



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

Planning • Architecture • Engineering • Interiors • Facility Management

PROJECT: Henry County LEC – Citizens Committee Meeting #5

LOCATION OF MEETING: Mount Pleasant, IA – Courthouse 2nd Floor Meeting Room

PROJECT NO.: 160811 **DATE:** January 30, 2017 **TIME:** 6:30 PM

PERSONS INVOLVED:	COMMUNITY/ORGANIZATION:	EMAIL ADDRESS:
Nancy Davis	Winfield	cndavis1994@gmail.com
Kay Denning	Mt. Pleasant	kaydenning2@gmail.com
Kurt Garretson	Jackson Township	kurtgarretson@gmail.com
Mike Hampton	Iowa Wesleyan University	mhampton@iw.edu
Gary Lauger	Swedesburg	gary@lauger.com
Bob McPheron	New London	bjmcp1983@gmail.com
Kirby Moon	Mt. Union	kirbymoon02@gmail.com
Kate Newman	Mt. Pleasant	newmank82@gmail.com
Brad Roth	Mayor of Wayland	bradroth@yahoo.com
Judy Sammons	Mt. Pleasant	jsammons@lisco.com
Cherry Sandeen	ISU Extension; Mt. Pleasant	cherry.sandeen@gmail.com
Jerry Wells	Mt. Pleasant	bricklayer245@gmail.com
Marc Lindeen	Henry County Board of Supervisors	supervisors@henrycountyiowa.us
Greg Moeller	Henry County Board of Supervisors	supervisors@henrycountyiowa.us
Gary See	Henry County Board of Supervisors	supervisors@henrycountyiowa.us
Rich McNamee	Henry County Sheriff	rmcnamee@henrycountyiowa.us
Julie Pilling	Henry County Jail Administrator	jpilling@henrycountyiowa.us
Steve Riley	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	sriley@prochaska.us
Jim Classe	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	jclasse@prochaska.us
Zach Svoboda	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	zsvoboda@prochaska.us
<i>Members unable to attend:</i>		
Steve Gerling	Mount Union	grrman@louisacomm.net
Linda Mortland	Mt. Pleasant	601 S. Locust St., Mt. Pleasant, IA
Steve Nichting	Salem	snichtingconst@hotmail.com

Guests in attendance:
Jack Swarm, Mt. Pleasant Building and Zoning Administrator
Several other guests attended but did not sign the attendance sheet.

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the meeting was to review cost projections developed for the Site Options presented in previous meetings. Drawings of Option 1A, Option 1B, Option 2 and Option 3 were briefly presented again and budgets estimates then followed.

1. Committee Chair Mike Hampton opened the meeting and noted that there were several guests in the audience. To help identify those in attendance, he asked everyone to introduce themselves going around the room. After these introductions, Mike asked for any opening comments. A comment had been received from a member of the public that other jails in the surrounding area have plenty of space and that inmates should just be transported rather than expand Henry County's jail. P&A noted that this idea has been studied (Option 3) and that the projected cost of doing this Option may change the person's mind.
2. Sheriff McNamee noted that documentation and drawings from all prior meetings is available to the public on the Henry County website and Facebook page.
3. P&A distributed copies of the Meeting Agenda and passed around the Attendance Record. It was noted that Steve Riley of P&A was unable to attend due to an unanticipated medical issue. He had prepared the budgets and shared background information with Jim prior to departure this morning.
4. P&A thanked Jack Swarm, Mt. Pleasant Building and Zoning Administrator, for his attendance at the meeting. Jack has been a tremendous help in the study of the Options developed thus far. Jack had offered to attend this meeting to help answer questions and provide information for the Committee.
5. P&A began a PowerPoint presentation to review information presented at prior meetings. The project schedule was discussed, including the possibility of switching from a May bond election to an August bond election if it becomes necessary. Several slides were used to explain how projected costs were developed. The difference between Hard Cost and Soft Costs was discussed. Hard Cost describes the actual cost of the building construction including fixed equipment, finishes and site work and is the amount people most often refer to when discussing a building's cost. However, there are many other costs that an owner incurs when building a project, beyond the contractor bids. These additional costs are called Soft Costs and include: site acquisition (if applicable); site survey to identify topography and exact location of easements and property lines; a geotechnical report to identify soil types and bearing capacity; professional engineering and architectural fees for design and construction administration; soil and concrete testing during construction; independent special inspections required by code; printing costs for construction documents; state agency review fees; reimbursable consultant expenses; furnishings/kitchen/laundry and miscellaneous movable equipment; data/communications equipment; builder's risk/all risk insurance; EPA required SWPPP erosion control inspections; construction phase contingency; and Hazmat assessment and abatement for existing buildings. When Hard Cost and Soft Costs are added together, this represents the overall project cost.
6. Inflation must be accounted for in the preparation of a budget. The numbers presented tonight are targeted for bids to be received in January 2018, assuming a May bond election. If it is decided to pursue an August bond election, the numbers will need to be adjusted for an additional three months of inflation (about 0.75% by rule-of-thumb). A chart was presented showing inflation rates over the last ten years.
7. The projected costs at such a preliminary stage are based on cost per square foot numbers multiplied by the area of each building component. Cost per square foot has been determined using both historical costs from our previous jail/office projects as well as national cost estimating guides. The national guides require the use of localization factors and building size factors. A slide was presented showing the difficulty of assigning a square foot cost, as seven of our recent jail projects in Iowa and Nebraska had a very wide spread of costs. This may be due to factors such as proximity to metropolitan areas, project size, number of bidders, state of the economy, etc.
8. Drawings were presented illustrating the Options 1A, 1B, 2 and 3.

Option 1A expands on the existing site (about 0.83 acre), renovating the existing building and using new construction for the jail, intake area and office expansion. The existing boiler building, evidence storage building and radio tower must be removed. This option is unable to fit within the building

setbacks. Off-street parking will not fit on the site and would require variances to be along the street curb. Future building expansion would require acquisition of adjacent residential property. Additional expansions beyond that would not be possible without closure of a street. Construction phasing would be necessary to allow renovation of the existing building and relocation of courthouse boilers.

Option 1B uses the existing site and attempts to work within building setbacks by removing the existing LEC building (which already violates the setback). Although more parking is shown on this version, it still requires variances since it must be curb parking rather than off-street parking. The building is all new and thus would require extensive construction phasing to build portions, relocate staff, tear down existing construction, and finish the new construction. Again the existing boiler building, evidence storage building and radio tower would need to be removed. Future expansion requires acquisition of two adjacent residential properties. Further future expansion would require closure of a street.

Option 2 studies a County-owned greenfield site (6.18 acres) which was also anticipated for use in previous bond elections that narrowly failed to pass. This option would be entirely new construction on a separate site, eliminating the need for construction phasing. The site accommodates off-street parking. Utilities are also available. The existing radio tower is anticipated to remain at its current location and would relay signals to be received at the proposed site. One difficulty is the many easements present on the property. Although most of the easements are at the perimeter, a 30' wide easement crosses through the middle of the site to accommodate a water line. The grade of the property is also fairly steep in places. The building design works around the easements and setbacks and attempts to work with a leveled area at the south side of the site. This site requires transportation of inmates to the courthouse.

Option 3 studies the concept of transporting and housing all inmates at other jails in the region. The existing site would be a 24 hour holding facility. The existing facility still must be upgraded to meet IDOC guidelines and building codes. A drawing has been illustrated of an addition with a single vehicle sallyport, booking area and holding cells on the ground level. Henry County jailors would contact other jail facilities for cell availability based on classification and then transport the inmates. The County pays housing costs, medical expenses, and transportation costs, including returning to the courthouse when needed.

9. For all sites within Mt. Pleasant, a Special Use Permit for a County Law Enforcement Center will be required from the Board of Adjustment. Depending on the selected site, rezoning may be recommended or needed. Other variances may be necessary as well. The City's Comprehensive Plan will also need to be considered, which identifies anticipated building types for different areas of Mt. Pleasant. In regard to a Special Use Permit, Jack Swarm suggested that the Committee go to the Board of Adjustment with a single preferred site rather than multiple options. Jack estimated the process might last 6 weeks to two months. He stated it is possible the Board would want to have an idea what the facility would look like as well.
10. Other possible site options were also discussed. A couple County-owned sites are located next to South Iris Street and are currently farmland. However, the sites do not currently have utilities. Another issue is that the sites are very near to the airport runway and would have strict limitations on building/radio antenna heights. Discussion of the limitations moved the Committee away from these sites. Another site was discussed immediately north of the Option 2 site, although several Committee members agreed that keeping the building further south as in Option 2 would be more ideal.
11. P&A distributed handout copies of the projected costs for the studied options. The first two pages provided a summary for each Option, and the following pages provided the supporting calculations. The first line of each budget summary for Options 1A, 1B and 2 provides the Hard Cost in bold text, and the last line provides the Total Project Budget. Option 3 lists the Hard Cost of the holding addition, followed by the transport and housing cost for 20 years. The total 20 year project budget is

given in net present value in 2018 dollars (although costs will continue to accumulate every year beyond 20 years as well or until a jail is built).

12. A question was asked if the Option 3 cost includes the increase in inmate population expected over 20 years. P&A indicated that the estimate does include the increase in inmates. It was then noted that the Options 1A, 1B and 2 only had 44 beds, while Option 3 increases to 74 in 20 years. To be consistent, the cost to add an addition to reach 74 beds should be provided for Options 1A, 1B and 2. (Editor's note: This issue is unusual because the County is pursuing a lower number of beds (44) than the 20 year projection of 74 beds. The figures will be updated for the final report. For quick reference, the future jail addition is drawn at 8,018 sq. ft., which equates to \$2,664,620 in hard cost. Soft cost would increase as well for each option, although the totals will still be lower than the Option 3 total.)
13. It was asked if these projections account for interest accrued on the bond. These budgets anticipate the hard and soft costs for construction of individual options. The County's fiscal agent can provide much greater detail regarding levies, interest and other financial issues associated with the bond. A fiscal agent may be asked to attend the next Committee meeting for information and to answer questions.
14. It was noted that the area jails are not overflowing with extra beds, which some people seem to perceive. There are many times that surrounding jails will not take additional inmates and turn Henry County inmates away. Sometimes other jails are too full, or sometimes an inmate is too mentally ill. Henry County jailors must deal with this difficulty on a daily basis, (When classifying inmates, a rule-of-thumb is that a jail is full when it reaches 80% of capacity.)
15. The Iowa Department of Corrections performs inspections of county jails and has flagged issues with Henry County, although these issues have been grandfathered so far, as long as a plan is in place to correct them. The existing facility will not be able to continue as-is indefinitely. Sheriff McNamee can provide the inspection report for review. (For safety reasons, not all deficiencies should be made public.) Delbert Longley of the IDOC could also be asked to attend a Committee meeting for his input.
16. If members of the public inquire about the existing jail, Jail Administrator Julie Pilling offered to provide tours of the building.
17. Although it is not intentionally sized for such a purpose, if Henry County builds new jail space, it potentially could house inmates from other counties as a source of income when cells are available.
18. The group was asked to comment on their preferred site option. Some members commented about the great difficulty of phasing construction work as necessary in Options 1A and 1B. It would be a headache for staff to work around the renovation. Will homeowners accept an expanded 44 bed jail in their neighborhood? A goal will be to identify the Committee's recommended option very soon, to allow the Special Use Permit to be pursued for a specific site.
19. Rich McNamee will work to set up a tour for the Citizens Committee of the Louisa County Jail, which is a newer building. Louisa County currently houses many transports from Henry County, uses the same healthcare service and has the same software. This tour will help Committee members become more familiar with a modern jail facility. Rich will try for Monday, February 13th if this works for Louisa County staff.
20. The next Committee meeting is now scheduled for Monday, February 20th at 6:30 PM at the same location (2nd floor meeting room at the Courthouse). Rich will contact Delbert Longley of the IDOC to hopefully attend the next meeting for his input. P&A will determine if one of the County's fiscal agents can attend this meeting for their input as well.

BY: 
Jim Classe, AIA
Vice President/Design

February 2, 2017 _____
Date

If any of the parties present take exception to these meeting notes, please notify Prochaska & Associates within five (5) days of issuance for correction or they shall stand as written.

PROCHASKA & ASSOCIATES

11317 Chicago Circle • Omaha, Nebraska 68154-2633

Telephone: (402) 334-0755

FAX: (402) 334-0868

E-Mail: mail@prochaska.us