

CUMBERLAND COUNTY FACILITIES COMMITTEE
MARCH 12, 1998, 8:00AM

MEMBERS

PRESENT: Commissioner J. Lee Warren, Jr.
Commissioner Thomas B. Bacote
Commissioner Ed Melvin

OTHERS: Cliff Strassenburg, County Manager
James Martin, Deputy County Manager
Juanita Pilgrim, Asst. County Manager
Cliff Spiller, Asst. County Manager
Neil Yarborough, County Attorney
Bob Stanger, County Engineer
Tom Cooney, Staff Engineer
Sheriff Earl Butler
Dan Ford, Chief Jailer
Marsha Fogle, Clerk

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes: December 11, 1997

A motion was made by Commissioner Bacote, seconded by Commissioner Melvin and unanimously approved to approve the minutes.

2. Election of Chairman

Commissioner Warren was unanimously elected Chairman of the Committee.

3. Designation of Regular Meeting Time (currently 2nd Thursday of each month at 8:00AM)

The Committee set the regular meeting time to the 2nd Thursday of each month at 8:30AM.

4. Presentation of Jail Site Plan by Greer Fripp

Mr. Steve Allan and Mr. Glenn Wehr presented the plan to the Committee. They offered the following information:

1. Most of the original plan for the jail can be used.
2. The site is flat and will not require a lot of grading.
3. There is good access from Gillespie Street because of the stop light. Limited access from Russell Street
4. Three options for placing the buildings on the site:

Option A: 268,000 square feet
Cost Estimate: \$39,000,000
About 10,000 square feet was cut from the building (trimmed the fat)
very limited parking

Option B. 270,000 square feet
Cost Estimate: \$40,000,000
Will allow full program expansion up to 1,000 beds
Improved parking from Option A
Building is very close to property line

Option C 269,000 square feet
Cost Estimate: \$39,500,000
Administrative functions moved to 2nd level
Secure functions on 1st level
Frees up footage for good site development
Adequate parking for staff and public
Adequate space for additional housing

Greer Fripp recommends the Board of Commissioners go with Option C. This option will provide a few more than 500 beds (512). In response to a question concerning the environmental issues, it was noted that in estimating the cost of construction, they used the worse case scenario in dealing with the site.

Cliff Strassenburg pointed out the cost estimate noted above is for construction only and does not include land cost., etc. He also noted that the areas that contain the most environmental problems would be areas that would be utilized for additional housing down the road and nature could very well take its course and clean up a lot of the problem.

Dan Ford noted 13,000 people were admitted to the jail last year. Sheriff Butler stated he felt 500 beds initially would be adequate. In discussing the jail in the law enforcement center and how it could be utilized, the Sheriff said it was not feasible to run two jails. He said they needed to discuss how to utilize the building. It was noted there is a need for about \$1,000,000 worth of repairs/renovations to the building.

Proposed Schedule if the Board authorizes the architects to move forward:

2-3 months to do schematic design
10 months to complete design
24 months for construction

It will take approximately three years to complete the project.

MOTION: **Commissioner Melvin offered a motion to recommend to the full Board that we move forward with Option C.**

SECOND: **Commissioner Bacote**

VOTE: **UNANIMOUS**

5. Discussion: Construction/Administration Services - DSS Building

Mr. Bob Stanger, County Engineer, offered the following thoughts on the construction/administration of the new DSS Building. He noted at this point little discussion has taken place concerning the method in which the County will administer the construction. He noted the goal is to produce a high quality building within the construction budget that is consistent with the plans and specifications. Under the terms of the contract with LSV Partnership, they will provide customary construction administration services as a part of their basis services, to include periodic (minimum weekly) inspections of the work, shop drawing review and approval, project documentation and general administration of the construction contracts. This is generally adequate for most county construction projects. However, because of the magnitude of the project, a higher level of service is warranted. He three offers three methods for consideration:

1. Augment the existing Engineering Department to provide adequate staff for full-time construction inspection services;
2. Contract with a private construction management firm to work in conjunction with the project architect;

3. Amend the project architect agreement to provide full-time inspection and a higher level of construction administration.

He pointed out the importance of keeping in mind the contractual relationship between the Owner, Architect and Contractor(s) and the responsibilities of each party when evaluating a project delivery approach. He noted the importance of communications to the contractor flowing through one entity. In his opinion the County should never assume the responsibility of providing directives to the Contractor because it gives the contractor the ability to play the owner against the architect and it requires the owner to interpret plans and specifications which is clearly the Architect's responsibility. He noted the County may want to employ a full time project manager within the Engineering Department to provide full-time owner representation, however this should not negate the need for a full time Resident Project Architect.

Mr. Stanger's recommendation is that we negotiate to have a full time Resident Project Architect, project engineer and clerical support for this project. Estimated cost: \$350,000 to \$500,000.

In discussing this issue with the Committee members, Mr. Stanger noted that the problem with the county acting in the role of project architect, increases our liability. For instance, if the county engineer gave a directive to the contractor and for some reason there was a problem, then the county would assume the liability, not the Architect. In addition, not having a full-time resident architect could cause delays if there are site problems in which the Architect cannot attend to on a timely basis.

County Attorney Neil Yarborough noted that Mr. Stanger's recommendation of providing a resident on-site architect puts more of the burden of overseeing the project and liability on the Architect.

Mr. Stanger stated he felt we would need a Resident Project Architect for the Jail project also.

Commissioners Bacote, Melvin and Warren indicated they would rather have county staff to oversee the project.

MOTION: Commissioner Bacote offered a motion that we secure additional people for the Engineering Department to handle the project.

SECOND: Commissioner Melvin

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

6. Parking Issues:

- A. Leasing of additional parking space from First Presbyterian Church
- B. Providing two spaces for State Employees Credit Union Full Service ATM Kiosk

MOTION: Commissioner Bacote offered a motion that the County request a proposal from the Church relative to providing additional county parking spaces (at the old fire station, once it has been demolished), that we make parking in front of the Courthouse 1 hour and ask the Sheriff's Department to include in their budget money for an enforcement officer, and that we provide two parking spaces for a full service ATM (State Employees Credit Union).

SECOND: Commissioner Melvin

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

7. Discussion: Law Enforcement Cooling Tower Replacement

Cliff Spiller, Asst. County Manager, told the Committee he will be asking the Board of Commissioners to appropriate money to replace this unit during this fiscal year. He said we should not wait any longer to get started on this project. Cost: \$225,000.

MOTION: Commissioner Bacote offered a motion that we proceed with the cooling tower replacement.

SECOND: Commissioner Melvin
VOTE: UNANIMOUS

8. Consideration of Rental Space for Storage of Surplus Property

Mr. Spiller told the Committee he is looking for storage space for the county. He will be bringing information to the full Board of Commissioners concerning location, cost, etc. No action needed today.

9. Other Matters:

Commissioner Bacote asked what is being done about the old courthouse as it relates to fixing some of the problems. Mr. Strassenburg noted that the first thing that needs to be done is sealing and caulking the building. After that the county can look at painting the inside. He noted the County has tried to find someone to remove the jail cells but everyone who has looked at the project says it is not economically feasible to remove them. Therefore those floors which have the jail cells will have to be used as storage. Mr. Strassenburg told the Committee they are looking at placing a second janitor in the building.

MEETING ADJOURNED