

CUMBERLAND COUNTY FACILITIES COMMITTEE
NEW COURTHOUSE, 117 DICK STREET, 5TH FLOOR, ROOM 564
JANUARY 6, 2011 – 8:30 AM
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Jimmy Keefe, Chair (arrived at 8:40 am)
Commissioner Marshall Faircloth
Commissioner Jeannette Council

OTHER COMMISSIONERS

PRESENT: Commissioner Edward Melvin
Commissioner Charles Evans (departed at 9:00 am)
Commissioner Billy King (arrived at 9:40 am)

OTHERS PRESENT:

James Martin, County Manager
Amy Cannon, Assistant County Manager
Howard Abner, Assistant Finance Director
Sally Shutt, Communications and Strategic Initiatives
Manager
Rick Moorefield, County Attorney
Kenny Currie, Emergency Services Director
Robert N. Stanger, County Engineer
Al Brunson, Facilities Maintenance Manager
Candice H. White, Deputy Clerk to the Board
Press

Commissioner Faircloth called the meeting to order and stated Commissioner Keefe was in route to the meeting.

1. ELECTION OF FACILITIES COMMITTEE CHAIR

MOTION: Commissioner Council moved to reappoint Commissioner Keefe as Chair of the Facilities Committee.
SECOND: Commissioner Faircloth
VOTE: UNANIMOUS

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – NOVEMBER 4, 2010 REGULAR MEETING

MOTION: Commissioner Council moved to approve the minutes.
SECOND: Commissioner Faircloth
VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Pending the arrival of Commissioner Keefe, Commissioner Faircloth suggested that James Martin, County Manager, determine the order of the agenda.

3. UPDATE ON MARKETABILITY OF FORMER PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT (APPRAISAL)

Mr. Martin reported that James Lawson, Assistant County Manager, had been working with appraiser Tom Keith who will perform the appraisal on the former public health building and the adjacent property which is part of the site. Mr. Martin further reported Mr. Keith said he would visit the site in two weeks and provide an official appraisal four weeks after his visit. Mr. Martin stated the appraised value of the property should be available at the March meeting of the Facilities Committee. Mr. Martin further stated Mr. Lawson was told by Mr. Keith that he thought the building could take some time to sell and the greater likelihood would be for the county to lease the space until it could be sold.

Commissioner Faircloth inquired regarding the E911 status with the city of Fayetteville. Mr. Martin stated Fayetteville City Manager Dale Iman provided a comprehensive report to the City Council at their work session this past Monday, January 3, 2011. Mr. Martin also referenced the letter provided to the County Commissioners and City Council about a phased approach and that additional time would be needed to work out the particulars of the third phase or actual merger. Mr. Martin stated at the conclusion of a recent presentation, city staff told county staff that it might be desirable to bring in a consultant who had experience in facilities and operations to take a comprehensive look at and identify all issues that might be involved in merging the two physical locations. Mr. Martin further stated the proposal is that the city and county jointly fund the study, the cost of which is currently unknown. Mr. Martin requested feedback from the committee.

Commissioner Keefe opened the floor for questions. Commissioner Council referenced the letter to Mr. Martin dated January 3, 2011 in which the court requested that the county begin their planning process to move all county offices out of the courthouse and the Board of Election's need for space, and stated there is an interrelationship and interdependency involved with the county's many facility needs. Commissioner Council asked staff for suggestions as to how the Board could best look at all of the needs and timelines at the same time.

Commissioner Keefe asked Rick Moorefield, County Attorney, whether the letter from the court was a mandate or a request, and if the county could be mandated to move out of the courthouse or provide more courtroom space. Mr. Moorefield stated there is no clear cut answer but judges do have an inherent authority with respect to being able to manage certain levels of facilities and security, while the Board of County Commissioners is responsible for the county's facilities, including the courthouse, and funding the cost of the facilities. Mr. Moorefield further stated he considered the letter to be a request or notice because the judges noted that this has been an expectation and discussion since the courthouse was initially constructed. Mr. Moorefield stated however, it could go to another level.

Commissioner Keefe stated until the county receives a firm commitment from the city of Fayetteville for the E911 merger, he would not recommend spending money on a consultant. Commissioner Faircloth asked whether the Board needed to take immediate action on a consultant. Mr. Martin stated he thinks city staff are reluctant to move forward on a number of issues until they have a more comprehensive understanding of what will be involved throughout the process. Mr. Martin further stated the city and the county are fully committed to phases one and two but he feels there is concern by the city as it relates to costs involved with the physical location. Mr. Martin stated he does not think the county has the current ability to fund a facility that would satisfy the needs of a consolidated dispatch center. A brief discussion followed.

4. REVIEW OF 2005 LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER (LEC) ASSESSMENT (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

Commissioner Council inquired whether it would be cost effective when considering the detention center expansion, to have all law enforcement housed in one building. Commissioner Council stated she would like to hear further recommendations.

Bob Stanger, County Engineer, stated if staff were to be displaced from the LEC, a facility would have to be built on the detention center site which would take space which could potentially be used for incarceration and use it for administrative space. Mr. Stanger stated he felt this would accelerate the timeline for the need to search out another jail site. Mr. Stanger stated he did not feel that was a direction the current Board should take and that the Board should probably go back to the original concept which included a third building for County Administration on the Courthouse site. There is an opportunity for a third administrative building on the Franklin Street parking lot that could house all of the needs to include the Board of Elections and Community Development. Mr. Stanger stated this would probably involve an associated parking deck.

Mr. Stanger further stated when the Law Enforcement Center (LEC) analysis was conducted in 2005 for potential reuse of the third and fourth floors, it was determined that the cost of demolition and renovation for office space was rapidly approaching the cost of new construction. Mr. Stanger stated in 2005 there was no discussion of moving the Sheriff's Office out of the first and second floors so the cost to renovate and reconfigure and move other agencies into that space may be cost effective over new construction. Mr. Stanger stated however this option would involve building 44,000 square feet somewhere else for the Sheriff's Office. Commissioner Council suggested the possibility of vertical expansion at the detention center site.

Mr. Stanger stated were a new county facility to be constructed, 100,000 square feet would likely be needed and the estimated cost would be \$20 million plus the cost of land. Mr. Stanger further stated the cost to renovate the former public health building, to include equipment and furnishings, would be close to \$13 million. Mr. Stanger pointed out that a 100,000 square foot facility should not include E911 dispatch because it would not make sense to build the entire structure to meet E911 standards. Discussion followed.

Mr. Stanger referenced the 2008 feasibility study and stated it would be a good base for relocating county administrative functions out of the courthouse facility; however the entire LEC had not been factored into the study. Kenny Currie, Emergency Services Director, stated emergency management, Fire Marshall functions and communications currently operate out of a little over 3,000 square feet. Mr. Moorefield advised it would also be prudent to maintain something in close proximity to the courthouse for the Sheriff's function to bring inmates back and forth to the court system.

Discussion returned to whether the county would participate in the cost of the study and whether there was a current need for additional space for a consolidated PSAP. Mr. Martin stated that based on this discussion, he was clear that the Committee did not wish to join with the city in hiring a consultant to study the consolidation and the county would move forward with a plan to utilize the \$1.9 million in E911 funds within the allowable timeframe. Mr. Stanger confirmed he would take a look at the entire LEC.

5. UPDATE ON PROGRESS AND TIMELINE OF CONSTRUCTION AND FINANCING OF THE JAIL EXPANSION

Mr. Stanger recapped activities leading up to the first meeting of the working committee held on January 4, 2011 during which there was a review of the facility tours and population forecasts that are being used to determine the number and classification of beds needed in the future. Mr. Stanger stated it was determined that the current mix of segregation, single or double lock-back cells, and dorm rooms was probably the right mix for the expanded facility. Mr. Stanger further stated recommendations for the number and types of beds for the expansion will be brought back to the next meeting. Mr. Stanger stated growth in five year increments out to thirty years was also looked at and based on the architect's preliminary analysis, it appears that in 2013 836 beds will be needed; the projection out to 2030 was for 900 beds, however, these numbers will be refined once the population forecasts are confirmed. Mr. Stanger advised the architects will conduct evaluations of the core facilities, controls and mechanical/electrical systems in the existing building. Mr. Stanger stated the next meeting is scheduled for January 24, 2011 and the programming/conceptual designs are anticipated to be completed in about fifteen weeks. Mr. Stanger stated he will update the Facilities Committee in February and he anticipates bringing back firm recommendations to the Facilities Committee and the Board of Commissioners in the March timeframe.

Amy Cannon, Assistant County Manager, provided an overview of potential funding sources for the detention facility expansion included herein at Attachment 5.A. Ms. Cannon reminded those present that there is 6/10 of a cent of the property tax rate dedicated towards the jail project and those monthly taxes are coded directly to the capital project fund, not the general fund. Ms. Cannon stated there is \$1.2 million budgeted as well as the \$1.8 million transfer from the general fund that came from the funds segregated for the health facility for total revenue in the amount of \$3,017,794.

Ms. Cannon stated expenses budgeted to date include \$164,682 for the architect and \$2.8 million for other construction for a total of \$3,017,794.

Ms. Cannon advised when looking at financing for the detention facility expansion, two variable factors to consider are the cost and actual timing of the project. Ms. Cannon reviewed the undesignated reserve (\$2,391,868), old health department reserve (\$3,882,892), and renovation/maintenance reserve (\$2,265,121) as potential funding sources and noted designation of the renovation and maintenance reserve is not recommended at this time. Ms. Cannon stated the costs begin at \$12 million since that figure has been in the CIP plan for the past several years. Ms. Cannon then reviewed funding from the potential funding sources and noted shortfalls for which other financing means would need to be secured. Ms. Cannon also noted that a 2% growth factor had been added to the \$1.2 million. Ms. Cannon stated at the end of fiscal year 2014, the dedicated ad valorem tax would revert to assist with funding for operating costs estimated to be about \$3 million per year.

Mr. Martin and Ms. Cannon responded to questions. Consensus of the committee was that the renovation and maintenance reserve be removed as a potential funding source.

6. OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS

There were no additional matters of business.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:55 AM