

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT INFORMAL MEETING OF JOHNSON COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING
COMMITTEE:
MAY 17, 2011**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Report On the Inventory of Space Needs for Courts, Court Administration, Sheriff, Jail and County Attorney	1
Report from Alternatives and Treatments Subcommittee	12
Report from Public Information/Outreach Subcommittee	12
Report from Facilities Subcommittee.....	13
Report from Funding/Grants Subcommittee	14
Set Next Meeting Date	14

Chairperson Harney called the Johnson County Board of Supervisors to order in the Johnson County Health and Human Services Building at 3:02 p.m. Members present were: Pat Harney, Terrence Neuzil, Sally Stutsman, and Rod Sullivan; absent: Janelle Rettig.

Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee Members present were: Iowa City City Council Member Connie Champion, Citizen Representative Bob Elliott, County Attorney Janet Lyness, Bar Association Representative James McCarragher arrived at 3:23 p.m., County Sheriff Lonny Pulkrabek, Judge Douglas Russell, Citizen Representative Professor Emeritus John Stratton, and Consultation of Religious Communities Representative Dorothy Whiston; absent: Department of Corrections Supervisor Jerri Allen, Mid-Eastern Council on Chemical Abuse Director Ron Berg, and Iowa City Public Library Adult Service Coordinator Kara Logsden and Attorney John Robertson. Staff present were: Facilities Manager David Kempf, Executive Assistant Andy Johnson, and Auditor’s Office Recording Secretary Cynthia Courter.

**REPORT ON THE INVENTORY OF SPACE NEEDS FOR COURTS, COURT
ADMINISTRATION, SHERIFF, JAIL AND COUNTY ATTORNEY**

Former University of Iowa Campus Planner Larry Wilson described the process in creating this space analysis. Three entities were involved in the project, including the Clerk of Court, judges, the County Attorney, and Jail Administration. He thinks everyone was in the spirit of cooperation and trying to think about what they could do in Phase I. These entities were told they should not move anything from Phase I to Phase II that they think is essential to the operation of the department. This is based on the entities’ view of maintaining a fully functional operation.

Wilson said they were asked to identify the spaces they think are unnecessary for the next ten years. They chose ten years for the add-on because a sooner timeframe would not be sellable to the public. Anything that was unnecessary in the first ten years would be moved to Phase II at some point after the ten years. Everyone looked for as much

space as they could. Although they did not find as much space as they had hoped, there was a significant amount. They reviewed the types and quantity of spaces. Instead of talking about how large those offices are they talked about how many offices they need. They did not get into reducing the physical space because that would be too much of an architectural question and should be answered by others.

Wilson referred to the packet given to the Board and the Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (CJCC) members and clarified that at the bottom of the chart "Phase I Identified Space" is highlighted, but it should be read that this is space they have identified in Phase I that can be moved to Phase II. Wilson said in retrospect it would have been clearer to call it "Phase II Identified Space." In Public/Shared Space there is not much reduction, only 560 square feet. In the Courts and Court Administration Space Inventory approximately 3,000 square feet of space was identified, which is a substantial amount. Conditions are asterisked in the chart to give more information about why things are done a certain way.

Facilities Manager Dave Kempf said that Wilson had gone over Public/Shared Space where there was a savings of 562 square feet. In the Courts and Court Administration Space Inventory they saved approximately 3,224 square feet. Wilson said in the Clerk of Court Space Inventory they were able to shift 1,420 square feet of space to Phase II.

Citizen Representative Bob Elliott asked Wilson if where it says Phase I in the document should be labeled Phase II. Wilson said that is correct. There is a difference between what Novak Design Group, Inc. (Novak) and what the CJCC identified as being needed in Phase I. The County Attorney identified 860 square feet of space that can be shifted to Phase II. There is a space that they looked at with more detail and determined that in Phase II they will need more space than what was identified in the Novak report. Everyone should keep in mind that the total space needed might increase.

Wilson said Jail and Jail Administration identified 9,600 to 9,700 square feet of space that can be shifted to Phase II. The next page of the packet breaks down jail housing capacity in Phase I, with a total of 248 beds. When the time comes to build it might not be sensible to build that many beds without allowing for additional beds to be added later. He said in the Sheriff's Department Space Inventory they can shift 2,746 square feet of space to Phase II.

Neuzil asked if they are assuming the existing Jail will not be used. Wilson said yes, for now, because there are questions about whether they would reuse the space or land bank it and resell it to the University of Iowa (UI). They thought it was so complex that it would be better to wait. Kempf said this report still maintains the assumption that they are reusing the existing Courthouse just like the Novak report mentioned. Wilson said there is no long-term storage space that is suggested to be moved to Phase II. Only the Clerk of Court agreed to have storage space off-site. Most departments think that storage space needs to be on-site for it to be functional, even though currently much of it is off-site.

Iowa City Council Member Connie Champion asked how adequate the 248 beds that are allotted in Phase I would be. County Sheriff Lonny Pulkrabek said it was a number they decided made sense to begin with. They thought 250 beds are where they need to start, and 200 will not be enough. He thinks the original Novak report included 350 beds. He thinks the 248 beds is the number it should be. Wilson asked how many beds the Jail currently has. Pulkrabek said there are 92 beds.

Neuzil asked if the project total is approximately \$44,745,000. Wilson asked if Neuzil was looking at the Capital Construction Cost Analysis sheet in the packet. Neuzil said yes. Wilson said all the spaces he went through are added up in the Phase I Cost column. The items in red are the spaces to be left in Phase I. In the Public/Shared Space line, the Novak report lists 11,833.5 square feet. That has been reduced to approximately 11,270 square feet in Phase I. Courthouse Components has been reduced from 27,731 square feet in the Novak report to 17,125 square feet in Phase I. The new tally amounts to \$44,745,560, which is about \$4 million less than the Novak report.

Neuzil asked how much the total would be if they removed parking and historic restoration plans. Wilson said that report is on the back of the Capital Construction Cost Analysis page. He said Novak suggested that the long-term storage could be left off-site as it currently is. All the departments except for the Clerk of Court did not think this was a workable solution for the next ten years. However, if that was done it would save the County \$476,550 and bring the Phase I total cost down to \$44,269,010. If the County could eliminate the parking ramp or pay for it from another source they could eliminate another \$4,025,800 and bring the total reduction from Phase I down to \$40,243,210.

Neuzil asked why they would save only \$4,025,800 by eliminating structured parking needs. Kempf said it is still allowing \$1 million for surface parking. Wilson said this was just an estimate, but they need to leave some money for parking.

Wilson said the way Novak has framed the Courthouse Renovations on the second line of the first sheet of the cost analysis under Courthouse Components is excluding existing Courthouse space because 25,000 square feet of Court Components will be in the existing Courthouse. This means the existing Courthouse is factored in to the equation, and they cannot do without it. The County can eliminate the cost of the renovation of the Courthouse. If there is another way to fund the renovation separately it will reduce the bondage. By doing this they will be closer to their target of \$33,993,210.

Wilson said if they went back to the departments and ask them to reduce it further they would start to cut into their operations and function ability. He said he does not know of any way to get the project down to a lesser amount unless they say they want to set a target of \$35 million for the project by reducing more space and looking into where the least painful place to reduce is. This is probably something the CJCC will need to go through anyway in the design details regardless of whether they set a target. He said he, Executive Assistant Andy Johnson, and Kempf are not architects or people designing spaces. They are simply taking the information that they have to work with the departments.

Stutsman asked if there was any savings to be found in the cost per square foot estimate by using different materials. She does not know if the estimate was based on top-of-the-line materials or otherwise. Wilson said when they get to a more detailed design they will have a better idea of what the materials will be. Typically, they will estimate on what it would take to be a nice space, and if that is too expensive they can start to reduce the quality or appearance of the materials. He said at this stage it is difficult to say what those reductions would be. They took what is the typical, middle of the road cost of these spaces, but if the structure is not built within five years the cost will go up. When they start to talk about bond issues the figures will be inflated. Wilson is sure that they will be able to find ways to make the cost decrease by using different materials, but they may find that certain materials are necessary on the outside to be compatible with the existing Courthouse. If they take that position there could be cost support. There is a tendency that the amount of space will grow slightly because they can forget little things.

Kempf said from this exercise the County is looking at a \$40 million project. This includes soft costs like professional fees and contingencies. It will allow the departments to still be functional and operational in a Phase I scenario for ten to 15 years while considering that the County will continue to grow. This number does not include a parking ramp, but does leave money in for surface parking. It still includes the historical restoration for the Courthouse because they need those square feet for the facility.

Neuzil said the potential for what they can get out of the Jail facility and using a funding stream similar to what they used to build the Health and Human Services (HHS) Building with a reverse bond referendum as well as a combination of managing debt, borrowing money, and saving. There is an opportunity to lobby the Iowa Legislature to change language like Polk County is trying to do to make Courthouses an essential County purpose through their unlimited and uncapped Supplemental Fund. This is how they paid for the Joint Emergency Communications Center (JECC). This is exactly what needed to be done. Neuzil said he thinks the next step is to come prepared to the June 2011 CJCC Meeting with a number they think is passable as they go through their steps.

Elliott said he appreciates the people who have the expertise and experience to provide this information. From where they started they are finally getting to a realistic territory. He asked what the chances are to receive historic preservation funds from the State to preserve a classic governmental building.

Judge Douglas Russell said he thinks the possibility is nil. The court preservation community periodically toys with tax credits from governments and individuals for preservation of historic buildings. To his knowledge and experience there is no funding available. He read from the second page of the document "Fund Renovation of Courthouse from other funds" and asked Wilson if the other funds exist. Wilson said the document means to look for other funds. He said there are people more knowledgeable than he is in that area. Russell said he has concerns about possibly moving the renovation to Phase II. Two of the main functions of these buildings are the Jail and

court rooms. If they move this out ten to 15 years until Phase II they would be in as bad of a position as they are now and possibly worse.

Champion said she does not think they can put off the renovation of the courthouse, but maybe it does not have to be done at a cost of around \$6 million. She said there are not many funds available from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Addressing the courtroom situation is an essential need. She asked how many parking spaces the Board is envisioning with the project and if it is part of their contract to provide parking for their employees. Stutsman said it is not part of the contract, but parking is provided. She asked Champion if she means that it is not negotiated. Champion said yes. Stutsman said not at this point. Champion said the County would not have to provide parking for their employees. Stutsman said they do, but they do not have to. Champion said she would like to see the parking eliminated before eliminating a major part of the Courthouse renovation to make the court rooms usable.

Sullivan said much of it is the City of Iowa City standards for different buildings. He said he knows City Manager Tom Markus, Iowa City Mayor Matt Hayek, and Planning and Community Development Director Jeff Davidson have said they would be willing to consider a waiver from the County if requested. Champion said the City runs parking, but their parking is paid for by parking fees and not tax dollars.

Wilson said the General Services Administration (GSA) requirement is what is driving the need for a ramp and if they work out a deal with GSA they will need some immediate parking for employees, supervisors, and public parking close at hand. He said if it is provided on the current courthouse site and Harrison Street it would be a little tight. He said they might be able to add it across the street but it has to be close at hand. They could have a remote surface lot for employees or allotted space in a ramp partially subsidized by the County for employees. He said eliminating the need to build a parking ramp is an area where they could make a difference in the cost analysis.

Neuzil said many of the issues with the parking ramp come from negotiations with GSA and the need for expansion of a future Board. He said to take out the money for parking other than the \$1 million for surface parking. The County has property that could be used for temporary parking until a negotiation is made with GSA. The County has flexibility, which means raising taxes, but they do have the ability to bond \$1.2 million for each project that they identify without voter approval. He said they also have the ability to do a reverse bond and go through that process. He said there are some avenues, but it still means an increase in taxes.

Stutsman said she thinks the Iowa Legislature is going to tighten down how much the County can raise commercial and property taxes. There are limits and included in that has to be the services the County is expected to provide. She does not disagree that there was a time they could do that, but she does not know if it will be as easy to do as it has been in the past.

Wilson said when it comes to reducing the total bonding it will become a matter of considering whether it is more important to have space for these departments to function or where they can park their cars. He said he thinks the County would be trying to do everything they can to avoid building a ramp.

Harney said if they want GSA property they are going to have to put parking somewhere, whether it is on-site, somewhere close, or in conjunction with existing City parking. He said Neumann Monson Architects said the cost has gone to \$15,000 to \$18,000 per space. Stutsman said she and Sullivan serve on the Parking Committee. Parking is a big issue, and she does not know how they could build a facility like the proposed justice center without parking. Neuzil said they have \$1 million built in for parking.

Sullivan said there are thousands of spaces within a couple blocks in this area. He said there is the Court Street ramp and the Burlington Street ramp, and the UI has surface parking to the west that is available for public use. The UI's future plan is to construct a ramp there, which would increase available parking. Sullivan thinks it would be foolish to build a ramp structure right now even though they might need something down the line with GSA, but he thinks they need to separate that from this project. In order to sell the plan for a future justice center to the public they need to lower the cost of the project. Sullivan thinks the project looks a lot better costing \$39 million than it does costing \$40 million. Neuzil said selling the existing Jail would provide a funding stream.

Consultation of Religious Communities Representative Dorothy Whiston asked what the Jail property is worth. Neuzil said as soon as the County buys the last house they will do an assessment. Stutsman said it would be worth whatever the UI wants to pay for it. Pulkrabek said the UI paid \$3.7 million for MidWestOne Bank.

Wilson said he wants to clarify his views on parking. He thinks some essential parking will have to be included on-site. If they cannot do it with surface parking and squeeze in around 50 spaces, they will need to build a ramp. They should focus on trying to negotiate with GSA to use spaces in the existing ramps. As far as the land for sale, there is no immediate alternative need for the UI to buy that land. They just want the land to use for unidentified future use. If at some point the UI identifies a need for the land, the need will raise the value of the land.

Russell asked how much the land cost that the County bought for parking on the former National Guard Armory (the Armory) site. Neuzil said it was approximately a \$1.3 million project that included the removal of the Armory. Stutsman said that it is a surface lot, not a ramp. Sullivan said the lot by itself cost \$970,000. It has some trails and is fairly elaborate. Kempf confirmed the cost of the land. Stutsman asked how much they paid for the HHS Building parking ramp. Kempf said it was in the \$2.2 million to \$2.3 million range and has 234 spaces. Sullivan said it also has additional footings. Kempf agreed. The additional footings added another level to that ramp. Champion asked why they would not use that ramp. Sullivan said they could. Kempf said the \$5 million or \$6 million number is only money having to do with acquisition of the GSA

property. If they treat the parking project as a separate project, as they can and probably should do, they would still need side work and some surface parking for visitors.

Neuzil said the County enhanced the parking lot where the Armory is because I-JOBS gave the County a \$975,000 grant. If they add \$1 million to that it could generate significant surface parking. Sullivan said there would be additional cost due to the fact they would have to tear down existing houses. Harney said the cost does not include what it would cost to trade the properties. Russell said he understood there would be property trade, but he was trying to get a sense of the value. Wilson said the \$1 million factored into the cost analysis is an estimate of what it might cost to replace the GSA parking on surface plus some necessary parking for immediate use at the proposed justice center, which would be similar in size to the Administration Building parking lot.

Sullivan said the analysis is heartening because it allows another couple sets of eyes to go through what was already there and confirmed that they are pretty close to coming up with a target cost. They were able to pull a little bit out, but not a lot. Sullivan thinks the analysis is really thoughtful and gives the County a target. Wilson said everyone involved was in the spirit of cooperation and thought hard about what they can shift to Phase II.

Stutsman asked if this is the final total. Kempf said no, they are at a crossroads because a couple things need to happen. They need to determine whether they are going to move the project forward. If they decide to move forward they are close to a time when they will need to hire professional services to take them to the pre-schematic design phase. That will help identify the cost. Then, Planning and Zoning will refine the cost and look at building materials in order to determine the cost per square footage which will provide them with a project they can bring to the voters.

Harney said he was concerned that by reducing what they were going to ask for the project, it would not be done right. Realistically, if they are going to start a bonding process in 2012 they are looking at four years before they will be able to build. During that time, space needs and the cost will increase. He has concerns about not having enough built into the plan. Harney understands that this step had to be done. He thinks it is a good move, but if the County does not ask for what they need and tries to come back for a second phase it will be difficult. If the County can do it for a certain price, independently, without going for a bond they might be able to get it accomplished. He thinks it will be difficult.

Kempf said this analysis gives them a price point. When they bring the entity they are going to partner with in the County will show them all the things they will need to fit into the facility and the price they need to be at. Then, the entity will not go out and design marble floors or a lobby area, similar to the Federal Courthouse, which would cost them around \$650 per square foot. They want the entry level of the Courthouse to be at bank level, which is around \$250 to \$275 per square foot. It gives something for the architectural firm to work towards so they will not come up with a \$67 million project and put them back at the point they are at now. This exercise told the County that for a

\$40 million range they should be able to get the things they need. They went through what they could take out of the plan, but it does not mean they want to remove those things. It may be cheaper to leave room for the spaces rather than removing it and doing a separate phase altogether. The expertise of an architect would be able to tell them those things.

Wilson said at that stage the architect should be able to answer questions about the spaces that they might need to house or fit into the existing Jail until or what can be moved to Phase II or what spaces in the Court Components will fit in the existing Courthouse. Once that is figured out, perhaps the \$6.2 million dollar figure can be reduced.

Neuzil said the timeline dictates that by June 2011, the County will develop a Request for Proposal (RFP) to select a design firm for a pre-schematic design. The project is falling into place now, but a design firm will want to know a budget. That is why the CJCC needs to come up with a number they can agree on by the next meeting, whether it is this number or another number.

Wilson said the design firm they choose might be able to cut down the cost further. A design firm would be able to ask departments tougher questions and use their experience from similar projects to suggest where they could cut down on space. Kempf agreed. He said all the County can do is ask departments how much work space they need. Kempf thinks he and Wilson do not have the expertise to determine that. Wilson said the design firm will be able to arrange space in certain ways so that it can be shared. If the design firm is really doing their job they can determine in which areas the current plan is lacking.

Champion said she agrees with Sullivan that it would be great if they can get the project's budget under \$40 million. She would prefer to see the budget around \$30 million, but understands that will not happen. Neuzil said there is a difference between what the Board thinks the number is and what they think they should request for a bond referendum. At some point, there are two numbers they need to come up with. First of all they need a fairly strong number to tell the pre-schematic design firm where they are at. Kempf said the firm could answer the question of whether to reuse the existing Jail or sell it to the UI or another entity and roll those funds into lowering the cost of the project. That is something that entity will be able to identify as well. What the County will spend to build the justice center and what they will request for a bond will probably be two different numbers.

Elliott asked if the County has an estimate of what the Jail property is currently worth. It appears that this property would go to the UI if it is sold. He asked to what degree the UI would like to acquire the Jail property. Kempf said the UI would like to have the property. The County has met with UI representatives a couple of times. He is hesitant to say what his impression is at this point in time, but he thinks it would be considered a fairly valuable property to the UI if they were able to acquire it. Wilson

said he thinks he heard the UI is interested in the land and not the Jail building. He thinks if the UI purchased it they would find some use for the building in the short term.

Elliott asked if the price the County would sell the Jail for is in the \$1 million to \$3 million range. Kempf said that is a possibility. Neuzil said he thinks that number sounds very low. Stutsman agreed. Neuzil said they do not need to know the exact number for a bond referendum yet, but the County would have to know that number at some point in October through December 2011. He thinks they would have that number by then so they would know what to put on the ballot.

Stutsman said she thinks the Jail property would go to the highest bidder. Whiston asked if there is any reason not to start with the \$40 million target budget for Phase I. Sullivan said he thinks that would be what the County has to do. It is a ballpark figure and there are a lot of variables, but that is the range the County knows they are looking at. They can move forward with the idea of looking into where they can make further cuts.

Stutsman asked if they are ready to start the RFP process. Neuzil said it sounds like Physical Plant would be ready to take that step to develop the RFP to select a design for a pre-schematic design. Stutsman said there will be many groups that will be interested in this RFP, which is good. Wilson said they might want to think of a process for it, perhaps look for architects who are involved in creating good criminal justice centers around the country. The County should make sure those architects are getting an invitation to get them on the list of possible candidates. The County might want to form a committee to create a short list reducing 100 candidates to 10 to begin with.

Neuzil said it may be a good idea to have the County Attorney, the County Sheriff and some judges that know individuals around the state of Iowa send out a big email asking who has built a jail lately. Stutsman asked who will draft the RFP. Kempf said Executive Assistant Andy Johnson and him would work on it and use something very similar to what they used to select an architect for the HHS Building. That is exactly the process Wilson described. The County had a committee that created a short list to bring three or five designs to the Board. Harney said he thinks Wilson should be involved in that committee if he is willing to do it. Kempf and Stutsman agreed.

Neuzil said it would be helpful to review what a pre-schematic design is for the next CJCC Meeting. Stutsman said to keep their timeline on track the RFP needs to be started. Kempf said he does not know if that can be pulled together that fast, but if they use what they have as their existing case line they should be able to develop something with Wilson's assistance. The County will need to include a narrative of what their expectations or interpretations are of getting to the pre-schematic design phase. Sullivan said if they go to the time frame that people on the committee had created and start backing things out, he shares Stutsman's concern. They have to get started because they cannot still be selecting someone to do the pre-schematic design in October 2011. At the beginning of 2012 the County will have to begin selling a bond referendum.

Wilson said there is no set definition of what a pre-schematic design is. It needs to have information that the Board would need to put up for the bond referendum. The Board already indicated that they want an idea of how the building will look from elevation. They would probably include their intentions for the Jail, even though it is not normally included in the pre-schematic design. It will be helpful if the Board lists the things they think they have to have for the bond issue. Neuzil said the Board will start to receive more questions as this process continues, and it will be nice to be able to create six or seven bullet points off of what the County is doing with the pre-schematic design. Those things will be put in their information outreach piece that will come out in the next couple months.

Kempf said he needs clarification regarding partnering with a firm to prepare the pre-schematic design. His impression is that the firm the County chooses will also be the firm that will take them through the full design and through the construction contingent upon bond referendum being passed. It would not make sense to switch firms that far along in the process. Harney said that is true because most architects want to use their own design. Stutsman said it would be more incentive for the firm to produce a good product if they know it is a long term venture. Kempf said it is more than putting out a RFP for a pre-schematic design; it would also include carrying out the plans throughout the construction phase contingent upon bonding approval.

Champion asked if a schematic design roughly shows the inside layout. Wilson said the schematic design would. They are trying to go to a complete schematic design. It is about 15% of the County's budget and will include a floor plan. When the County is ready to go to the schematic design phase they will need to think about it far enough so they know it is workable and can identify spaces well enough to know what the building can look like. The pre-schematic design is very similar to preliminary plans. The CJCC is discussing something that would probably come somewhere between.

Neuzil said the Funding/Grants Subcommittee would have to determine the process of funding strategy to hire. He asked if they have an estimate of what up front funding they will need. Wilson said he made an estimate of \$175,000 to \$200,000, but they need to define what the County thinks it wants and poll a local architect just to get an idea of what they are talking about. It would be nice if they had a local architect that is not going to be interested in doing the project to serve on the committee. There are people at the UI the County could ask about pre-schematic plans. Kempf said if it is 10% of the fees for the project, it would be about \$250,000. Neuzil said that subcommittee will have to take a look at the amount of reserves they have at the end of the year. Wilson said they would want to test that before they send it out with someone who has been doing it recently and is used to working with many firms.

Russell said he would suggest when they are developing the RFP they should talk to Story County because they built a justice center in Nevada, Iowa in the last few years. Wilson said they could ask for a copy of their RFP. Harney said he liked that Story County used a lot of stone and not oak or walnut. It is usable and efficient. Kempf said Story County used a lot of polished brick and polished block as opposed to actual

limestone. It is a very nice facility. Harney said he thinks when the County gets to the point of getting a pre-schematic design and moving forward with that, he wants to see a project manager. He does not necessarily want do the same thing they did with the HHS Building.

Citizen Representative Professor Emeritus John Stratton asked if they are talking about the pre-schematic plan just for Phase I. If that is the case, that is a problem. Fitting Phase II into that plan will have to be taken into consideration. Wilson said in their case the pre-schematic plan would include all phases, but it would make it a more difficult pre-schematic design because they are asking for more.

Harney asked if Phase II will have the basics built into the building and the rest of it completed later. It seems like nothing ever lines up when adding on to another building. Wilson said that is a challenge for the architect to determine what can be separated into Phase II without jeopardizing the current space and making future costs exorbitant. It might make sense in some cases to shell space out because it would be too hard to make the proper relationship clear. These are all questions the architect will have to answer. It will probably mean a combination of moving some things to a future phase, shelling space out and accepting some relationships that might not be ideal to allow for expansion.

Sullivan said the County is going to have two future expansion options including one that utilizes GSA and one that does not because they do not know what the outcome will be. Obviously the GSA route gives them many more options, but just in case the architect will have to have two plans for expansion. Wilson said making the pre-schematic plan more complex gets them closer to a schematic plan in terms of information.

Pulkrabek asked at what point in time the County will have to bring the project manager in. He asked if the project manager would need to come in after the pre-schematic plan is completed if they are going to be involved in the whole project. If the project manager is involved in the pre-schematic then they would know where they are going. He said he is not clear on the timing. Kempf said he would see the project manager coming in when they move from the pre-schematic phase into the actual design and construction. He would not necessarily bring the project manager on board prior to a bond referendum but would on the tails of a successful referendum. That way the project manager would be on track with finishing designs of the building, the scheduling, and other types of issues. Pulkrabek asked if that cost is included in the professional fees. Kempf said no. Wilson said they could postpone hiring that firm until the construction phase even though it would be desirable to have them here, a good firm would be able to catch up quickly.

Stutsman asked if Kempf and Johnson will start working on drafting the RFP and if they will need other help. Kempf said he is positive he and Johnson will have questions for Wilson. Wilson said he will help any way he can. Harney said he would like to see Wilson involved if he is willing.

Stratton said he spoke with Mercy Iowa City (Mercy) President and Chief Executive Officer Ronald R. Reed, and they have been doing a lot of building. He said he asked what Mercy's approach was. He said Reed said Mercy does a cost-plus bid, which allows the contractors to get involved very early in the design phase, and thereby interact with the architects. Kempf said Iowa Code does not allow the County to do that. Wilson said the County can employ a project manager to do that. It is usually a construction cost. A good firm hired to do the design can advise the County on different construction options. Stutsman said the difference is that the County has to ask the taxpayers for permission to do this project and provide the funding.

REPORT FROM ALTERNATIVES AND TREATMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE

County Attorney Janet Lyness said she will give a report of Mid-Eastern Council on Chemical Abuse (MECCA) court evaluations for the first quarter, January through March, 2011. They attended initial appearances on 86 days. MECCA made 130 requests and 129 were completed. Treatment was recommended for 55% of cases. Fifty-seven of the cases occurred on weekends. Four worked with Spanish interpreters. No treatment was recommended for 39 people. Further evaluation was recommended for 18 individuals, which means they did not have enough information or the evaluator did not trust the information they were given. In April, staff attended initial appearances on 30 days. Fifty-five assessments were requested and 51 were completed. Of those, 31 were recommended treatment. Staff made 33 Operating While Intoxicated evaluations and 22 other evaluations. They have been looking at having a MECCA employee make evaluations for people who request or require a substance abuse evaluation but are in jail for other offenses. Those individuals would have to make their own arrangement for payment. It seems to be going well.

REPORT FROM PUBLIC INFORMATION/OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE

Bar Association Representative James McCarragher said the Public Information/Outreach Subcommittee met and they are developing an information brochure to hopefully be distributed to the public in June 2011. They are also working with County Auditor Tom Slockett to give them a written report on available election dates.

Neuzil said the Board is comfortable adding Tiffin Mayor Royce Phillips to the Public Information/Outreach Subcommittee. They are also planning to invite someone from Information Technology to help inform the public about the justice center project through the County website. There will be quite a few reports put together during the summer of 2011. McCarragher said an email was sent to Phillips asking him to join. Stutsman asked if they extended the invitation to anyone from North Liberty or Coralville. Neuzil said Phillips was the only one who showed interest. McCarragher said he thinks eventually they will try to involve as many of the communities as they can.

Neuzil said one of the goals the Board laid out at the beginning of 2011 is “Works with Area Governments for Support Letters and Resolutions.” It is an area in which they will want to have input from many local governments and the law enforcement community. Hopefully they will have a similar feel to what the County saw in 2006 and 2007 with the JECC project. The community rallied behind the project. It was spurred by the League of Women Voters of Johnson County, and then the project caught fire with the City of Iowa City and the Sheriff’s Office. Hopefully they will find that spirit again with the need for the justice center.

REPORT FROM FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Harney said the Facilities Subcommittee is complicated. They have not met, but they will be meeting in the next week. The big issue is that GSA wants a proposal of what the County will offer for that space. He does not know what they are going to offer GSA if they do not offer them a ramp. He is afraid the County might lose that opportunity if they do not make an offer since GSA had the Excess Property Manager present via telephone the last time the County talked to them. He thinks that indicates that GSA is considering getting rid of that property. At that time GSA told the County that they did not even propose to own the property. The County would own the property and give GSA a long term lease for a certain number of parking spaces, which would be negotiable. He still thinks the County can do a ramp separate from the justice center facility.

Kempf said it is his impression that GSA’s opinion of this project from when they started to where they are currently is completely opposite. Originally, GSA did not want to speak to the County. Sullivan said some of this change is attributed to the focus of paying down the national debt. Sullivan said United States President Barack Obama told GSA to look at property they could sell. GSA came up with \$1 trillion worth of property that they think they could get rid of, and the local GSA property may be one of those properties. Kempf said they need to work on what that proposal might mean.

Harney said last week a local architect approached him about space for the GSA and said that there might be space available that would soon become a ramp if the County wants to buy into that and provide space there for the GSA. He said he thinks the banks have a five-year lease on their standard offer. If there is going to be a ramp there it will provide another possibility. However, he thinks they need to move forward on the GSA property as it is now without even considering that. Stutsman asked if they could authorize the Facilities Subcommittee to draw up a proposal outside of what the Board is talking about. Harney said he would like Lyness to review it. Neuzil said Pulkrabek is on the Facilities Subcommittee as well as Sullivan. Harney said Wilson could possibly sit in on a meeting.

Kempf said the Board needs to look at the proposal before they move forward with it. Stutsman agreed. Harney said GSA made it very clear that whatever they put in the proposal is negotiable. Sullivan said he does not want to take too much time away from Kempf and Wilson by saying that he thinks the first thing they need to move forward on is the justice center itself. Harney said it makes a difference on where the justice center

is going, what it is going to cost, and what the design will be if they have this space. Sullivan said the County will not get the answer they want in the time frame they need working with the Federal government. The County needs to say they are moving forward in this way and have a plan for if the Federal government comes on board in a year or two. Neuzil said it provides a future Board with the space necessary. If the opportunity is there it would be hard to pass up, but it will take some time. He is comfortable in making a proposal.

Harney asked if they are going to keep the present Jail are they going to offer to trade the properties they just bought to make it rectangular on the south edge or keep it and do everything above it towards Clinton Street. Neuzil said the last vision was to reconfigure the existing parking lot from being north to south to being east to west along Prentiss Street.

Russell said it seems appropriate for the County to say it has a policy goal to acquire that square block in some configuration with an arrangement providing GSA the parking they require for the deal as surface or in a ramp. Harney said he does not mind paying them if there is an issue on what the cost is. Russell suggested switching around the arrangement on the block, buy some and lease some, whatever it turns out to be. The County should have it within their sights to acquire that property and then a lot of variations are possible.

Wilson said the more land they have available will reduce the cost of construction. Stutsman said the County can always resell that property as well. Wilson said he thinks the County will need it. The question is if the County can afford a land bank. Sullivan said if they can get a hold of it they have solved the problem for 100 years, and if they cannot the problem would only be solved for around 40 years. Harney said they will arrange a committee meeting to come up with a plan.

REPORT FROM FUNDING/GRANTS SUBCOMMITTEE

Kempf said the Funding/Grants Subcommittee has not met lately, and he does not think anything has changed since they met the last time.

SET NEXT MEETING DATE

Harney said the next CJCC Meeting is scheduled for June 1, 2011 at 4:30 p.m.

Adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Attest: Tom Slockett, Auditor

On the _____ day of _____, 2011

By Cynthia Courter, Recording Secretary

Sent to the Board of Supervisors on June 27, 2011 at 4:50 p.m.