



Chairman: Jay Stewart

Members: Ed Bedore, Ricardo Morales, Larry Ivory, Bill Black

Minutes – June 4, 2015 Meeting

Present in Springfield: Jay Stewart
Ed Bedore
Bill Black

Present Via Telephone: Rick Morales

Absent: Larry Ivory

The Board started the meeting by confirming attendance at 10:00 a.m. Member Bedore made a motion to allow Member Morales to participate in the meeting via telephone and Chairman Stewart seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The first item on the agenda was the approval of the Board meeting minutes from May 7, 2015. Member Morales stated that the minutes state that Member Black is both present and absent. Director Blount replied that they will make that correction. Member Bedore made a motion that they accept the minutes as printed and revised with Member Morales seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The next item on the agenda was the Veterans Business Program. Director Blount stated that under follow-up items in their meeting packets the Board has a report provided by Ms. Kim McCullough of CMS who wasn't able to be here today, but if the Board has any questions he'll be happy to relay them, although he believes someone from CMS' Office of Governmental Affairs is here today. Member Bedore stated that he has one or two questions. If you look at the map that was presented to the Board, you obviously can see that out of the 103, 58 are in Chicago land area, and the rest of the entire State has only 45. He can't believe in Macoupin, Christian, Marion, Alexander, many counties don't have any veteran participation. So there still seems to be a lack of outreach. The other thing is that he received a phone call from a veteran contractor and he talked about the North Riverside Project, it's the Illinois National Guard. When that was originally submitted there was no veteran's goal on it, but the point is when you put out a RFP/RFQ, whatever you want to put it out as, he thinks there's got to be a packet or something to these vendors talking about the Veteran Program. Some of these organizations don't know that we have a set-a-side for veterans. He thinks besides reaching out to the veterans groups across the State, he also believes that we have got to be reaching out in everything we're sending out and we should have a nice little pamphlet or something explaining the Veterans Program to all of our vendors. This North Riverside Project really bothers him. It's an Illinois National Guard Armory. He doesn't know why this program wasn't put out as 100% veterans program and not 2% or 3%. This is to be working on the Illinois National Guard Building. Why wasn't that 50% or 100% veterans? He thinks the State here is lacking. Either we do this program or we should abandon it, get legislation and do away with it. Was this program just for flag waving under the past administration? Now here is a prime example under the Capital Development Board. The North Riverside Armory and we've got 2% veterans, it should be 50% or 100%, so he thinks the State is lacking and there doesn't seem to be anybody here that is pushing this program. The Board talked about this 3 months ago. The new administration said this was going to be a high priority and where are we at, we're at 103 veteran businesses across the entire State of Illinois. Every month they get two or three more and they should be getting 20 or 30 more, so yes he has questions on this program and he wishes that CMS would be here next month or the following month. Where are we going with this? Why aren't we doing stuff that involves the Illinois National Guard or anything with the military and why is

M:150312

222 SOUTH COLLEGE STREET, SUITE 231, SPRINGFIELD, IL 62704
Telephone: (217) 785-3988 Fax: (217) 557-9927 TTY: (888) 642-3450

the percent still at 2% or 3%, why not 50% or at 100%? Member Bedore stated that he is still very disappointed in this program and there doesn't seem to be any movement. You've got 103 and the month before there was 89 or whatever the number was or 90 something. You're going up every couple months 5 or 6 firms and if you look at this map, it's disgusting, Edgar, Douglas, Coles, Clark, Cumberland, Crawford, Lawrence, Richmond, Wabash, Iroquois, Ford, Livingston, not one. He is sorry, the outreach in this organization, it seems like nobody really wants to push this. Either we say let's do away with the State's statute or let's do it. Member Bedore stated that to him it's very disappointing. Member Morales stated that there is quite an effort to move forward in 2016 to grow this program. He's curious to know two things, one is that he would like to see a follow-up to let the Board know where's that's at as you implement these initiatives and also the last we spoke about staff the Board was told, he believes that there was one individual or two individuals that ran that entire program. Is that still the case or are there more individuals now a part of the program considering it's such an aggressive move as they say to improve these initiatives? Member Bedore stated that the Board doesn't have that answer because they've been talking with this group here now for three months and doesn't seem to be getting anywhere. They are too busy to appear here today, so he doesn't know maybe they will appear at the next meeting and answer something. Chairman Stewart asked if there are any other questions or comments by Board members. Chairman Stewart stated that we need to follow-up with CMS and it would be helpful to have them here next time to answer some of the questions, but he thinks to Member Bedore's point, maybe a little bit more of what is the plan moving forward, you can't un-ring the bell for what happened in the past, but certainly there's some information here about the forward looking plans, but maybe a little more to the question of what resources in terms of manpower and dollars are going to be devoted on a forward-looking basis? Yes, it looks like there is going to be more outreach, but how do they intend to do that? It's easy to say that they're going to do the outreach, but how do they intend to achieve that would be helpful for the Board to hear. Member Bedore stated that the Board should also look at a type of policy where when you have a military facility, maybe there should be a policy where it's 100% veterans. So that's something the Board should look into in the future, and the Board should also look at what they are doing with all the vendors. This gentleman, a very sincere man, a veteran, besides being a vet he's disabled, and he was called the day before the bid was to be submitted. He said because they got a call from CDB saying, oh you have to have a veteran. Why didn't CDB talk to these vendors right up front? Why not explain the State's program to these people. So it's not all the vendors' faults, it's the fault here. CDB went out with something and never talked about the veterans. Sure it's buried in there, the 2% veterans, but they should promote it. In the case of the armory they should have made a policy that it was going to be 50% or 100%. Maybe there should be a policy by this Board. Chairman Stewart asked if there were any further questions or comments.

The next item on the agenda was CMS ADA Standards. Director Blount stated that in the Board's meeting packets they have CMS' current ADA checklist and the new ADA checklist that is in draft form that were requested by the Board at the last Board meeting. Member Bedore asked if there was someone here to explain the differences between the current and proposed checklist. In attendance was Susan Florence, Lease Administrator for CMS and Albert Coll, General Counsel for CMS. Member Bedore stated that instead of going through every item that has changed, is the proposal meeting all the standards of the organization that came in last month to testify? Mr. Coll stated that he believes the question was the difference between the old checklist and the new checklist. The difference is only in form. The older CMS checklist had been reviewed and it was determined that the individual items, the data contained therein, is up to date to the standards that are prepared by the Attorney General's Office and CDB. However, they were forwarded a different form of checklists by the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. That form seemed to be a little more manageable because it gave more space for notes. Oftentimes notes are very important because it can lead into conclusions as to how difficult it will be to take a non-accessible or non-compliant item and make it accessible. CMS also reached out to the Institute of Human Center Design, which is part of the New England ADA Institute. They had very helpful illustrations which they thought if they incorporated into their checklists, they would assist the people making evaluations and provide greater accuracy in the evaluation. Also, the checklist that was provided by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, the way that they worded the data points was a little more succinct than their checklist. Meaning instead of having 88 questions in their old checklist, those were reduced down to about 50. It just makes it a little easier for the evaluator to conduct their evaluation of the premises. Chairman Stewart asked if they have shared the draft with those who are actually going to doing the evaluations. Ms. Florence replied that they have on a limited basis. One of their space planners in Chicago has actually used this form for a couple of primarily pre-build-

out evaluations and was really happy with it. CMS has training scheduled in August for all of their leasing reps and facility managers. They are going to do three; one north, one central, and one south with representatives from the Attorney General's Office who will conduct the trainings. Just to get everybody more current and updated with the form and any questions they may have about process and completion, so that's when they'll really roll it out. Member Bedore asked how long the training was. Mr. Coll replied that the training is the standard training sessions that are provided by the Attorney General's Office on disability issues. He believes it is between two and three hours in length. Training sessions will start about 10:00 a.m. with a 15 minute break in the middle of it. They will be training sessions that are centered on a specific building and will be hands on. A representative from the Attorney General's Office will provide hands on instructions on how to evaluate the specific design elements that CMS is looking at. Member Bedore stated that he assumes their rules and checklist is fully compliant with ADA. Mr. Coll replied that is his understanding that it is compliant with the Illinois Environmental Barrier's Act, which is the building code that they are seeking compliance with. Member Bedore stated that he assumes that Illinois is a little stricter than the ADA. Mr. Coll replied that he couldn't speak to that. Chairman Stewart stated that he liked the use of the, just looking between the two forms, the visual. The visual jumps out at you and it does seem just by glancing just at the original your eyes sort of glaze over quickly. This, even just to a lay person such as himself, it does seem to jump out a little more directly as to exactly what you're supposed to be looking for. He thinks CMS did a good job in terms of going to third parties as best practices to put together something like this. He knows it's the same information, but how you organize it can make a difference. Chairman Stewart stated that he knows they're doing the training with the Attorney General's Office and he is assuming they're aware of this particular effort and have had input to make sure it's appropriate. Mr. Coll replied that is correct. Member Bedore stated that he has to commend CMS on the form, much better than the present one. Chairman Stewart stated that he can see how in the old form you might just accidentally miss something not intentionally, this is a little less likely to inadvertently over look something. Then again, he agrees with Member Bedore that this is a much better, clearer form and agrees with the notes that you have some room. He knows it doesn't sound like much, but if you actually have to do something substantial you can keep your thoughts clear. Chairman Stewart asked if there were any other questions or comments. Member Black stated that it was his understanding that no building is grandfathered, right? If you're an old building you don't have an elevator there, and nowhere to put one in. Member Black stated that this is going on in his hometown and it's not a hypothetical. The building used to be a YWCA. They had a pool and still do in the back in the basement and they have some exercise rooms in the basement. His wife is recovering from a stroke and they recommended water therapy. She went there yesterday, now she can get down there stairs but not easily, and when she inquired, she just said well the manager stated that it has been taken over by a Human Service Agency. If we have to put in an elevator we close the building. They don't have the money and they don't have any room from what an architect and engineer have told them, you don't have any room to put in an elevator in anyway. So now she is concerned, she can get down there, she needs the water therapy, but what happens if someone comes in and says you're not ADA accessible and we're going to close you down because she asked him if they were grandfathered and he said that he didn't think so. Member Black stated that he thinks you have to comply at some point, is that correct? Mr. Coll replied that he appreciates the question and the personal nature that it comes from, but it would be very difficult for him to provide an analysis of this particular issue because a lot of factors could go into it. They could be talking about the ownership of the facility or the entity that is using it. The standards could possibly differ depending on that, as well as the date the building was constructed and how it's been altered. Member Black replied almost 100 years ago. Mr. Coll replied that he would not be the best person to provide an answer to that question at this moment with the information. Member Black stated that it is the horns of an interesting dilemma because the entity when the YWCA decided that they could no longer function financially they sold the building to a Human Service Agency that is highly regarded. Done excellent work in the community and if there was any way for Tom Pollock to put in an elevator he would do so, but he thinks their position is one, they don't have the money and two, they don't have the void space to do it, and three, the stairway going down to the pool and the exercise rooms is not wide enough to accommodate a stair lift. It's just one of those things where he understands the rationale behind the ADA, but sometimes the flip side of saying you will do this means, ok a place that you had for almost 100 years and is the only place in Danville that offers water therapy and physical therapy classes could very well cease to exist. Member Black stated that he doesn't know how to resolve that. He was hoping you wouldn't have to go to court, but that seems like where everything ends up. Mr. Coll replied that one thing they could do is reach out to a local attorney who may provide an evaluation/pro bono services. It sounds like a very important and assuming a private... Member Black

interjected stating that he should have thought of that and will talk to the Director and see if he's ever, because he is sure they have an attorney on retainer or something because they do a number of counseling activities, mental health and disability and so forth, and so on, they are an outstanding agency. Member Black stated that he will ask Tom if he's every talked to an attorney about that, because all of a sudden water therapy has become the darling of hospital physical therapist and Carl told his wife that she needs to get into a water therapy class that will help her and that's the only one in the city. Mr. Coll replied that there are also numerous non-profit and other types of entities that provide guidance and resource concerning ADA issues such as the organization that they reached out to and provided assistance with their checklist. They can certainly provide guidance on that issue at perhaps no cost as well. Member Black stated that they have another issue that the Attorney General is involved in. They have a Civic Center under the old Governor Thompson Civic Center Act. It owns no parking lots and it's a hybrid city/county stand-alone entity. They own none of the streets and there was one handicap parking spot when it was being built, but it was on a back entrance on a dead end street, so the city later took that out and we have a disabled veteran who has filed numerous complaints with the Attorney General that there are no ADA parking places for the Civic Center, and the Civic Center's response is we don't own any parking places, we don't have a parking lot, the only street in front of it is a public street and the city has indicated if they put handicap parking there everything else on that street is no parking period. So that hasn't been resolved either, but Channel 3 has fun with it about every 7 or 8 days. If they think this disabled veteran is going to give up and go away they just don't understand him. Member Black stated that he has talked to him and he just says there has to be. When they got into it, there is a parking lot across the street where he wants one marked, but that belongs to a bank and the bank says, hey we have ADA parking and entrances for their customers, we're not going to get into the business of making ADA parking and ramps down from their parking lot so they can go cross the street to the Civic Center and we're not connected with that. So this guy is very upset and it's been going on now for about 6 or 7 months. If you watch Channel 3 it will be on at least once a month, still not resolved. Member Black stated that he remembered when this Act happened and he had a legislative office that wasn't ADA accessible unless you came in the back door. He had a constituent file a complaint that he shouldn't have to come in the back door. Well, he'll put a name tag on it and he'll make it the front door. That didn't satisfy him either. These things can be really tricky with no easy answer. If you can give him any direction on either one of those issues he'll appreciate it at some point. He knows just enough that he's probably caused more trouble than what its worth. Mr. Coll replied that he would be happy to, but he doesn't think it would be proper for him to do that. Member Black stated that he has a call in to the Attorney General because they closed it at one time and said, well there isn't any place to put one and then because of his complaint, and he can understand his complaint, they have re-opened it and he doesn't know what will become of it, he has no idea. Mr. Coll replied that he would just suggest that they seek their own representation and review the issue and work with the Attorney General on finding a resolution on that.

The next item on the agenda is CMS Facilities. Director Blount stated that Ms. Florence with CMS is here to answer any general questions or concerns the Board may have on facilities, other than the leases that are on the agenda. Member Bedore stated that something the Board had talked about for years now and he means that, years, is the cost of electricity, the cost of operating these facilities. He reads through these every month and CMS you patted yourselves on the back by saying, oh in this one facility we've installed a master switch and we've reduced the cost of electricity. That's great, why aren't they doing that with all of their facilities? Why aren't we installing motion sensors? Member Bedore stated that he has them at his church and their parish hall and when you are not there the lights are off, when you walk into the room the lights go on. What is so difficult about doing that? You did great job with the Bloom Building, that's moving along, you saved hundreds of thousands of dollars. Why aren't they saving hundreds of thousands of dollars in every one of their buildings? What does a motion sensor switch cost, \$25 - \$30? He doesn't understand why they don't force the owners of these buildings to do these things. We don't have a policy, this has been going back for years and we've talked about this for years. The Board has talked about it with Nick, that's how far back we go. We should come up with a policy that any lease that gets implemented, that includes renewals, we should have a policy about the lighting. Why should you walk by or drive by, he knows Member Black does it all the time at 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning and sees lights on, you know he's a party person, so you see these lights on in these State-leased buildings, why? Well because nobody flips the switch. There was one of the leases he just read, one that he was asking questions about, where CMS took credit. We put in a master switch, right. Ms. Florence replied that she doesn't think taking credit was necessarily the point... Member Bedore interjected stating the point is that CMS said it was going to reduce the electrical cost. Ms. Florence replied

yes. Member Bedore stated well if CMS said that for one lease, why aren't they saying that in a policy for all leases. That's his only point. Ms. Florence replied that she understands. Member Bedore stated that he thinks this Board should look at coming up with a policy that we won't accept any lease unless there is something done along the lines on reducing electrical cost, motion sensors, master switches, whatever. He's really tired of talking about it. This goes back at least five years. We've talked about reducing electrical costs and we're still talking about it. Maybe the only way we can get anything done is for this Board to come up with a policy that the Board won't approve a lease unless it has some of these features. We went to the Bloom Building and we both saw the cost of how high electricity was compared to the building across the street, and CMS did something about it. Ms. Florence replied yes sir. You got the landlord to put in all these sensors and switches at no cost to the State, saving hundreds of thousands of dollars. Why aren't they doing that with every facility? That's his point. Ms. Florence replied that she understands. Member Bedore stated that he hopes they can come up with a policy within the next month or two. It doesn't have to be the next the meeting, but he thinks we should. He's tired of talking about it. Member Black stated that under LEED and all the environmental rules and green energy and all that, he thought governments were charged with leasing property to make sure they were leasing property that met minimum standards, in other words had replaced the old fluorescent bulbs, had replaced the old incandescent bulbs. By the way there is a black market now in incandescent bulbs, but he doesn't know why we would want a renewal lease if the electrical usage and the light bulbs themselves didn't meet current standards. Again the media catches onto all this stuff. Channel 3 two weeks ago on the 10:00 news had their camera out here, look at the Stratton Building, it's a beacon, every light in the building is on, but there is nobody there. Then they pan and do the Capitol, look at the Capitol there's nobody there, but all the lights are on. Well they weren't because there are a lot of motion sensors in the Capital, but he thinks Member Bedore is onto something where eventually people are going to say, how could you spend \$10, \$12, \$15 thousand a month on a building that doesn't meet the contemporary energy standards and until you put a little pressure on the landlord, if he could get by renting the building with 100 watt bulbs or the old style fluorescent tubes, well he's not going to change it. Now that we have Republican Governor, the Washington people might say ah ha. They are in financial trouble and they're not meeting energy standards on some of their leased buildings. Member Black stated that he thinks Member Bedore is onto something here. He's not saying that we have to take a heavy-hand. Member Black stated that he's the sole voice of reason left here and he would just think at some point we're going to have to put that in the lease agreement. He doesn't think that we have to be heavy-handed about it or anything else, but he thinks everybody today knows that commercial buildings are going to have to meet new green energy standards or their rental viability or their lease viability is going to go right down the drain. Chairman Stewart stated that he knows for State facilities we do have standards and given the immense amount of leasing that we do, there is logic if we do it for our own property that we manage and own having something, it doesn't have to be the same standard, acknowledging the big portfolio you have in leasing, but perhaps using that as a basis to discuss what type of standards there should be on a forward looking basis for the leased properties. If you want to start with the big properties first and do only the big ones, he doesn't think we need to decide right here and now, but to Member Bedore's point and Member Black's point, it's been raised for a long time. The State has made progress here and there, certainly with its own facilities it has, but perhaps it is time to start expanding it out to all properties. Ms. Florence replied absolutely and it's something that they talk about internally as well. It's not something they're not aware of. Member Bedore stated that he thinks that we should, you've been talking about it, the Board has been talking about it, let's quit talking and let's put something in a policy so you have something to go to the owners with and say, we would like you to do this and here is the State's policy you must comply, and quit talking. Member Bedore stated that we don't have to do this... it is complex and there may be some phasing in, there may be some grandfathering, who knows. He doesn't expect an answer next week or next month, but before the fall, he thinks the Board should have a policy. No excuses, but he thinks the September meeting the Board should have it laid out right in front of them. Member Black stated that he would think it is at least something to work towards. He thinks the day is rapidly approaching when somebody in some level of government is going to say, no we are not going to allow you to rent or lease expensive space who's using lighting fixtures that were state of the art in 1952. Member Black stated that he doesn't think they're going to allow that. Chairman Stewart stated that he thinks that everyone is well aware of the fiscal problems the State is facing, and energy efficiency measures are not by themselves going to resolve those problems, but if there is some low hanging fruit that could be snagged he thinks the public and our elected leaders would at least expect us to explore that and see if we can come up with something that is workable, don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good, but at some point we have to put pen to paper and come up with a policy. So the Board will pencil in September and our staff will work

together and see if we can come up with something obviously to Member Bedore's point, not a one-size fits all policy, he doesn't think anyone is envisioning that, but something that could actually be implemented and perhaps staging and other things he understands that, everyone has got their operational restraints, but probably time to start putting pen to paper, versus talking about it. Chairman Stewart asked if there were any other general inquiries.

The next item on the agenda was CMS Lease Review. Director Blount stated that CMS has 5 leases for the Board's approval and all of these leases require a Certificate of No Objection. The first lease 6270 was carried over from the last Board Meeting. He should also note that the CPO has withheld his statements that lease 6281 and 6292 are in the best interest of the State, which is a requirement of Article 40 for these leases to move forward, and the agencies are here to assist Ms. Florence and answer questions. Ms. Florence stated that 6270 was rejected by the Board last month, she believes Member Bedore's primary concern was that the total cost of the lease was higher than a lease that they had recently posted in Springfield. She has since provided some additional cost analysis for other Marion leases to the Board. This particular lease is not out of line with those costs. The landlord has agreed however, to reduce the rent to \$12 for the first year of the lease and it would go back up to the initially proposed \$12.25 for the remainder of the term. Chairman Stewart asked for the other Marion leases, what was approximately the range in terms of square footage? Ms. Florence replies that they currently have four other office leases in Marion, the current average base rent of those is \$12.20 and the average total direct cost is \$15.70. Director Blount stated that he did an analysis on our end, which basically came to the same conclusion. Member Bedore made a motion to issue a Certificate of No Objection with Member Black seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved and a certificate will be issued.

The next lease on the agenda was lease 4117 for the Prisoner Review Board (PRB). Ms. Florence stated that she believes that there is someone here in Springfield from the PRB. In attendance for the Prisoner Review Board was Nikki Damhoff. Ms. Florence stated that this lease is 11,807 square feet, they do have a day termination option, base rent starts at \$10.47 for the office space and has been reduced to \$8 for the 3,100 of square feet of file storage. Member Bedore stated that this lease has done some great things. It's now split off the storage area and it also has dropped the real estate escalation clause, so there is a savings to the State of about \$70,000 a year. He doesn't have a problem with that. Member Bedore stated that he does have a little concern about the square foot per employee. After you take out the storage you're at 421 square feet per employee, when our goal is 275 square feet. How do we justify going from 275 to 421? Ms. Florence replied that she has not personally been in this space, so she was hoping that Ms. Damhoff could to speak to the space usage of the facility. Ms. Nikki Damhoff stated that their space has one side that has several offices, which are already set up and of course have employees in them and then they have one big open bay area, which they have cubicles in there as of right now. Then they have their main storage space, which consists of an enormous file system and then they have one other space on the other side, which again consists of cubicle space with one office and a set of restrooms are in there as well. So it's not just one big open space to put cubicles in every area. Member Bedore stated that he understands, but it still works out, after you take out the storage and everything else, you're still at 420 square feet per employee. That's way above the standard for the State of Illinois. Ms. Florence asked if they have vacancies currently? Ms. Damhoff replied that they do have one vacancy as of right now. They do have a couple of Federal decrees that went into place and they are going to require them to add more employees, so that square footage will go down probably within the next 12 months. Member Morales asked where are those new employees coming from? We don't have any other offices, just the one in Springfield, they would be new hires. Member Bedore stated that during this time of crisis in the State of Illinois, you're going to be hiring additional people? Member Bedore stated that he was just curious, you're at 17 plus the Board Members. Chairman Stewart stated that he thinks that they, you can correct him, but he thinks that there is a Federal consent decree on hearings for juveniles or some such thing, the judge basically... Ms. Damhoff replied correct that's the MH and the current one that is pending for the adults for Morales is a Federal decree. Chairman Stewart asked if she had a guesstimate of approximately how many additional employees above these 17 budgeted headcount you have currently. Ms. Damhoff replied between 10 and 15. Chairman Stewart replied on top of the 17. Ms. Damhoff replied correct, because the new decree that they are working with right now, which they are fighting with the Attorney General's Office of course and the Department of Corrections, it is geared toward the adults, as opposed to the juvenile population. Member Morales stated to excuse the Board's tone, it's just been in the past they have been told that they would add personnel to other buildings and it hasn't happened so that is why they asked. Member

Bedore stated so they have to add 10 employees, are you going to incorporate them in this facility or are you going to expand? Ms. Damhoff replies no, they're going to incorporate them into this facility. Member Bedore asked how they are going to do that. Ms. Damhoff replied by reducing the space per employee, that will happen. They have no other place to go and they are not looking to go any other place. They're actually looking to reduce their agency, because they're also in the process of digitalizing all of our files to get rid of the storage space that they have in their agency as well, so they can one, be moved or consolidated elsewhere, or two, to reduce space within that building as well. Member Bedore asked about the cancellation clause. Ms. Florence replied it's 90 days anytime. Member Black asked for clarification, did she say 90 days. Ms. Florence replied yes. As she said she hasn't had an opportunity to visit this particular facility. She did look at the site evaluation that they do for every facility before they do a new lease and there was not any extensive amount of vacant space, offices or cubes. She thinks it's just the layout of the office. Member Bedore replied yes and it's being utilized, it just comes out to be 146 more square feet per employee. He has no objection with the amount of the lease, he has reduced it, he's taken out the real estate escalator, it's just something that he would hope that the staff would follow-up within 90 days or so, to see that you're getting additional employees and if not then we will have to reevaluate with a 90 day cancellation. Ms. Florence replied that she was surprised herself just knowing that it's not sitting there with 15 empty cubicles. Member Bedore made a motion that the Board issue a Certificate of No Objection for lease 4117, with Member Morales seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved and a certificate will be issued. Member Black asked if he could talk to her after the meeting. Ms. Damhoff replied absolutely. Member Black stated that he has a couple of cases that he works on in his district on a regular basis and he hasn't heard anything and that's very unusual. Ms. Damhoff asked if it was regarding to clemency. Member Black replied no, it is in regards to probation and letting them out. Ms. Damhoff replied okay that's fine she'll wait. Member Black stated that one is a cop killer and the other killed a 14 year old boy, so you know where he is, but he doesn't hear anything.

The next item on the agenda was lease 4136 in North Aurora. Ms. Florence stated that they also have Barb Piwowski, Deputy Director of DES available in Chicago. Ms. Florence stated that this lease is an existing DES office in North Aurora. They are actually terminating two other existing DES offices, one in Elgin and one in Aurora and those staff will consolidate into North Aurora later this summer, so those leases are going away entirely. They are taking on a small amount of additional space in North Aurora in order to accommodate those additional staff and there is some fairly minor build-out required. That will cost about \$26,000 and will be amortized over the term of the lease. Overall they are saving in the first year in total direct cost over \$450,000. Member Black stated that he is fascinated by the address of this facility, 2 Smoketree Office Plaza, since the official policy of the State of Illinois seems to be no one can smoke anywhere, anytime, no way, no how. He's not sure if we should rent space at an address called Smoketree, not Smokefree, Smoketree Office Plaza. Member Black stated that he has a weird sense of humor and just saw that and thought oh well. He's just kidding, but before he left yesterday he got a very nasty call from a lady who he used to work with who has a home daycare center. Very nice facility for the kids on the lower level, a family room in the upper level and her husband smokes. Member Black stated that he is a non-smoker and always has been and she's going to get out of the business because he can no longer smoke anywhere in the house. Now he's going to file an objection if he can smoke in the attic, but he told her he doubts if he would be able to smoke anywhere. So there is a good homecare provider that the City of Danville is going to lose because he can't smoke in the house. When he was in the General Assembly they said you couldn't smoke in the car if you had kids in the car and somebody asked what if it was a convertible. It doesn't make any difference and he's a confirmed non-smoker, but he finds some of these arguments over the years to be somewhat fascinating. Member Bedore stated just to let Member Black know that he has a smoke tree in his backyard. There is such a tree and it gets these blooms that look like smoke, so that is why it's called that. Member Black stated that he thinks the General Assembly should outlaw those trees. Chairman Stewart stated who knew you could learn about trees at the PPB meeting. Chairman Stewart asked if the current consolidation is going on and does she know the staff number of the facility now and what it will be when it's consolidated? Ms. Florence replied no, she doesn't. She can provide that, are you asking the total there as we speak? Director Blount provided Chairman Stewart with the answer. Chairman Stewart stated that it looks like 10. Chairman Stewart asked if anyone has any further questions. Member Bedore made a motion to issue a Certificate of No Objection for lease 4136, with Member Black seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved and a Certificate of No Objection will be issued. Mrs. Florence asked if we can bump up the other DES lease while they have Ms. Piwowski still available. Chairman Stewart replied sure.

The next lease on the agenda was lease #6292 located at 1700 West 118th Street in Chicago. Ms. Florence stated that the personnel space is 161 square feet per person adjusted, there is 120-day anytime termination clause, base rent for the office is \$26.01 flat for 5 years, and storage is \$3.00 flat for 5 years. The lease is full gross except for security guards. Member Bedore stated that he has a question regarding the rate, 1700 West 18th Street is one block west of Ashland on 18th street, right? Ms. Florence replied yes. Member Bedore stated that CMS is talking about \$26.01 and everything is included except security. Now a lease that he is going to object to is the 300 West Adams Street. If you look at that lease, now we're talking downtown Chicago, correct? Ms. Florence replied yes. Member Bedore stated that this is a prime location, at 300 West Adams, they're paying \$25.00 per square foot that does not include electricity. So if you add the electricity for downtown Chicago that becomes \$26.70. At 18th and Ashland it is \$26.00 almost the same rate as downtown Chicago and he realizes that this is a location that is prime for their program, it's in the Pilsen, what do they call it? Ms. Florence replied she's not sure. Member Morales replied that it was the Pilsen area. Member Bedore stated that's right, it's the Pilsen area on 18th and Ashland. It will deal with Hispanic people. He understands the need for having a facility there, he doesn't understand why they have to pay the same rent, not the same but very close to the same rent, as you do in downtown Chicago. Ms. Florence stated that they lease from the IDES partner, we are actually in a sub-lease. They have a prime lease with the property owner and they are in a full triple-net lease with the property owner. They sent her an itemized breakdown of their cost per square footage and they are charging us less than what they are paying for their lease. That's where those costs come from. Member Bedore asked how CMS can justify 18th and Ashland downtown Chicago. How can you justify approximately the same rate? Ms. Florence replied that she will let Ms. Piwowski speak to need to be in this location and continue to be in this location. Member Bedore stated that he understands the need to be Pilsen neighborhood. He understands dealing with the Latino community, that's the heart of it in Chicago. He understands all that. He doesn't understand why they have to pay the same type rent that they do for downtown Chicago. He's sorry, but he's from Chicago and he knows the neighborhood. How can you compare 300 W. Adams to 18th and Ashland? Ms. Florence replied that her response would be that if DES needs to be in this particular location with this particular landlord, they are charging CMS slightly less than what they are paying for their own lease. Ms. Piwowski stated that she would add that this location serves as the comprehensive center for the entire city. It's kind of located in the middle so... Member Bedore stated that nobody is arguing the location. He has no objection to the location. He has an objection to the rate, so he doesn't want to hear about location, which he admitted that right from the start that it's needed. He understands the Hispanic community in Chicago, yes it is needed, but you're not answering the question. Member Morales stated to trust him if he doesn't agree with Member Bedore he would say something coming from that area and growing up in that area. It is needed in the area he understands that, but he agrees with Member Bedore but he curious to know why the rent is so high as compared to the West Adams location. Member Morales stated that he knows that Pilsen has changed and the value of the properties have gone up in recent years, but he still would like to know why it compares as it does to West Adams. Ms. Florence replied that as she said they are in a sub-lease, they are simply trying to.... they're providing CMS a portion of their space that they are paying for and they are charging them a similar rate to what they're paying for that space. They can certainly talk to them further... Member Morales interjected and asked why they are paying that much as well. Ms. Florence replied that she does not know. They can certainly go back to them and try to get a rate reduction, if that can't happen then they'll have to have a discussion with DES about relocating to a different site. Member Morales stated just to reiterate, the Board does not have a problem with the location he thinks it is well utilized in that location and is needed, but it's the question of the cost. Director Blount asked if CMS thinks they can try and get a rate reduction. Ms. Florence replied that they can try, they can always try. Chairman Stewart stated that he's willing to give, but he's not going to speak for other Board members, but he didn't hear a whole lot of support for the current proposed lease rate. He thinks CMS should at least give the agency another shot at perhaps trying to come up with something that is palatable to the Board. Director Blount asked if there are other properties in the area? Ms. Florence replied that she is sure there are off the top of her head, but doesn't know what those are. She would have to look at a map. Ms. Piwowski stated that they would have to be co-located National ABLE Network, Inc. who is their landlord, so if they were to move that would break their lease. Chairman Stewart stated that it begs the question, why it is necessary to be co-located with this particular landlord. Is there a consent order or a court decree, a State law that mandates this? Ms. Piwowski replied that it's actually through the Workforce Investment Act. Cook County is the local Workforce Area 7 and so we have two comprehensive centers in the local Workforce Area 7. One is in Pilsen and the other one is Arlington Heights. They have other areas where they are co-located

with partners on a smaller basis, but those are the two main locations in the county. Chairman Stewart asked why, at least what he heard is that they have to literally, they must be with National ABLE Network. They cannot be with anyone else. Is that what you're saying or are you saying something else. Ms. Piwowarski replied that is what she is saying. They are the designated Workforce partner in Cook County for that. Chairman Stewart asked if State law or other requirements requires them to be physically co-located with that particular vendor. Ms. Piwowarski replied yes, statutorily. Chairman Stewart stated that it would be helpful if someone could share that with the Board. He thinks they would still like to take a whack at a rate reduction, but if the answer is that they have no choice but to co-locate with this landlord, he would like to see some writing to that affect. Ms. Piwowarski replied sure. Chairman Stewart replied particularly from legal counsel from DES. It may be true, but he'd like to see that. The Board will hold off on this one to see if they can get a rate reduction and go from there. No further comments or questions were made.

The next item on the agenda was lease #6281 for the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (CJIA) located at 300 West Adams Street in Chicago. Ms. Florence stated that she believes their Executive Directive and Deputy Director are available in Chicago. The rate as provided is \$25.00 with a 2% increase annually and they do pay electric and water. They currently have 11 existing leases in the Loop in Chicago, of those the average direct cost is \$26.60 currently for FY15 to date. Member Bedore stated that it's not so much the rate, but why are they there. Ms. Florence replied that she will let the agency speak to their need to be downtown. She doesn't think they are opposed to relocating and doesn't think they're wed to this particular building. Member Bedore stated that we all have a background on this building, isn't that correct, he objected to it. The Ethics Commission looked at this lease the last time around. You also don't have a letter here from the CPO saying, it is in the best interest in the State of Illinois. Ms. Florence replied correct. Member Bedore stated that the letter is not here. Ms. Florence replied correct. Member Bedore stated that this went to the Ethics Commission the last time and he had to go in there and testify. This is the building that CMS went ahead and did the improvements, the build-out before it was approved. That's before her time and he's not accusing her of saying anything, but he's just saying that he's had history with this particular lease and he's going to object to it now, and he objected to it 5 years ago and he'll keep objecting to it, and when CMS wants to show the Board, and he thinks it's a terrible picture to show them this at 300 West Adams. Oh, you've got all these great prominent people that are leasing in this building, isn't that great? The argument the Board heard last time is, well you know these people that are on this Board, they have to be downtown. It's the State's Attorney and blah, blah, blah. Criminal Justice there's a great spot on UIC campus that would be great, it's only a couple miles away. You can show me that it's \$26.00 square foot average in Chicago and when you add the electric it comes out to \$26.70. So you were right there. His point is, why are they right there? Why aren't they at UIC, why aren't they someplace else? Why does it have to be prime location in Chicago and he's going to hear the argument, well they have these Board members, they can't possibly go to some slum, but he's sorry that's where he's at. Chairman Stewart asked if there is someone from CJIA that could answer why it has to be in this particular location downtown. John Maki, Executive Director for the CJIA, stated that by their mission, by the work that they do, by their labor force, they are essentially a downtown Chicago agency. The entire history has been in Chicago, by statute they are a coordinating council for the State Justice System, and by statute their Chicago stakeholders are their biggest part. The majority of their statutory Independent Oversight Board are from Chicago, 12 out of 17 members, but for those members that are not from the downtown area and again they have 5, downtown Chicago is an ideal location for them. Mr. Maki stated that he just spoke with his Chair yesterday for example Chief Judge, she is now a retired, but former Chief Judge Elizabeth Robb from Normal, a former Chief Judge from McLean County. She said she really couldn't imagine doing her work as a Chair and be able to drive outside downtown Chicago area, so when members come down for our Board meetings and their sub-committees it also enables this kind of synergy that the authority has the power to inspire and to create. Mr. Maki stated that he wanted to go into the work that they do. They have deep relationships with the Chicago Universities. The University of Illinois at Chicago, University of Chicago, Loyola University, Northwestern University, DePaul, all which depend on their downtown location. They are in talks right now with the University of Chicago Harris School to bring in 30 interns, masters level policy students, and they said up front that their location was one of the biggest reasons for partnering with them, because it allows easy access for their students. They have a relationship with Chicago area foundations, which they would risk losing without their downtown location. We're the CJIA, but their staff spends a significant amount of time in meetings in the field in Chicago. Finally, their staff is a highly skilled white collar workforce. There are PhD's, there are CPA's and master level employees who easily can find jobs elsewhere. He was actually worried about this getting out, he feels like there would

be a flood of resignations if they thought they would be leaving the downtown Chicago area. A significant number of their staff, and they're proud of this, more than 40% are African American and Latino who live on the south and west side of Chicago. Not being in the downtown Chicago area he would be afraid that they would lose some of those staff. Mr. Maki stated that he will defer to CMS here, but it is his understanding they have an excellent price for their downtown location, and he also understands from CMS that moving the Authority will cost more than \$60,000. So for all these reasons he understands that the Authority is kind of in a special situation with his lease, but for all of these reasons he would submit that they're a special agency and so he would ask the Board to consider their lease favorably. Ms. Florence stated that she could tell the Board they did bid this before they extended the existing lease. They did put it out for bid and the incumbent landlord was the only proposer. Member Bedore stated it all depends on what area you put out. Ms. Florence replied she should have brought the boundaries, but didn't do that. Chairman Stewart stated that he sees that the CPO is in the room. It was mentioned by Member Bedore that they don't have the customary best interest of the State. He is curious as to the extent he could share with the Board on how he came to that particular determination.

Matt Brown Chief Procurement Officer for General Services stated that there are two factors that have driven him to at this time not to conclude that this is in the State's interest. First it's very clear that the State of Illinois is captive to the Chicago real estate market. They are nowhere near as nimble as other lessees who are. They are prohibited both budgetarily and statutorily in a number of ways to locate in certain areas. It makes it very difficult for them to work competitively for varied lease locations and it also makes it very difficult for them to negotiate in the State's best interest. That is situation number one. Situation number two is that being captive in this marketplace it also means that each agency that has requirements should really be able to stand for what their needs are. In this situation he knows that this is the first opportunity for the new leadership of the CJIA to express their interest and to express their needs. He thinks a full vetting of that will be appropriate. Their current appreciation for the conduct of the lease has only been emerging in the space where he is for about two weeks. He did have a chance to speak to the Director of CJIA to appreciate their needs and knowing he would be here today to express the value of this location. He wanted to make sure that it had a hearing in front of this Board, but given the nature of all the work that they do in leasing in Chicago, at this time he didn't think it was appropriate to say that this was in the State's best interest. Full vetting needs to be seen through and he thinks the commitment that the Director is indicating is that being in the downtown area is important and he simply deferred to CMS about the rate and current location. As those business considerations begin to finalize, this very well could be the best rate, but the existence of other opportunities is really untold at this time. Member Bedore asked if this included any parking spaces. Mr. Kurtz replied that this lease does not include any parking. Member Bedore asked if they have parking in a different building? In other words the State of Illinois is paying for some parking. Mr. Kurtz replied that they have two cars that they use and are parked by the Thompson Center. Ms. Florence asked if she could interject, she doesn't know what the current cost is because she doesn't handle this, but the State does have master contracts for parking for State-owned pool vehicles in Chicago. She would assume that the CJIA vehicles are a part of that. Member Bedore asked if they pay for parking for the Board members. Mr. Maki replied no. Member Bedore asked if they reimburse them when they come to a meeting. Mr. Maki replied that he can get back to the Board on what they actually pay for the reimbursement rate, he doesn't have those numbers off the top of his head. Member Bedore stated that since you're downtown and you say its so convenient he would imagine most of your Board members drive to the meeting and then ask for reimbursement from the State. Mr. Maki replied that most of the Board members they actually come from offices downtown, so there would be no parking costs or travel cost. Member Bedore stated that he was making an argument earlier about how important it is to be in Chicago. Nobody's arguing that you shouldn't be in Chicago. The argument is, and you're saying the employees, the Latino and African Americans, they can get to any other location. He thinks Chicago has a pretty good system and it's called the CTA and it also works real well with the UIC. He thinks that would be an ideal location. You have students right there, you have the Richard J. Daley Library. It would be quite an asset to be on the campus or in the campus area as compared to downtown and then having to pay for parking. Mr. Maki replied that he'll defer to CMS for the space. The only point he has is... Mr. Kurtz interjected adding that their workforce, as Mr. Maki mentioned before, is over 40% city dwellers... Member Bedore interjected stating that he's not objecting to Chicago. Chairman Stewart asked if they could repeat what they last said. Mr. Kurtz stated that in addition to the city dwellers they have a large contingent of suburbanites who come in and have pretty long commutes already so going to UIC would add another half hour to their already long commute. So Mr. Maki's comments earlier about the workforce and the relationship

of their location to the main transportation center are strictly valid for that suburban workforce. Chairman Stewart stated that he wanted to note that they pulled up a boundary map that came up for this particular lease. The north boundary is Division, east boundary is Lake Michigan, south boundary is 18th Street, and western boundary is Ashland. Ms. Florence stated that she thinks it was like about a mile in a half each direction. Chairman Stewart stated that 17th street is downtown for purposes of CJIA. Chairman Stewart stated that the Board has just heard a lot about being in the Loop, he wouldn't characterize the Loop not downtown. He's not going to hold forth on whether they need to be in the Loop, but he just noted that the boundary map seems to be a little more expansive than the Loop despite critical, critical, critical nature of being in the Loop as being expounded by the authority. Member Morales stated that the earlier lease that the Board discussed, 6292, they really need to be in Pilsen also, just making a point. Chairman Stewart asked if anyone had any further questions or comments on this particular lease. Chairman Stewart asked if anyone wanted to make a motion for a Certificate of No Objection. Not hearing a motion no certificate will be issued.

The next item on the agenda is legislation. Member Bedore interjected stating that since CPO Brown is still here he would like to have a discussion that could be brought up at their next meeting. He would like to talk about an employee that started with this organization, started with the Procurement Policy Board. He was the first director. He got us up and running and he thinks they are all grateful for everything he has done for this Board. Then he moved on to be the CPO of the State of Illinois for General Services. He also then took that ship into untested waters. A new program, SB51, just as he took our Procurement Board, as we were untested and didn't really know what they were going to be doing. Steve Schnorf and himself and a few other members, but CPO Brown directed them and righted the ship and brought them to where they are today with this Procurement Policy Board and he believes that he's done the same with the legislation SB51. It was untested waters, he worked hard and he may have stepped on a few toes, but he thinks CPO Brown has done an outstanding job and he would just hope that Chad Fornoff and the Executive Ethics Commission realized that they really made a mistake. The elusive Mr. Fornoff, he normally doesn't disagree with him all the time, and he certainly disagrees with him and his cohorts this time, so he would like to say that he would make a recommendation to this Board at the next meeting that they have a resolution thanking Matt Brown for all his hard work. Not only with this committee, but with the other CPO job he did an outstanding job and the citizens of Illinois benefitted greatly from his hard work, thank you. Chairman Stewart thanked Member Bedore and we will do such a resolution. He will not repeat everything you said, but he had the pleasure to know Mr. Brown for 4½ years now and particularly he got to know him when he became the CPO and his staff, Ms. VanDijk and others who he knows over there, they were faced with a very big challenge of trying to stand up a brand new procurement system, which really hadn't been done anywhere else in the country and that's a hard thing to do and they were asked to do it in real-time without much of a ramp up. He thinks the ramp up was you're starting today and that is the ramp up. That is challenging in the best of times. When everyone is fully funded and the State is not in a bit of a crisis and Mr. Brown didn't have the luxury of coming in on that situation, really had to start from day one with minimal staffing and minimal resources at the time. For those of us in government that's a really, really steep hill to climb and he does appreciate that he came from the PPB and again, he knew him as a CPO and he thought he did a great job particularly without a playbook to refer to. Chairman Stewart stated that he thinks the playbook was written mid-stream and that's again exceptionally challenging in any environment, particularly in government. The Board will have such a resolution at the next meeting, but just wanted to add on to what Member Bedore said. CPO Brown replied that he appreciates the comments towards his work in procurement and the relationships he's been able to build and the work that he's done with this Board and many others in government. He's still in the middle of his career and intends to continue to be where he can be a good steward of government and participate in the way that this Board and others have been accustomed to his work, so again thank you for the comments, he appreciates that.

The next item on the agenda was legislation. Director Blount stated that the only major bill that was of concern that passed both houses and is headed to the Governor would be the CDB Single Prime Bill, which he brought up last month, HB3498. The bill was amended in the Senate to add some oversight as the bill filed in the House completely removed the Board's oversight. Their oversight will now consist of CDB filing a quarterly report with the Board with information on the general scope, the budget and established Business Enterprise Program goals for any single prime procurement bid in the previous 3 months with a total construction cost valued at less than \$10 million. Also for every 5th determination to use the single prime Procurement Method for a project for under \$10 million, currently they need a PPB approval for a single

prime project that exceeds \$15 million also, for every 5th determination to use the single prime procurement method for a project under \$10 million they will need PPB approval within 7 days. It also says the PPB shall not unreasonably withhold their approval. Somehow the sponsors were under the impression that the Board holds up all of CDB's projects and our approvals on all the single prime projects, which would be "a nightmare" when in fact our turnaround time on the waiver process for not only CBD, but all agencies is under 48 hours. The Board still has their 30 day review, but no longer has approval oversight on any of the larger projects that exceed \$10 million. It is expected that the Governor will sign it.

Chairman Stewart stated that the next meeting of the Board is scheduled for July 9, 2015 pending Board confirmation.

With no further business up for discussion a motion was made to adjourn into Executive Session for purposes of discussing personnel matters. Member Morales made the motion with Member Bedore seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.