

**MINUTES OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COMMITTEE:
OCTOBER 5, 2011**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Planning and Scheduling of Bond Referendum	1
Report from Alternatives and Treatment Subcommittee.....	5
Report from Public Information/Outreach Subcommittee	5
Justice Center Questions and Answers Draft Brochure.....	5
Courthouse Safety, Security and Space Deficiencies Document	7
Justice Center Provides Safety, Security and Space Document	7
Report on Downtown Location Draft.....	8
Report from Facilities Subcommittee.....	9
Design Firm Selection Process.....	9
Other.....	9
Report from the Funding and Grants Subcommittee.....	9
Comments from the Public.....	9
Set Next Meeting Date	10

Chairperson Harney called the Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee to order in the Johnson County Health and Human Services Building at 4:30 p.m. Members present were: Department of Corrections Supervisor Jerri Allen, MECCA Director Ron Berg, Iowa City City Council Member Connie Champion, Supervisor Pat Harney, Iowa City Public Library Adult Service Coordinator Kara Logsden, County Attorney Janet Lyness, Bar Association Representative James McCarragher, Supervisor Terrence Neuzil, County Sheriff Lonny Pulkrabek, Judge Douglas Russell, and Citizen Representative Professor Emeritus John Stratton, Supervisor Sally Stutsman, Supervisor Rod Sullivan; absent: Citizen Representative Bob Elliott, Iowa City Public Defender's Managing Attorney Peter Persaud, Supervisor Janelle Rettig, Consultation of Religious Communities Representative Dorothy Whiston. Staff present: Executive Assistant Andy Johnson and Auditor's Office Recording Secretary Nancy Tomkovicz.

All motions passed with the following roll call: aye: Allen, Berg, Champion, Harney, Logsden, Lyness, McCarragher, Neuzil, Pulkrabek, Russell, Stratton, Stutsman, Sullivan; absent: Elliott, Persaud, Rettig, Whiston.

PLANNING AND SCHEDULING OF BOND REFERENDUM

Executive Assistant Andy Johnson said at the previous Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (CJCC) meeting, the CJCC discussed a desire to work toward making a decision on this topic. Johnson said there is information provided by the Auditor's Office regarding possible dates for the bond referendum. Based on what he has heard in the design firm interviews, he thinks some of the firms may be able to assist in making this decision. However, this is still a preliminary discussion. Stutsman said County Auditor Tom Slockett was unable to attend the present meeting. Johnson confirmed.

Sullivan said there is approximately an eight week interval between when something is approved by the Board of Supervisors to be placed on the ballot and when it can actually be placed on a ballot. County Attorney Janet Lyness said that is correct. Sullivan said the CJCC would have until late May 2012 to decide whether to schedule the bond referendum in August 2012. Neuzil said it seems that the discussion will be partially based on whether the County wants to spend money on a special election. If so, it will be necessary to justify having a special election as opposed to having the bond referendum on the November General Election ballot. The discussion should also address any opportunities to vote on the bond referendum outside of the General Election or a special election. Such a scenario is possible.

Neuzil said the CJCC has some options to consider, and he does not think they have to decide today. He is convinced it would be tough to justify a special election in March or May 2012 since the consultant's report will not be available until at least April 1, 2012. Johnson said that is the target date, but some of the consultants say they can complete a report by March. Sullivan said April 1, 2012, is the date in the Request for Proposals (RFP).

Stutsman asked Johnson what he meant when he said that some firms can help make the decision about when to schedule the bond referendum. Johnson said the Request for Quotations (RFQ) included preparation of materials for the County to use in a referendum. One of the things the design firms will be highlighting during the interviews is their experience in helping entities with bond referendums. Stutsman agreed with Neuzil that it may be a little premature to discuss this topic at this meeting. Harney said the only election date available in 2012 other than March 1, May 6, and August 7, is the November 6 General Election.

Neuzil said there is one other potential scenario, and it happens to involve Stutsman. If Stutsman is elected to the State House of Representatives, the vacancy on the Board of Supervisors would call for a special election and a general election which would likely take place in either December 2012 or January 2013. Neuzil said in the past, Rettig had pointed out that she was not interested in a special election, and that was partially due to the associated costs. However, this scenario would already have a cost associated with it.

Iowa City City Council Member Connie Champion said she is not completely against a special election, but it needs to be on some particular day, such as Saint Valentine's Day or Veterans Day. Stutsman said she does not think an election can be scheduled at the discretion of the County. Sullivan said according to state law, only certain dates are allowed for special elections. These dates are listed in the packet provided to CJCC members. Neuzil said according to information from County Auditor Tom Slockett, the dates that a special election could be scheduled are March 6, May 1, or August 7, or on the date of a special election to fill a vacancy if there is a vacancy on the Board of Supervisors and if a special election is scheduled. That special election would likely occur in December 2012 or January 2013.

Judge Douglas Russell asked if there is any reason the bond referendum would not be on the November 6, 2012, General Election ballot. Neuzil said he thinks people are hesitant to have it on that date because there would be a much larger electorate to convince to support the proposed justice center. That will impact the CJCC's strategy. He thinks it is best to have the bond referendum during the General Election, but 15,000 University of Iowa students may participate in that election. Neuzil said he assumes that at least half of the students participate in a General Election and presidential election, and when 60% of the vote is necessary to pass the bond referendum, those students become a factor to consider. Stutsman agreed that the CJCC needs to be realistic about this; that is part of the strategy.

Bar Association Representative James McCarragher said from what he has heard everyone say, nobody wants to pay \$75,000 for a special election. If the County is not going to schedule the bond referendum on the date of the General Election, then it makes more sense to him to tie the referendum to something that is already going to occur.

Champion said she agreed that the University of Iowa Students will not vote for a jail, they will vote against it. Neuzil said the CJCC ought to have a good enough argument to convince the entire community, and the students are a part of the community. Students are counted in the Census and the community benefits from the federal money generated by the students. This ultimately comes down to convincing students to support this project which goes beyond the jail issue. Neuzil said CJCC discussions focus way too much on the jail issue. Strategically, they need to bring the discussion back to the sense of safety and security. The community need goes beyond the jail issue; it is a safety issue. Harney said the discussion should involve the Courthouse and the proposed justice center, as well.

Stutsman asked how soon the bond referendum could be placed on the ballot if it was not successful on November 6, 2012. Lyness said she does not think there is a time restriction; it can be put back on the ballot whenever the Board wants. It is more a matter of whether the Board wants to do that. Sullivan said state law does not have a restriction on that, but some groups have tried to suggest at least a one year gap between school bond issues. He said early voting begins 40 days before the General Election. There is a period of a couple weeks in that time when the Auditor's Office needs to print ballots. He thinks the Board has to make a decision about whether something will be on the ballot at least eight weeks before that election would take place. Sullivan said realistically the CJCC would have to make a final decision by the end of May 2012 if they want the bond referendum scheduled at a time other than the General Election.

Neuzil said the consultant or organization that the County works with may be able to provide some guidance in making a decision on the date for the bond referendum. He asked if the CJCC is still interested in conducting a public poll or having an outside organization do it. At this point, that idea has basically been rejected. Stutsman asked how many ballot issues have been successful because polling was done and the entity was more informed about what the electorate is willing to accept. Neuzil said that happens with almost every successful ballot issue. He said the last major countywide bond

initiative was the Conservation Bond Initiative. Polling was conducted, and they knew exactly how much to ask for. It was calculated down to a couple hundred votes. However, it is different when it is done by an outside organization.

Harney said realistically, he thinks the County needs to look at putting the bond referendum on the ballot in the General Election. The CJCC will not have a report, a design, or recommendations back in time to schedule it earlier. If an opportunity for the bond referendum comes up before that date or if there is another date that the CJCC would be more comfortable with, then they can adjust to that date if necessary. Neuzil said if the County wants to schedule the bond referendum at the General Election, the County can inform the other communities that the proposed justice center will be the County's big topic on the ballot. They would respectfully ask other communities, cities, and school districts to postpone putting anything on the ballot that would compete against the justice center initiative. This message of respectfully asking the other entities not to compete against this initiative needs to be sent fairly soon.

Sullivan said it might not hurt to speak to area school district boards to make this message really clear. Neuzil said there could potentially be a letter from the CJCC that outlines this message. The justice center initiative is big, expensive, and will impact every resident that pays property tax in Johnson County. The letter can ask the other entities to help the County prioritize this initiative for the next election.

Harney asked if CJCC members are willing to schedule the bond referendum for the General Election or if they want to leave this topic open until a study is done. Iowa City Public Library Adult Service Coordinator Kara Logsden said she is of two minds. First, she thinks they need to set a date before asking other entities to allow the County to prioritize this initiative. She does not feel like she has enough information to know whether it is the right decision to place the bond referendum on the General Election ballot. She would defer to someone who has more experience in that area. This may be a time for the CJCC to do some polling.

Harney asked if anyone knows how University of Iowa students have voted on ballot initiatives that are unrelated to alcohol initiatives or other University issues. Champion said students ordinarily do not vote on such items, but they will vote in the November 6, 2012 General Election because it is a presidential election. Students do not like the police and the Jail because they feel that the City of Iowa City is putting a lot of their demographic in jail. Champion said that is not true, but that is the gossip that occurs among young students. She thinks the student vote will influence this bond referendum in a negative way.

Stutsman said if students wanted to campaign against the jail initiative, all they would have to say is that it will raise their rent because property owners will have to make up the cost. Champion said she does not think the CJCC should put off the vote because of the students because they can always bring the initiative back. In most elections, the student representation is pretty small, but students do vote in presidential elections. That has become a big thing across the country. The youth got involved in the 2008

presidential election, and they are still involved. Stutsman said people pick and choose which items to vote for on a ballot, and some people skip everything except the presidential candidates. Champion agreed; she is hoping the bond referendum will be on the back side of the ballot and the students will not turn it over. Sullivan said it would probably have to be listed last on the ballot. Champion said a lot of students will want to vote for the presidential candidates, but they probably do not care about many of the other ballot items. It may be alright for the bond referendum to be included. She said the CJCC should go for it.

Stutsman said she does not have enough information to make an informed decision about when the bond referendum should be scheduled. Everyone speculates about the right decision, but there may be some things that someone with more experience could advise the CJCC on. Logsdon said she does not want to keep putting off the decision. It feels like the CJCC needs to make a decision about when this will be placed on the ballot. Harney said he thinks they have tentatively agreed to schedule the bond referendum for the November 6, 2012 General Election, but he does not have any problem leaving this decision open until a report or study from the design firms is completed. Harney said at this time, it does not sound like there is consensus to set a firm date for the bond referendum.

REPORT FROM ALTERNATIVES AND TREATMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Lyness said the committee has nothing to report at this time.

REPORT FROM PUBLIC INFORMATION/OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE **Justice Center Questions and Answers Draft Brochure**

McCarragher said the CJCC members have had the opportunity to review and offer feedback on several draft documents of various pieces of publicity on the proposed justice center project. The Public Information/Outreach Subcommittee members incorporated some of the feedback and now propose the draft documents for a final review. He would like the CJCC members to approve the documents at the present meeting. McCarragher said the Public Information/Outreach Subcommittee would like to begin giving information to the public about the Courthouse and the need for the proposed justice center. The only way they can do this is by publishing documents in places that can be viewed by the public, and that should hopefully generate comments from the public.

McCarragher said the first document includes questions and answers about the proposed justice center. He requested that the CJCC approve the brochure as it is now drafted before them. Lyness said she had some comments but did not send them to McCarragher before the present meeting so she discussed her concerns and suggestions for revision.

Lyness said she was a little worried about including the text which says the present Jail is out of compliance with state requirements for inmate space. County Sheriff Lonny

Pulkrabek said the State Jail Inspector is critical of the Jail's exercise area, so that statement is not inaccurate.

Champion said she likes the whole document and encourages the publication be distributed at libraries and similar places in order to get people thinking about this initiative. McCarragher said he will take comments from the CJCC and then ask for approval of the document subject to those comments.

Lyness asked if the CJCC can be certain that the bond will not exceed \$39 million before hearing the design firm presentations on October 6, 2011. Sullivan said the RFP stated \$39 million so that is what firms should present; anything higher than that is not what the CJCC asked for. Neuzil said the amount listed is specifically related to the bond initiative. The cost of the proposed justice center may be more, but the direction from the CJCC was that the bond initiative will not exceed \$39 million.

McCarragher said the brochure will not probably be distributed within the next two days. If there will be an issue with the \$39 million figure, they can edit that later. As Neuzil said, the amount of the bond referendum may be different from what the total cost of the project may be. The CJCC is just trying to determine the bond amount the public will be asked to support. McCarragher said the CJCC has already talked about some of these things, and he thinks the committee should stand firm on those things that have already been discussed.

Russell said he thinks this is a good document, and it is the product of a lot of thoughtful work. He thinks the CJCC should approve it.

Neuzil said this is a very fluid document. There will be an area on the County web page that will feature this document and others that are developed in order to provide the public with more in depth information. He does not think 10,000 copies should be printed, but some can be printed now.

Stutsman said she does not think the \$39 million figure listed in the document should be changed every month. If the CJCC lists that figure, they should try to stick to it. In her mind, that is the number that has been decided. Sullivan said if one of the design firms presents a \$50 million proposal, it will not be well received. He would rather see cuts in order to create a \$39 million proposal.

Former University of Iowa Campus Planner Larry Wilson said one design firm came right out and said they did not think \$39 million was enough to accommodate everything. CJCC members said that if they set an amount of \$39 million, that amount will just grow by the time it goes out for bid. In order to keep the amount at \$39 million, they will need to go out to bid for a lesser amount and include alternates. In addition, there are construction management costs. In terms of the on-site parking, it was not clear how much parking would be included in the \$39 million proposal. The firms were told that off-site parking would not be included in the amount but on-site parking would. However, if that includes the structure, then that affects a lot. Wilson suggested holding

the amount at no more than \$39 million for everything. If at the end of the interviews, it appears too much has been cut from their programming, adjustments can be made then.

Motion by Citizen Representative Professor Emeritus John Stratton, second by Lyness, to accept the “Justice Center Questions and Answers” brochure including changes laid forth by Lyness. Motion passed.

Courthouse Safety, Security and Space Deficiencies Document

McCarragher said the next document is entitled “Courthouse Safety, Security and Space Deficiencies” dated September 27, 2011.

Motion by McCarragher, second by Stutsman, to accept the “Courthouse Safety, Security, and Space Deficiencies” document. Motion passed.

Justice Center Provides Safety, Security and Space Document

McCarragher said the third document, “Justice Center Provides Safety, Security and Space,” provides information about how the justice center would address deficiencies. Each section provides an answer or solution to a deficiency that was stated in the “Courthouse Safety, Security, and Space Deficiencies” document. Mid-Eastern Council on Chemical Abuse (MECCA) Director Ron Berg said one of the documents includes the word Courthouse in its title and the other one includes the word Justice Center in its title. McCarragher said the proposed justice center will take over the Courthouse and Jail. The proposed justice center will become the courthouse and the jail. Neuzil said there will be a separate document addressing the Jail in the future. Berg said the document regarding the Courthouse is about the current structure and the document regarding the proposed justice center is about the proposed new structure. Neuzil said yes.

Berg said he would have the same comment about this document as Lyness had about treatment and education space in the Justice Center Questions and Answers document. He did not see that deficiency listed in the present document. McCarragher said the additional space for education and treatment programming is aligned with the Jail. He said a new document is currently being created regarding Jail deficiencies. He is trying to get information out regarding the Jail because very little has been published about the Courthouse. It is important for people to understand that this project focuses both on the Jail and the Courthouse. By releasing information to the public, they can come to an understanding that the justice center equates to the combination of the current Jail and current Courthouse which will result in a safer, more secure, and spacious environment.

Logsdon said it may be wise to include a section about Courthouse and Jail safety so everyone starts thinking about both buildings as one within the proposed justice center. McCarragher said paragraph six of the security section addresses the Sheriff’s Office relocation to the justice center and paragraph one in the safety section states there will be one secure public entrance. This entrance would be for both the jail and courthouse. These documents are currently slanted towards the Courthouse because that was the main

focus. However, as the focus now moves towards the jail, new documents will be created. He suggested retitling the document to read that the justice center will provide safety, security, and space for the Courthouse.

Russell said a solution to these concerns may be to retitle the document to convey that the justice center provides these safety, security, and space solutions in place of the existing Jail and Courthouse facilities. When the document regarding Jail deficiencies is completed, a retitled document could be produced reflecting the concerns from the Sheriff's Office as well.

Department of Corrections Supervisor Jerri Allen said the preliminary document addresses exercise space, visitation, and professional visits. Russell clarified that the document regarding the safety, security, and space provisions of the justice center is only half of the final product. Allen said yes it is. Russell clarified that this document is focused on the replacement of the current Courthouse with a proposed justice center, while the second document will cover the replacement of the current Jail with a proposed justice center. McCarragher confirmed.

McCarragher said the title of the document could be changed to "Justice Center Provides Safety, Security, and Space for Courthouse Deficiencies." Harney asked McCarragher if he would like to amend his previous motion to match this statement.

Motion by McCarragher, second by Champion, to accept the "Justice Center Provides Safety, Security and Space for Courthouse Deficiencies" document. Motion passed.

Report on Downtown Location Draft

McCarragher said the final document entitled "Advantages of Justice Center Location" was designed by the CJCC in an attempt to indicate factors they believed support locating the proposed justice center around the current Courthouse. Stutsman, Russell, and Lyness suggested specific corrections to the document and McCarragher agreed to make the changes.

Sullivan said after the chosen architect submits their report, this document may be updated so that it discusses the use of the existing Jail site. It is still unknown as to whether that is going to be part of the plan, but it is a potential amendment.

McCarragher said the CJCC had hoped that this document be placed on the County website so that as the need for change comes, that ability would still stand. This would serve as a way to keep the public up-to-date regarding this project's progress. Harney said things are always subject to change and would be normal with any document published online.

Motion by McCarragher, second by Stratton, to accept the "Advantages of Justice Center Location" document including the recommended changes. Motion passed.

REPORT FROM FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE
Design Firm Selection Process

Johnson said 13 proposals were received. The Facilities Subcommittee was able to narrow that pool down to five firms for initial interviews which were held September 30, 2011, after which the pool was narrowed down again to three design firms. The second-round interviews are scheduled for October 7th and will include Novak Design Group, Neumann Monson Architects, and OPN Architects. Each design firm will be allotted one hour for their presentation followed by 45 minutes for a question and answer session. Neuzil clarified that these interviews are open to the public. Members of the public are welcome to observe or listen to the digital recording which will be available shortly after the meeting adjourns.

Sullivan said the Board has the ability to make their decision that same day if they feel comfortable doing so. Johnson said the first interview will begin at 8:15 a.m., the second will be held at 10:30 a.m., and the final will begin at 1:30 p.m. Lyness encouraged the public to attend this open meeting when the Board will conduct the interviews.

Other

Harney said he spoke with General Services Administration (GSA) Portfolio Management Division Director Kevin Rothmier about his presentation of the Board's proposal in Washington, D.C. GSA now has a new asset manager and is taking some time to bring them up to speed. Rothmier had individual conversations with the new asset manager who seemed to be in favor of the proposed action, but felt that more research was needed before moving ahead. The asset manager informally supports the proposal and Rothmier expects to receive more information within the next few weeks.

Wilson said all of firms interviewed felt that the existing site on Harrison Street was adequate for the current program. However, most of them thought that the additional GSA space would be needed for future expansion. Harney said he asked Rothmier if the County had any obligation to provide space for parking in addition to what is already there. He said he was told that GSA would be satisfied with that until the County decided to construct a parking ramp.

REPORT FROM THE FUNDING AND GRANTS SUBCOMMITTEE

There is no report at this time.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

John Deeth said he is not representing the Auditor's Office but is speaking as a County resident and is on personal vacation time to attend this meeting. He said if the CJCC members plan to ask the public for such a high level of investment, then they owe it to the community to hold that vote when the entire community is present. He said the

rhetoric got offensive during the late stages of the Conservation Bond in which people made statements that students should not be allowed to vote. He saw a bumper sticker stating that only tax payers should vote. Deeth said students are indirectly paying taxes through rent. He does not see any justification in scheduling the bond referendum when 25,000 to 30,000 people are out of the city. He asked, what is Iowa City without the University of Iowa and its students? If there are concerns that the students may vote no on this measure, then the reasons behind such opposition need to be looked at. He said this vote should be held with the 2012 Presidential Election when the most number of voters will be voting.

Set Next Meeting Date

Harney said the next CJCC Meeting is scheduled for November 2, 2011, at 4:30 p.m.

Adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Attest: Tom Slockett, Auditor
By Nancy Tomkovicz, Recording Secretary