Members Present
Mr. Nicholos, Mr. Bossert, Ms. Bernard, Mr. Bertrand, Ms. Hertzberger, Mr. James, Mr. Marcotte, Mr. Tripp, Mr. Vickery, Mr. Whitis and Mr. Yates.

Members Absent
Ms. Waskosky.

In Attendance
Mr. McLaren, Mr. Whitten, Delbert Miller, Dave Cagle, Rick Einfeldt, Bruce Clark, Judge Erickson, John Snyder and Kevin Duval.

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Bossert at 8:00 a.m. Quorum present.

2. Public Comment
None.

3. Approval of Minutes
A motion was made by Mr. James and seconded by Mr. Tripp to approve the minutes from October 25, 2006. Motion carried.

4. Delbert Miller- Facilities Manager
a. Update on Fire Escape
Mr. Miller advised that KJWW Engineering has completed their study on our fire escape. They have determined that the following is needed:
- Anchors replaced
- Additional bracing to be welded in
- Some of the rust/scale removed and repainted
The next step will be to take this out for bid to get the work done. Mr. Miller anticipates that the cost will be far less than the other alternative and commencement will take place when the weather permits or near the Spring.

Mr. James felt that this issue should be taken care of as rapidly as possible and if they happen to get shut down due to foul weather then that would be okay. He didn’t think that stopping at this point because the weather conditions were not perfect for them to work in was not an issue that should be put aside. This is a safety issue.

Mr. Miller agreed with Mr. James and said the only thing they should hold off or wait on would be the painting.
A motion to proceed with the bidding process and to keep this issue moving was made by Mr. James and seconded by Ms. Bernard. Motion carried by a roll call vote of 12 ayes and 0 nays.

5. Resolution in Support of the Local Historical Preservation’s Attempt to make the Courthouse a National Historical Landmark

Mr. Nicholas addressed this issue and said what is needed is for the State’s Attorney’s Office to draft a resolution from this Committee saying that the County Board is in support of the Local Historical Preservation Society’s attempt to put the Courthouse on a national registry of historical landmarks. He explained that the Hearing process has already started and he felt that it would be a good gesture from this County to do that and support it. At this time, Mr. Nicholas was requesting the State’s Attorney’s Office draft a resolution in regard to this issue.

Mr. Tripp asked should they know some more about this, what it entails and what’s involved if they do that. If they do this, what does that mean, what we can do and cannot do with that building?

Mr. Nicholas said it doesn’t keep us from doing anything with that building. Except that the Preservation Society would work in conjunction with us on some plans. He said that he had talked with members of the Historical Preservation Society already (Mrs. Hinton) and told them, in a best case scenario, what we would like to do down there and they were very supportive of it.

Mr. Tripp said that he wasn’t against this, but there were things we need to know about it. Mr. Nicholas replied that it has already started and there was not much we could do to stop it anyway.

A motion to request the State’s Attorney’s Office to draft a resolution in support of the Local Historical Preservation’s Attempt to make the Courthouse a National Historical Landmark was made by Mr. Nicholas and seconded by Mr. James. Motion carried.

Mr. Yates stated that if this Board goes about the business of making a resolution in reference to making the Courthouse a national landmark, that does, in fact, limit the amount of things you can do in terms of repairs – you can’t do structural changes or any of those type of things. He said his concern was, are they by chance implicitly making a recommendation and/or turning away any thoughts or are we implying we just want to go forward in building a new Courthouse as opposed to doing repairs on the current one.

Mr. Nicholas said it does not restrict us from doing any repairs to the building at all. There was already a Hearing – the State’s Attorney’s Office
was present at the Hearing in Springfield – it does not preclude us from doing any repairs to the building at all. To the contrary, doing that they would promote the fact that we would try to do whatever we could, especially if it comes to bringing it back to how the Courthouse looked previously. All they would do is work in conjunction with you.

Mr. Yates asked if the County had reviewed what stipulations that are due to us that is associated with landmarks?

Mr. Nicholas said that the Preservation Society can go forth as they have without the support of the County Board and do this, which is what they have already done. Mr. Nicholas further said that this Committee, Mr. James and Ms. Bernard met with the Preservation Society as a subcommittee about 6-7 months ago when they first brought this to their attention.

Mr. Bossert said what he was hearing was concern and perhaps a presentation by this group to this Committee might be in order. He said a resolution still could be drafted and have ready, but it might be an opportunity to ask questions of the entire Committee and get some of these questions resolved. He also asked if it was possible to get a representative to come here from the local preservation society.

Mr. Nicholas said that the State’s Attorney’s Office would be able to answer those questions, because they were present at the Hearing.

Ms. Hertzberger sought clarification -- we could do repairs to the building, but there is no moving of walls, etc.

Mr. Nicholas replied that that was not true.

Ms. Hertzberger further said, “so you could go in there and just revamp the whole inside of the Courthouse?”

Mr. Nicholas said that you can go in there and bring the Courthouse back to what it previously appeared as.

Ms. Hertzberger said that was not what she was asking. What she was asking was, can you make it look different – make rooms bigger, etc.

Mr. Nicholas replied, “yes” you can make rooms bigger and move walls.

Mr. Whitis explained that his experience was that as Mr. Nicholas had said – it all has to be going back to the original structure of the building. If it doesn’t have anything to do with the original structure of the building, then you can’t do it. As far as repairs, everything has to be vintage so there’s a
cost burden associated to the County and that would be his concern. However, he was not against it and being new like Mr. Yates, they don’t know a lot about it, but his concern would be that it does put on a financial burden, because everything is more expensive.

Mr. James stated that on December 8th they had a meeting here, which everyone was invited to attend, with the Historic Preservation and he had all the information. He said it was well explained – the group was enthusiastic about going forward with it and if there was any particular thing anyone wanted to know about it, ask him and he will look it up – he had the answers right here. He further said that this is a step forward for the County and something that action had to be taken on now because it had already started. Kankakee has a Historic Preservation District now that’s rated as one of the top in the State.

Mr. Nicholas confirmed that the outside of the Courthouse building would not be changed.

Mr. Bossert suggested moving ahead with drafting the resolution and distributing the literature that Mr. James had in his possession so that this issue could be further discussed at the next Committee meeting.

(Recording Secretary will copy information and place in each member’s mailbox).

6. Counter for County Clerk’s Office

Mr. Clark advised that the space in the County Clerk’s Office has become limited due to a number of things. They have become full capacity with the County Board records from the old Coroner’s Office. In addition, early voting has increased a need for space and they anticipate that increase is a need for growth. He said he was looking around various places to find additional space not only for the early voting and County Board records, but they are also limited in space with their new electronic voting system that has filled up the capacity very quickly. He had turned to his existing office for increasing the space and one way to do that is to utilize the space that customers/public uses at the reference desks to use that for office space. In order to do that, he was suggesting that a counter be built similar to the Assessor’s Office whereas filing cabinets could be stored underneath those counters and use those counters to wait on customers. This way, it would free up some additional space in the main office for records usage. The counter would provide some security for records that are stored in the office. In addition, the installation of glass tops that computers would fit under would also be useful.

At this time, Mr. Clark was asking the Committee for consideration. He said he had discussed this issue with Mr. Miller. He further advised that
they would need a counter; they may need someone to make a recommendation on how that counter would look, because they would want it to meet all of the ADA standards for people with disabilities. They also have special needs and privacy in terms of people who wait for long periods of time completing passports and marriage licenses. This counter would have to be aesthetically pleasing, because it would be the first thing you would see when you walk into this County building.

Mr. Miller advised that he and Mr. Clark had discussed this issue yesterday and he understood his reasoning of shifting his area around to make it more efficient and the space that he has, he is trying to utilize in a better manner. He further said that years ago, the Maintenance Department did build the counters in the Assessor’s Office and if he could get specifications (i.e., width, height, etc.), he did not see any reason why they could not do this for him.

Mr. Clark suggested some drawings that would meet some areas that he may be able to foresee or solicitation from the Architect, Bob Bohlmann to draw out a plan.

Mr. McLaren said that he was in favor of this and would like to see Messrs. Miller and Clark get together and see if they could come up with something on their own rather than help from the Architect. If it can be done in-house, he certainly would like to see that happen, if possible. It would save a little bit of money and if it runs into any problems, we can always bring it back to the other alternative.

Mr. Tripp said he supported moving ahead with this issue and not to disagree with Mr. McLaren, he would like to see the Architect involved. The County is paying the Architect by the hour and he was sure that they would not spend much time doing that and it would help play this out a little better. With the three of them working together, they could get a design and then go out for bid and he would like to make that motion.

Mr. Vickery said he supported what Mr. Tripp said -- not to disagree with his colleague. He felt that Mr. Miller’s staff could build it, but to engineer or design it, this is the first thing that the public would see when they enter into the door and he would like for it to be pleasing and efficient and he supports getting Mr. Bohlmann involved with a simple sketch and give some plans to Mr. Miller so his staff could build it and make it ADA compliant.

Mr. Miller confirmed that when the Maintenance Department did the Assessor’s Office countertop, there was no Architect involved. However, the difference between the Assessor's and the County Clerk's is there are a lot of different turns and there are different heights and levels. He
wasn’t saying that they could not do this, but there were some parts (glass counter tops) that he would farm to outside business for recommendations.

A motion to move ahead with this project as quickly as possible and have Messers. Clark, Miller and Bohlmann work together on a design in order to obtain a bid and return back to this Committee with a bid recommendation was made by Mr. Tripp and seconded by Mr. Vickery.

Mr. McLaren said that this is not going out for bid, but it was in the motion and asked what was being put out for bid, because he thought this was being done in-house.

A motion to move ahead with this project as quickly as possible and engage Bob Bohlmann of RGB Architectural Group, Inc., for a design and to consult with Messrs. Clark and Miller and return back to this Committee with a recommendation was made by Mr. Tripp and seconded by Mr. Vickery. Motion carried by a roll call vote of 10 ayes and 0 nays.

Mr. McLaren said further to this issue, as for moving the computers, Mr. Duval should be involved. He was sure there will be cost in moving these computers and Mr. Duval should also report back to this Committee for his input as well.

7. Old Business
None.

8. New Business
Mr. Bossert stated that Chairman Mr. Nicholas, wanted him to mention that he would like to move the time for this Committee to 9:00 a.m.

Historically, this has been an early meeting, because of Judiciary and State’s Attorney’s Office involvement in discussion concerning the Courthouse.

Judge Erickson said that 9:00 a.m. was fine, except if the Committee was looking for more Judicial input, it could limit the length of time. If there were specific issues that come up that the Committee would like to have input from the Judiciary, he was sure that a meeting could be arranged.

Effective immediately, the Development and Operations meeting will now be held at 9:00 a.m., instead of 8:00 a.m.

9. Adjournment
A motion was made by Mr. Tripp and seconded by Mr. Whitis to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 a.m. Motion carried.
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