



Property Committee

Greg Longfellow, Chairman
James Carius Community Room
101 S. Capitol Street
Pekin, Illinois 61554
Tuesday, August 20, 2024 – 3:30 p.m.

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approve the minutes of the July 23, 2024 meeting and August 7, 2024 in-place meeting
- III. Public Comment
- IV. New Business
 - P-24-23 A. Recommend to approve bid for McKenzie Building exterior limestone replacement and repair
 - B. Discussion: Justice Center Annex
- V. Reports and Communications
- VI. Unfinished Business
- VII. Recess

Members: Chairman Greg Longfellow, Dave Mingus, Bill Atkins, Mark Goddard, Nick Graff, Jon Hopkins, Kim Joesting, Tammy Rich-Stimson, Max Schneider

Minutes pending committee approval



Property Committee Meeting

James Carius Community Room
Tuesday, July 23, 2024 – 3:30 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Greg Longfellow, Vice-Chair Dave Mingus, Bill Atkins, Nick Graff, Jon Hopkins, Kim Joesting, Tammy Rich-Stimson, Max Schneider

Committee Members Absent: Mark Goddard

MOTION **MOTION BY MEMBER MINGUS, SECOND BY MEMBER RICH-STIMSON** to approve the minutes of the June 18, 2024 meeting and June 26, 2024 in-place meeting

On voice vote, **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

MOTION

P-24-20

MOTION BY MEMBER SCHNEIDER, SECOND BY MEMBER GRAFF

to recommend to approve bid for countertops and cabinetry at 1800 Broadway in Pekin

On voice vote, **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

DISCUSSION: Justice Center Annex

Matt Bickel from Wold Architects and Engineering provided handouts to the committee members which outlined the options that have been discussed for the Justice Center Annex.

Member Jon Hopkins arrived to the meeting at 3:33 p.m.

Mr. Bickel stated that Option F would meet the County's needs and is closest to the budget that was previously identified. He stated that Option G would be to build the shell of the building master planning the full long term needs of the county and then begin to build out that shell over time.

Mr. Bickel stated that all options include the following design criteria:

1. Times Building property not required
2. Secure connection to Justice Center
3. Single-Point secured public entry
4. Achieves three-way separation
5. Ability for future expansion

Mr. Bickel stated that within options F and G, they have come up with several variations all aimed at trying to achieve as many of the criteria that they have identified through their efforts with the core planning group.

The handout provided by Mr. Bickel provided the following summary of the options:

- Option F-1 – Total cost of \$32,943,248 – including 3 finished courtrooms, shelled space for the State’s Attorney, shelled space for probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 60,400
- Option F-2 – Total cost of \$34,602,048 – including 3 finished courtrooms, finished space for State’s Attorney, shelled space for probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 60,400
- Option F-3 – Total cost of \$37,705,239 – including 3 finished courtrooms, finished space for State’s Attorney, probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 60,400
- Option F-4 – Total cost of \$44,042,739 – including 3 finished courtrooms and 3 shelled courtrooms, finished space for State’s Attorney, probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 79,900
- Option F-5 – Total cost of \$45,173,635 – including 4 finished courtrooms, finished space for State’s Attorney, probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 74,165
- Option G-1 – Total cost of \$35,473,022 – including shelled space for 6 total courtrooms, shelled space for State’s Attorney, shelled space for probation/drug treatment, shelled space for Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex, and shelled space for Circuit Clerk.
- Option G-2 – Total cost of \$50,266,788 – including 3 finished courtrooms, finished space for State’s Attorney, probation/drug treatment, Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex, and shelled space Circuit Clerk.

Mr. Bickel stated that during normal business hours, every person coming into the building would come in through the main entrance. He stated that

there would be an after hour only entrance which would be secure and would not allow anyone to enter any other areas of the courthouse. Mr. Bickel provided an overview of each site plan option.

Member Graff asked for clarification and stated that if we do option F-3, we are building a basement plus floors 1 and 2 and any future additions would require major new construction. He stated that if we go with F-4, we are building a basement plus floors 1-3 with the third floor shelled so when it's time to add those courtrooms, we do not have major construction, just interior construction. Mr. Bickel confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Bickel stated that option F-5 is similar to F-3 and F-4. He stated that this option removes some mechanical and electrical space from the lower levels of the building. He stated that MEP/storage would move from the basement to the third floor.

Member Graff asked for clarification that options F-4 and F-5 include the building being fully equipped including desks, etc. Mr. Bickel confirmed that includes total project costs including a 10% contingency.

Mr. Bickel stated that Option G1 is building the shell of the full build which would include everything that we would need now and in the future. He stated that we would build the building then slowly finish the space. The differences between Options G1 and G2 is the G2 option includes 3 total courtrooms and shelled space for 3 total courtrooms, finished space for State's Attorney, probation/drug treatment, Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex, and shelled space Circuit Clerk – full department.

Member Harris stated that F-3, F-4, and F5 are all over the budget amount and asked where we plan on finding the money. He also questioned what we will do with the courthouse since he has heard comments that the courthouse has a short life expectancy of not 100 years, it's 20 years or 50 years.

Chairman Longfellow stated that there are CIP funds for the courthouse for HVAC and windows. He stated that the public defender is going to move out of the Tazewell Bank Building into the State's Attorney's office.

Member Graff asked Mr. Bickel what option he would recommend. Mr. Bickel stated that the merits of F-3 and F-4 are very strong. He stated that there is a cost increase, however, we will never see the cost as low as it is today. He stated that Option F-5 does not give us as much flexibility for the future.

Member Graff stated that Option F-3 gets us by but for \$6,337,500 it takes us to F-4 and gives us more flexibility and takes us into the future. He believes it would be foolish not to do the F-4 project versus the F-3 project.

Administrator Mike Deluhery stated that he and Assistant Administrator/Finance Director Mindy Darcy have been working through the budget process and working on a final draft for FY25. He stated that they budgeted a relatively low interest rate for the CIP fund and it has done significantly better than expected. He stated that they had roughly \$100,000 budgeted and now are estimating closer to \$2,000,000 by the end of this year. He stated that the other component is the General Fund balance and stated that it has continued to grow over the last couple of years. He stated that they are estimating that the fund balance at the end of 2025 would be 76% of the general fund expenses. He stated that if they were to use the existing fund balance and bring it down to what they expect to be 50% level next year, that would be an additional \$9,300,000. He stated that it assumes not spend any funds on contingency. He stated that it also maintains the capital improvement plan funds set aside for the buildings in the five year capital plan that was approved. He stated that the board approved \$34,400,000 for the justice center annex project in the budget this year.

Administrator Deluhery stated that the board had approved going to 50% of the existing fund balance for FY24, so it is financially feasible.

Assistant Administrator/Finance Director Mindy Darcy stated that she personally would not feel comfortable going below 50% of the fund balance.

Member Graff stated that he did a quick calculation and the cost difference between the F3 and F4 is \$325 a square feet for the third floor and representatives from Wold confirmed that is a close calculation which is a discounted rate.

Chairman Longfellow received consensus from the committee to move forward with Option F-4.

Member Hopkins voiced his preference of either F-3 or F-4.

Members Schneider and Joesting voiced their preference of Option F-1 to stay within the budget.

DISCUSSION: Generator for 1800 Broadway

Chairman Longfellow stated that they priced out a 80 kilowatt full service Caterpillar generator to supply the whole building. He stated that the cost is \$116,000. He stated that another option is to get a smaller unit that would cost around \$30,000.

Chairman Longfellow received consensus from the members to move

forward with the 80 kilowatt generator.

RECESS Chairman Longfellow recessed the meeting at 4:46 p.m.

(transcribed by S. Gullette)

DRAFT



Minutes pending committee approval

In-Place Property Committee Meeting

James Carius Community Room

Wednesday, August 7, 2024 – 6:07 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Greg Longfellow, Vice-Chair Dave Mingus, Bill Atkins, Nick Graff, Jon Hopkins, Kim Joesting, Tammy Rich-Stimson, Max Schneider

Committee Members Absent: Mark Goddard

MOTION

P-24-22

MOTION BY MEMBER GRAFF, SECOND BY MEMBER ATKINS

to recommend to approve schematic design for new Justice Center Annex

Matt Bickel from Wold Architects and Engineering presented a presentation outlining the options that have been discussed for the Justice Center Annex.

Mr. Bickel stated that the dollar figures that are being presented when he talks about total project cost include the construction costs, design fee, construction testing, surveying, etc. as well as furniture, fixtures, and equipment.

Mr. Bickel stated that the costs include a 10% contingency.

Mr. Bickel stated that all options include the following design criteria:

1. Times Building property not required
2. Secure connection to Justice Center
3. Single-Point secured public entry
4. Achieves three-way separation
5. Ability for future expansion

The handout provided by Mr. Bickel provided the following summary of the options:

Option F-1 – Total cost of \$32,943,248 – including 3 finished courtrooms, shelled space for the State's Attorney, shelled space for probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 60,400

Option F-2 – Total cost of \$34,602,048 – including 3 finished courtrooms, finished space for State's Attorney, shelled space for probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to

annex. Total building square feet: 60,400

Option F-3 – Total cost of \$37,705,239 – including 3 finished courtrooms, finished space for State's Attorney, probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 60,400

Option F-4 – Total cost of \$44,042,739 – including 3 finished courtrooms and 3 shelled courtrooms, finished space for State's Attorney, probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 79,900

Option F-5 – Total cost of \$45,173,635 – including 4 finished courtrooms, finished space for State's Attorney, probation/drug treatment, and Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex. Total building square feet: 74,165

Option G-1 – Total cost of \$35,473,022 – including shelled space for 6 total courtrooms, shelled space for State's Attorney, shelled space for probation/drug treatment, shelled space for Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex, and shelled space for Circuit Clerk.

Option G-2 – Total cost of \$50,266,788 – including 3 finished courtrooms, finished space for State's Attorney, probation/drug treatment, Circuit Clerk traffic moved to annex, and shelled space Circuit Clerk.

Member Graff asked for clarification that Options F1, F2, F3 and F5 all require future property acquisition, and Mr. Bickel confirmed that this is correct.

Member Schneider asked Mr. Bickel how often he deals with design changes in projects as large as ours. Mr. Bickel stated that in regards to the shelled spaces, you could get down the road years from now and decide that another department could go into the space instead of an additional courtroom.

Member Harris stated that in his experience of contingency, 10% is an average figure and it usually goes over on major building projects.

Mr. Bickel stated that in their experience with new construction, the average is less than 1% in total change orders.

Chairman Zimmerman stated that when they built the jail, they had 4% contingency.

Member Crawford questioned who determined how many courtrooms were necessary. Mr. Bickel stated that since the current courthouse has 6, they

started with that number. He stated that at minimum, they determined that they would need courtrooms for criminal, felony, and misdemeanor courts. He stated that a fourth courtroom was discussed which would be for juvenile court.

Member Crawford questioned if one courtroom could serve multi-purposes.

Judge Doscotch stated that it would not be practical to share courtrooms due to trials and schedules, etc.

Mr. Bickel stated that it would be best practice to have a designated courtroom for each court.

Member Schneider questioned the cost of the 3+ future addition. Mr. Bickel stated that the 3+ future addition costs are not included in the total project cost.

Chairman Zimmerman stated that if security is needed in the old courthouse and the new courthouse, it would cost around \$450,000 a year.

Mr. Bickel stated that during normal business hours, every person coming into the building would come in through the main entrance. He stated that there would be an after hour only entrance which would be secure and would not allow anyone to enter any other areas of the courthouse.

Member Atkins questioned how much a shelled courtroom would cost to be finished and John or Scott from Wold stated that it would be about \$2,000,000-\$2,500,000.

On voice vote, **MOTION CARRIED**

Member Schneider voted nay

RECESS

Chairman Longfellow recessed the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

(transcribed by S. Gullette)

COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Tazewell County Board:

Your Property Committee has considered the following RESOLUTION and recommends that it be adopted by the Board:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the County's Property Committee recommends to the County Board to approve the bid for exterior limestone replacement and repair at the McKenzie Building at 11 S. 4th Street, Pekin, Illinois; and

WHEREAS, the following bids for Project #2024-P-14 were submitted for review: Western Specialty Contractors and Mr. Mason Contractor, L.L.C. Western Specialty Contractors was deemed the best bid option at the project cost of \$134,890; and

WHEREAS, the project was funded for in the 2024 Capital Improvement Plan; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator recommends approving the bid and is authorized to move forward with the project as submitted.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the County Board approve this recommendation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Clerk notifies the County Board Office, the Facilities Director, the Finance Director, and the Auditor of this action.

PASSED THIS 28th DAY OF AUGUST, 2024.

ATTEST:

Tazewell County Clerk

Tazewell County Board Chairman

Tazewell County

Project # 2024-P-14
 McKenzie Building Exterior
 Limestone Replacement &
 Repair

08.13.2024 @ 2:00 pm

Bidder:	Western Specialty Contractors	Mr. Mason Contractor, L.L.C	X
Date/Time Received:	08.13.2024 @ 9:40 am	08.13.2024 @ 1:52 pm	X
Base Bid: including all material costs, labor, freight, disposal of removed materials, repairs, etc.	\$134,890	\$144,100	X
Optional Cost/Considerations:	See Attached	None	X
Rate for Time and Material Calculations	N/A	\$87.00 plus 15% overhead & profit on Labor & Material	X
Warrant Terms: Sample letter should be included in the proposal	1 Year, attached	1 Year, standard warranty	X
Start Date	09.24.2024	09.16.2024	X
Completion Date/Number of Days to Completion	90 Calendar Days, weather permitting	11.22.2024	X