

## **Facilities Steering Committee Meeting**

February 23, 2007

Swamp Fox Conference Room

Members Present: Roy Deede, Jan Fritz, Gayle Horton, Laurie Steele, Chuck Sybrandt, Jeff White, Mike Wilkerson

Support Staff Present: Bob Hutchinson, Vickie Ivester, Cindy Johnson, Jerry Woelke

Guests Present: Rod Calkins, John Lattimer

Gayle offered her appreciation to all present for their participation and indicated that everyone should have a copy of the Facilities Master Plan Final Report prepared by Daniel C. Smith & Associates and KMD Architects and Planners. The report was complicated to read with a lot of information, so Gayle created a document, "Facilities Recommendations by Campus," that extracted summary information from Section Five of the report. The other handout was a list of Facilities Steering Committee members and support staff, listing their departments and phone numbers. Gayle indicated that other department staff members are welcome to attend the meetings.

The vision is that the committee will look at the 25,000-foot level and that staff will do the work. The committee will be putting together recommendations for the Board of Commissioners as it goes forward. Then the committee will go through the recommendations to set priorities and take a look at finances. Gayle then summarized the recommendations by campus.

Downtown: No new construction is needed for the downtown area. The Courthouse is sufficient for the 20-year plan if the Law Library and Sheriff's Office Administration move out. Some basic work was done along with the Courthouse restoration to prepare for the new courtroom.

Center Street – Health: The consultants recommend that we build a new health building adjacent to the old building. The plan is in two phases, renovate the old building, construct the new building and move staff currently in leased space to the Center Street campus. The current health building is an open spaced building that was not designed for the maze of offices currently in place. The building has HVAC problems and is not efficient, causing very high utility costs. The current configuration of space creates potential problems for the different categories of customers/clients serviced at the various divisions. We would need the new building, or rent space that would possibly be more costly, in order to renovate the old building. All agreed that the current health building is broken and health and safety concerns need to be resolved. There was discussion that the new health building should be constructed in the next 5 years.

Center Street – Juvenile: The consultants recommend that we retain the Logan buildings, Juvenile Center, Open Air Market, Juvenile House and Wood Shop buildings. However, the Juvenile Center is at the end of its life, and they recommended we build a new Juvenile building for administration and Alternative Program A, and expand the new Juvenile Center to make room for three new courtrooms and support space. They suggest leaving one courtroom space as a core and shell space until we need it as a courtroom. Then the old Juvenile building and Alternative Program A building can be demolished.

The three phases would be:

1. In the next 5+ years – construct the new administrative building (20,000+ gross square feet), expand the Juvenile Center by 15,000+ gross square feet for the 3 court sets (one kept as a shell until 2015), and demolish the existing Juvenile Building.
2. 10 years out – expand the new administrative building by 17,000+ gross square feet and demolish the existing Alternative Programs A building.
3. 15-20 years out – complete the third court set in the Juvenile Center, relocate the staff from Juvenile House to the new administrative building, and convert Juvenile House to a conference center.

The ability to expand the Detention Center was discussed. We would have to double bunk or add another pod to expand. It is not desirable to double bunk because of the liability issues. Not all the beds are being used currently (in the low 40's). It is not known when to anticipate the next pod (not indicated in the study).

The question was asked regarding how to handle areas that were not addressed in the study. These areas, such as a third Juvenile pod, need to be identified by the committee. We need to discuss what to add or subtract to the recommendations, because the Detention facility may not be able accommodate the growth of the next 20 years.

Corrections Campus: The study recommends four phases.

1. In the next 5 years – complete a 128-bed G Pod, add a new infirmary and convert the old infirmary to provide general population beds, and add an Acute Mental Health Unit and a step-down Mental Health unit (56 beds).
2. 10 years out – construct the first half of a 128-bed H Pod, expand the intake area and develop a new jail warehouse, temporarily relocate Parole and Probation to Center Street and demolish the modular buildings, construct a Sheriff's Complex, relocate the Central District from the Work Release Center to the Sheriff's Complex, expand the Work Release Center, reconfigure the space vacated by the Central District, and expand the site Maintenance Facility.
3. 15 years out – complete the second half of the 128-bed H Pod and relocate Parole and Probation to the Sheriff's Complex.

4. Add one additional court set.

The committee should investigate whether we need to add the acute and step-down units in the next 5 years and if it is feasible and cost effective to convert the old infirmary into general population beds.

The committee discussed whether it was wise or not to move the Parole and Probation to the old Health Building during the transition. There are a lot of Parole and Probation clients that are not desirable individuals to interact with some of the Health Department's customers/clients. There also are concerns about youth offenders mixing with adult offenders, though the juveniles should be supervised. It would be ideal if the new construction for Parole and Probation were completed on the property before relocation.

If it were decided to expand the Work Release Center, it would have to be reconfigured inside. We would require a needs and cost analysis, including the additional cost of maintenance anticipated.

Public Works: The committee will discuss Public Works in more detail when Jim Sears is present, hopefully at the next committee meeting.

Building 1 is the Administration Building and the study recommends keeping this building. Buildings 2 and 3 are currently used by the fleet operations and it is recommended that these be demolished and replaced with a new consolidated building. The consultant recommended keeping building 2 as a storage space and demolishing building 3. Buildings 4 through 9 are primarily storage facilities and anticipated replacement could be 15-20 years out. Buildings 10 through 12 are primarily storage facilities and should be adequate through 2025. A covered parking area is recommended for the large equipment and other service vehicles. It was decided that further discussion on Public Works will be tabled until Jim can participate.

General Discussion

There is a need for more in-depth information gathering. Is there an alternative to a new Health building? Building costs should be compared to leasing other locations. Can staff from other locations be incorporated into fewer leases? It was noted that a lot of space is already leased for Health Department programs and staff. It is felt that the leased space would be more expensive than built space, especially if there is currently enough County-owned land – it would make sense to build there.

Questions were raised about whether IT has enough equipment room. It is believed that IT is crowded now and at capacity. There are plans to buy new servers; Sun boxes provide more capacity. One will be moved out to the Silverton Road campus. The new equipment also uses less electricity. We may need to take another look at Courthouse Square to see if that IT space is used efficiently. The consultants didn't believe it was. Laurie Steele mentioned that a committee was formed to discuss the use of space within

Courthouse Square. Issues were prioritized and the committee decided to table it for now because of the lack of funding for making changes.

The question was asked about the impact of moving the Law Library to the first floor of Courthouse Square. John Lattimer advised the committee that the Law Library will not be moving to the first floor. There should be sufficient funds to pay for leased space for the Law Library when it needs to move. The Law Library will definitely be moved out of the Courthouse, but not necessarily to Courthouse Square.

Further discussion on the Health Campus noted that the Health Building is an unhealthy building. It is an inappropriate building for some of the clinic services. It was not designed for cubicles since there are more triangles than square walls. Space needs to be separated out to preserve client confidentiality. In order to get from one area to another, staff and/or visitors must walk through patient areas. Some people have to work around refrigerators of vaccines. The traffic flows don't work well and people tend to get lost in the building. The facility is difficult and expensive to maintain. It was noted that the utilities for the Health Department building and the Jail are very costly. It is believed that every possible accommodation has already been done. For efficiency, satellite sites should be moved together. Financing will be a challenge.

John Lattimer believed it would be helpful to look at campuses instead of buildings, although it is hard to do because you have different departments with different funding. Consensus of the committee was that it would be advantageous to look at other ways of funding. Trying to get the public to vote for a bond may be difficult for health facilities. Also, Salem-Keiser and City of Salem are going out for bonds, so we could find it difficult to get some passed. Another idea was to have someone else build and buy the facility back – basically like paying rent. John Lattimer felt we would still need a funding stream, so we might as well build.

Some questions asked were what the cost is of staffing a pod and can we get extra beds by converting existing pods. Mike indicated that they would need to do an operations levy in addition to the building bonds. It was explained that 70 beds out of a total of 600 are not used. The strategy is to not fill them all so that people can be moved around as needed. It is believed that redoing the HVAC in the Work Release Center will allow for the addition of 30-40 more beds. That would be pushing it operationally, but there is the capacity for growth.

It was discussed that the voters may support a bond for a 128-bed expansion if we go out to the community with our concerns and keep a single focus. Diluting the focus would probably get a failed vote. There is a need for a medical detox area, which is a need that the community may support. It may be advisable to go out for bonds to do both Phase 1 and 2 together instead of phasing.

Discussion on Costs: Costs estimated for the first 5 yrs include:

Construct the new Health Building	\$22,148,883
Renovate existing Health Building	\$11,665,701
Construct the new Juvenile Administration Building	\$11,330,550
Expand the Juvenile Center for two additional court-sets	\$6,280,848
Complete Corrections G Pod	\$7,062,957
Construct a new Infirmary	\$4,455,000
Construct a new Acute Mental Health Unit	\$2,227,500
Construct a new Mental Health Step-down Unit	\$4,009,500
Construct a new Medical Area in Jail	\$2,646,000

Mike Wilkerson said that in their research to prepare for a bond, the designers feel the costs have been underestimated in the report. Their cost estimates to expand G-Pod would be closer to \$11 million in today's money, not \$7 million. It was felt that the consultants tried to be fair in their estimates, but the estimates are not coming close to architects' estimates.

It was felt that Health could save some money from leases, but would still need additional funds. We will need to plan for a revenue stream for paying debt service. Health will need to see if any of their grant funds can be used for facility costs or not. They do know that Medicaid funds can only go for services.

We may need to analyze the cost for using the current Juvenile Administration Building to show the offset to the cost of a new building. There was a question regarding available grant money for Juvenile or the Jail and possible homeland security funding. The committee feels those options should be pursued.

This committee will need to determine priorities and financing options, which will require research before making recommendations to the Board of Commissioners. Since costs can change dramatically in just a few months, there is some concern that estimated costs may not be realistic.

To summarize, more information on the funding is needed and a determination on whether the plans really accommodate the programs. Will the new Health Building be sufficient space for the programs? Will we remodel the old building and use both buildings? We need to project growth and see if the timeframe is reasonable. The Lancaster site is crowded now. Some programs have changed since the survey. What is the difference in the cost of leasing vs. purchasing? We need analytical work done. Utilities are very expensive. We need information on what the debt service will be. We need to look at the work before setting priorities. Do we agree with the report (some things need to be updated)? When we answer these questions, we may set priorities differently than the consultants did.

Departments need to spend time looking at their areas of the report and then come back to the committee ready to discuss their needs and priorities. The findings must be taken seriously because there are serious problems with some facilities.

Next Meeting

Gayle will try to schedule the next meeting on a Friday morning the first week of April, if possible. You should be receiving a meeting invite shortly.

Meeting adjourned. Minutes prepare by Vickie Ivester, Business Services Administration