vice Chairman	April 2, 2010
Ms. Cheryl Nicholson	September 30, 2018	Commissioner	August 19, 2015
Mr. Charles Shepard	September 30, 2021	Commissioner	October 1, 2011
Mr. Matt Swanson	September 30, 2017	Chairman	September 19, 2007
<u>Non-Voting Officers</u>			
Ms. Tasha Sims	September 30, 2017	Secretary	October 4, 2016
Mr. Gary H. Hanson	September 30, 2017	Treasurer	February 18, 1984

Note: These minutes are not official until approved by the Public Building Commission at a subsequent meeting. Please refer to the meeting minutes when these minutes are approved to obtain any changes to these minutes.