



**CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD  
FACILITIES COMMITTEE MINUTES  
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois**

**MINUTES – *Approved as Distributed April 7, 2026***

---

**DATE:** Tuesday, February 3, 2026  
**TIME:** 6:33 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Shields-Carter Meeting Room  
Bennett Administrative Center  
102 E. Main St., Urbana IL 61801

---

**Committee Members**

**Present:** Dennise Arres, Stephanie Fortado, Elly Hanauer-Friedman, Jenny Lokshin, Bethany Vanichtheeranont, Daniel Wiggs, and Jeff Wilson

**Absent:** Ben Crane

**County Staff:** Michelle Jett (Acting Facilities Director), Steve Summers (County Executive), and Mary Ward (Recording Clerk)

**Others Present:** Chris Smith (Building and Grounds Manager), Jennifer Locke (Board Chair), Judge Rosenbaum, and Lori Hansen

---

**Agenda**

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Lokshin called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared present.

II. Approval of Agenda/Addenda

**MOTION** by Mr. Wilson to approve the agenda; seconded by Mr. Wiggs. Upon voice vote, the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes – January 6, 2026

**MOTION** by Mx. Arres to approve the January 6, 2026 minutes; seconded by Ms. Vanichtheeranont. Upon voice vote, the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

IV. Public Input

There was no public input.

Ms. Hanauer-Friedman joined the meeting at 6:31 p.m.

V. Communications

There were no communications.

VI. New Business

**A. Discussion and Approval of ITB 2026-XXX Champaign County Select Demolition For Champaign County, Illinois, 1701 East Main St., Urbana (Old Nursing Home)**

Ms. Smalley with Bailey Edward was present to discuss the bid documents for the old Nursing Home at 1701 E Main. Sealed bids are due Tuesday, February 24, no later than 4 p.m. A pre-bid conference will be held on-site on Tuesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>.

Mx. Arres asked if anyone could attend the pre-bid meeting. Ms. Smalley said they can but typically it is interested bidders. They can look at the property, are walked through the process and can ask questions. Questions are usually not answered there but are put in a document as an addendum that is sent out. Mx. Arres asked about the bid process and if it was decided then and there. Bids are closed and collected at 4 p.m. and then they are read publicly.

Mr. Wilson asked if anything on the inside was salvageable. No, there is mold everywhere and there may be lead based paint. He also asked if there were any anticipated issues. There may be some structural stability issues as they take the building down.

The question was asked where in the building the pre-bid meeting would be. No one will be allowed in the building due to issues with mold, lead paint, stability, etc. It will be held on the grounds surrounding the building.

Mr. Wiggs asked about the LEEDS Certification section in the bid document on page 221. That was accidentally put in. It will be removed. Ms. Hanauer-Friedman asked about the total cost of the project. With the connection that needs to be closed off at ILEAS, it will be approximately \$1.4 million. Just the removal of the old nursing home will be \$900,000+. We are splitting this cost with Highway so they can build a cold storage building once the land is cleared.

Ms. Vanichtheeranont asked if there was any concern with asbestos. At this time, we believe it is all gone.

**MOTION** by Mx. Arres to approve the release of ITB 2026-XXX Champaign County Select Demolition bid document with the removal of the LEEDS Certification section; seconded by Mr. Wiggs. Upon voice vote, the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

**B. Champaign County Courtroom Feasibility Report**

Ms. Smalley shared the Courtroom Feasibility Report for splitting Courtroom F into two Courtrooms to allow space for the new judge we were given last year. The approximate cost of splitting Courtroom F is \$500,000. Ms. Hanauer-Friedman asked what makes the range amount? It would depend on when this goes out for bid. Ms. Fortado questioned that the furnishings came in at \$0. Do we have furnishings? The bench for the judge and witness stand would need to be built. The furnishing would be just the tables/chairs for the prosecution and defense and some spectator seating.

Ms. Jett had passed out a spreadsheet showing Courthouse capital projects for the next few years.

Ms. Hanauer-Friedman asked, if this is added to FY26, are there any capital projects that can be deferred to another year. We would need to have a conversation about priorities. Replacing the carpet and wallpaper could probably be deferred.

Judge Rosenbaum was present and asked for his thoughts. While the carpet/wallpaper is 25 years old, looks bad and needs replacement, the Courtroom is the number one priority.

Ms. Fortado stated that we don't want to delay tuck pointing the building and any elevator work, as they are not usually something that can be moved to a later date.

Ms. Hanauer-Friedman asked what the timeline would be. Once approved, it would take eight to nine months to design and then go out to bid. Actual construction will be done depending on the Court's schedule. Ms. Jett said it's likely this would not be completed this year. Ms. Fortado added that it may require weekend work, which would be an extra cost i.e. no jackhammers next door to jury trials.

Direction is needed from the committee. Members wanted to hear about the chillers before deciding what direction to go.

### **C. Courthouse Chiller Project**

Jim Gleason, GHR Engineers, presented the report on the Courthouse Chillers. There are currently two chillers on the Courthouse roof. They've been in place for 25 years, their service life is 20 years, and they are starting to fail. Compressors and other parts have started to go out.

In designing the project, they considered the projected expansion of the Courthouse, which will increase the cooling load, and it will increase it beyond the cooling load of what we currently have. They estimated what the new load would be based on some projected increase in area. They added that to the existing load and came up with a couple of chiller sizes and two chillers and started working from there. The new chillers would be larger than the existing units. They won't fit the same footprint where the existing chillers are.

There is also a phasing issue. We can't take the building down completely. It would need to be done in the "shoulder season"; spring or fall, when we can get by with one machine. They would be replaced one at a time.

Some screening, in the form of the mansard roof on the newer addition that would need to be taken down to allow the chillers to breathe. Will work on other screening/methods on the south to help keep the sound down. The portion of the roof where the chillers are located is concrete. It was built that way to soak up sound and vibration to the benefit of the people in the building. Will continue to take advantage of the concrete roof that is there.

Space issues at the Courthouse will become really critical. The question is, do we replace the chillers pound for pound for what we have now at a cost of \$750,000 to \$1 million. Or do we

replace for the anticipated larger load and building expansion at an approximate cost of \$2 million.

Ms. Hanauer-Friedman asked if the expansion took place in 5-10 years, would the chillers need to be moved for the expansion project? Mr. Gleason said no, they are tucked away on the west end, and any expansion would be on the east. He also cautioned that replacing for the same load size is not as easy as it sounds. The units are bigger, so some of the curbing, etc. that is there will need to be adjusted. Also, the current units are too close together. There needs to be adequate spacing for them to work correctly.

Mr. Wiggs stated that if one of the chillers goes, the other is not big enough to carry the load for the whole building. Ms. Fortado asked where the chillers are currently located, if they would be able to service an expanded building. They would. She also asked if this was a job that would need to be done on the weekends?

It's estimated to bring in a big crane on the weekend to lift the units onto the roof. They would need to close the street for this. This is something that would have to be done when the public is not going in and out of the building. Once that is done, work could continue without disruptions. Ms. Fortado asked what is the estimated length of time to replace one chiller? It would be approximately 10 weeks. Also, we do not want to do this work in the wintertime as it is a lot of roof work and the weather/footing is not ideal.

Mr. Wiggs asked Chris Smith, Building & Grounds Manager, for his opinion. He said it wouldn't take long to lose a building if one of units goes down. There is only one original compressor left, all the others have been replaced. The last one was replaced two years ago.

Discussion continued with various scenarios and questions being raised and finances being looked at for this project as well as the Courtroom project and the future Courthouse expansion.

All we hear is that there is no more room at the Courthouse and we need to do something soon, but there is no money. There are long-ranging implications no matter what.

Judge Rosenbaum was asked his opinion. He hopes it is not going to pit one project against another. Sharing a Courtroom is a miserable solution. Judges cannot wait for an expansion. We can probably handle it like this for a year to a year and a half. Can we look at taking funds from other places around the county? Everyone hates the way we are doing it now.

Ms. Fortado asked about the larger expansion; can you wait beyond five years if the Courtroom is split now? If the expansion was 15 to 20 years down the road? They could; it would be tight but adequate. You really need to check with other Courthouse departments. They are the ones out of space.

Mx. Arres asked if there are other projects, besides the Courthouse, that could be shifted to free up funds. Ms. Jett said she would check with the Maintenance team to see what could be shifted around

Ms. Fortado reminded the committee that the Public Safety Sales Tax fund has been used to help prop up the General Fund and there is not much wiggle room left.

Mr. Wilson would like to see all the CARF projects. Without the complete list, it is hard to prioritize what else could be moved to help with these projects. He feels splitting the Courtroom should be a priority.

The desire is to move forward with splitting the Courtroom and Ms. Jett will be back with more options for potentially covering both projects.

**D. ARPA Spending Update**

The green energy project with rebates is in progress now. The remaining money that has not been allocated and the rebate money is being held to help pay for the old nursing home demolition. Ms. Jett considers everything from ARPA to be spent at this point.

**VII. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**VIII. Presiding Officer's Report**

There was no presiding officer's report.

**A. Future Meeting – March 3, 2026 @ 6:30 pm**

Ms. Lokshin announced that the next meeting will be on March 3 at 6:30 p.m.

**IX. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda**

There were no items for the Consent Agenda.

**X. Adjournment**

Chair Lokshin adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.