



# MEETING DOCUMENTATION

Planning • Architecture • Engineering • Interiors • Facility Management

**PROJECT:** Webster County Justice Center – 5th Citizens Committee Meeting

**LOCATION OF MEETING:** Red Cloud, NE – Courthouse 3rd Floor Courtroom

**PROJECT NO.:** 170509      **DATE:** May 24, 2018      **TIME:** 6:30 PM

<b>PERSONS INVOLVED:</b>	<b>COMMUNITY/ORGANIZATION:</b>	<b>EMAIL ADDRESS:</b>
Ashley Olson	Citizen’s Committee / Tax Payer	aolson@willacather.org
Daren Niemeyer	Citizen’s Committee / Tax Payer	dbnfarms@gmail.com
David Karr (Vice-Chair)	Citizen’s Committee / Tax Payer	dkarr@nordersupply.com
Dayre Williams (Chair)	Citizen’s Committee / Tax Payer	dayremw@gpcom.net
Deb Fisbeck	Sheriff’s Office / Lead Jailer	wcso530@yahoo.com
Jack McGuire	Citizen’s Committee / Tax Payer	m McGuireconst@gmail.com
Nelson Trambly	Citizen’s Committee / Tax Payer	nelsontrambly@yahoo.com
Roger Bohrer	Citizen’s Committee / Commissioner	rogerbohrerPSC@yahoo.com
Ron Sunday	Chief Deputy / Emergency Manager	chiefdeputysunday@yahoo.com
Troy Schmitz	Webster Co. Sheriff / Jail Administrator	tschmitzwcso945@yahoo.com
Zach Svoboda	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	zsvoboda@prochaska.us
Jim Classe	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	jclasse@prochaska.us
<b>Unable to attend:</b>		
JoAnn Reiher	Citizen’s Committee / Commissioner	jrcommish@gtmc.net
Kim Ely	Citizen’s Committee / Tax Payer	kimely8@gmail.com
Keith Buschow	Citizen’s Committee / Commissioner	keithbuschow@gmail.com
<b>Other Attendees:</b>		
Rick Houchin	Blue Hill Leader (Newspaper)	bluehillleader@gtmc.net

## DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the meeting was to present the Revision to the Option 1 Cost Forecast, to review Option 3, to review the Pros & Cons for Options 1-3 and to present the budgets for all three options to the Citizens’ Committee.

1. The meeting began by P&A opening the meeting asking the Citizens’ Committee and attending Webster County officials regarding what questions or comments they have had from the public asking about the project. Sheriff Schmitz stated that he has been regularly asked about the project and that the public is interested in the progress being made and what options are being explored.
2. P&A noted that the presentation for the meeting covers a large amount of information and to be respectful of the Committee’s time, the presentation would move quickly, but individuals should interrupt as questions arise.

- The presentation stated that the Options to be covered were as follows:
  - i. Option 1: Revision – ‘Hold & Transport’ with Pros & Cons and Budget
  - ii. Option 2: ‘On Site Historic Courthouse Addition and Renovation’ with Pros & Cons and Budget
  - iii. Option 3: ‘On Site Construction of Justice Center (freestanding option) Presentation of Floor Plan, with Pros & Cons and Budget.
  
- Next, the Revision to Option 1: ‘Hold & Transport’ was covered. From the initial presentation of the Option 1, all the factors, with the exception of forecasted number of inmates requiring transport at Webster County’s expense, remained the same. The revision reduced the number of inmates to 70.19% of the initial forecast, with 29.81% representing inmates belonging to surrounding counties that Webster County would not be required to transport.
  
- While Webster County would not have to transport 29.81% of the forecasted inmates under Option 1, it is worth noting that the 29.81% of inmates still represents a loss of revenue when compared to the operational conditions of the current sheriff’s office and jail facility. The revision altered the Option 1 cost forecast as follows:
  - i. The Sum of 20 year Costs is \$7,121,450 (down from: \$10,145,961)
  - ii. **The Net Present Value (NPV) 20 year Cost: \$4,994,831 (down from: \$7,116,158)**
  - iii. The NPV 25 year Cost is \$6,512,871 (down from: \$9,278,916)
  - iv. The NPV 30 year Cost is \$8,118,569 (down from: \$11,566,561)
  
- Though the costs for Option 1 were reduced, the presentation noted that the ‘Hold & Transport’ Option still requires a short-term versus long-term perspective. From years 1-18 of the forecast, Option 1 would be the least expensive option. From years 19-23, Option 1 would be the 2<sup>nd</sup> most expensive option. From year 24 and until a county jail facility is constructed, Option 1 is the most expensive option. By forecast year 45, the expense of Option 1 will exceed the cost of Options 2 or 3 by 2-times the 2019 project cost.
  
- Also noted with Option 1 was that the expense of Transporting, Boarding, and Revenue Loss will continue to increase over time. This expense will likely require future generations to address these expenses. (Editor’s note: from forecast years 20 to 25 Option 1 will cost Webster County an additional \$1.6 million in expense and lost revenue. Between years 25 and 30 the cost will rise by another approx. \$1.8 million. This 5-year cost pattern will continue until a county jail facility is built).
  
- During the presentation of the revision to Option 1, a series of questions were asked of P&A:
  - i. A question was asked regarding how many jail staff would need to be added to accommodate the 16- or 20-bed facility. P&A responded that the 16- or 20-bed facility options are both sized to utilize the existing staff and that when county jails expand from a single-digit bed jail to the 15- to 20-bed size facility, they are often able to find some efficiency of size. Additionally, it was stated that based on inmate to staff ratios, there might be some situation where a ratio of 40 to 1 could be possible and safe, but a staffing ratio of 15 or 20 to 1 is very common and would likely be accepted by the state as a safe staffing ratio. Also, while the current jail is currently exploring a plan to hire a few more staff members, these hires would be tied to the possibility of bringing 911 service back to the county and helping the sheriff’s office to better meet minimum safe staffing levels, which

is not connected to the jail growing from 10 beds to a 16- or 20-bed facility.

- ii. The next question dealt with the difference between a 16- and a 20-bed facility. The answer given was that based upon the Phase 1 Needs Assessment, the difference is 4 cells at an approximate cost \$120,000. If the county is able to keep these cells full with out-of-county inmates, the 4 cells would have an approximate payback time of 2 years and 10 months, while allowing the county to have dorm space or additional space to grow.
  - iii. A question was asked regarding the difference between on-street parking versus having an on-site parking lot and how this effects handicap parking. P&A responded that all the options are attempting to reinforce the historic nature courthouse site, which is why diagonal curb parking is shown in all the options to preserve green space. The on-street solution is already utilized on the surrounding streets. Handicap stalls are required to be placed on the closest accessible route to the facility they serve, whether the county chooses an on-site parking lot or curb parking to help maintain green space.
- Pros & Cons for each of the three options were presented.
    - i. Option 1 – Pros: lowest cost short-term solution; on-site option with least size/impact to the site; all current Webster county; facilities remain “as-is”, current communications tower remains “as-is”.
    - ii. Option 1 – Cons: most expensive long-term option; future generations will need to address the expense of this option; Sheriff’s staff will be “chauffeur” inmates instead of patrolling the county; increase risk to staff, public, and inmates (traffic accidents, escape, assaults, etc.).
    - iii. Option 2 – Pros: lowest cost long-term solution; extends the useful life of the historic courthouse, existing Webster County Sheriff’s Office remains “as-is”, existing communications tower remains “as-is”; creates a new accessible south-facing main entrance for both existing courthouse and new justice center; provides an ideal drive-through sallyport; and greatly improves fire safety and egress of historic courthouse.
    - iv. Option 2 – Cons: adds 1 elevator, partially covers the west and east facades of the historic courthouse; some courthouse windows might require fire protection; and courthouse might require fire sprinklers.
    - v. Option 3 – Pros: 2<sup>nd</sup> least expensive long-term option, preserves historic courthouse “as-is”; no stairs or elevators needed, new justice center is single-level, main entrance faces South to maintain side yard setbacks, courtroom is more spacious and has sound lock vestibule.
    - vi. Option 3 – Cons: most expensive short-term option; 2<sup>nd</sup> most expensive long-term option; option with largest footprint; requires phased construction to maintain operation of Sheriff’s office and jail; must demolish existing Sheriff’s Office, Jail and Garage; Communications Tower will require relocation or replacement (sizeable expense); new sallyport is not drive-thru; and historic courthouse will have vacant, unusable spaces until upgrades are made. (Editor’s Note: the slide show stated “new garage is smaller” but measurements show the new garage to be about 300 sq-ft larger)

- After the Pros & Cons of each option were covered, the option budgets were covered:
- Option 1 – ‘Hold & Transport Inmates’ (New Sheriff’s Office, 24-Hour Holding, Transport)

Construction Budget Total (Hard & Soft Costs)	\$2,323,430 (Fixed: Year 2019)
NPV of 20 Year Costs of Boarding-Out Inmates	\$4,994,831 (costs will continue)
<u>NPV of 20 Year Costs of Revenue Loss</u>	<u>\$561,805 (costs will continue)</u>
<b>TOTAL (20 Year NPV in 2019 Dollars)</b>	<b>\$7,880,066</b>

**Note:**

TOTAL (25 Year NPV in 2019 Dollars)	\$9,568,828
TOTAL (30 Year NPV in 2019 Dollars)	\$11,355,206

- Option 2 – Law Enforcement Center Addition to Courthouse & Court Space Remodel

Project Budget Total (Hard Costs)	\$6,247,850
Overhead Budget (Soft Costs)	\$1,249,570
<u>Existing Tower to Remain (need to verify)</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>TOTAL (20 Year NPV in 2019 Dollars)</b>	<b>\$7,497,420</b>

- Option 3 – Freestanding Justice Center on Historic Courthouse Site

Project Budget Total (Hard Costs)	\$6,640,410
Overhead Budget (Soft Costs)	\$1,328,080
<u>Relocate Comm. Tower (need to verify)</u>	<u>\$300,000</u>
<b>TOTAL (20 Year NPV in 2019 Dollars)</b>	<b>\$8,268,490</b>

- After the option budgets were presented, the schedule for the Citizens’ Committee was reviewed. It was noted that the committee is on schedule and making progress at the anticipated pace.

3. After the presentation of the option budgets, additional questions were asked:

- What is the zoning of the courthouse site? P&A stated that the zoning is R-2 (a residential zoning designation).
- Sheriff Schmitz was asked “what is the age of the two communications towers at the current sheriff’s office and would it make sense to replace the communications equipment if a new facility were built?” He stated that he believes the north tower was put up in 2004 and that if a new facility were built it would be logical to replace the current equipment. The south tower might not be needed, but these answers will need verification with Pierce Electronics.
- A question was asked as to how many times County & District Courts are in session per month. On average it might be around 4 days per month, but some months have more days.
- It was asked how large a greenfield site would need to be to accommodate a new justice center. The greenfield site would need to be at least 2 acres to contain the new building and off-street parking. The budget would need to include the land cost and possibly the extension of utilities to the site.

4. The next meeting is scheduled on **Wednesday, June 13<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 PM** at Webster County Courthouse, in the Courtroom. This meeting will explore financial options available to the county.



BY:

Zach Svoboda  
Prochaska & Associates

May 31, 2018

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: [zsvoboda@prochaska.us](mailto:zsvoboda@prochaska.us)