

# **Meeting Notes**

Jefferson County – Courthouse/Sheriff's Building Design Study

Project No. 2020.01.00 February 3, 2021

Purpose: Building & Grounds Committee meeting to review next steps in defining the project scope.

**Location: Zoom meeting** 

### **Project Representatives:**

Name	Organization	P	ED
Ben Wehmeier	Jefferson Co. Admin.	Χ	Χ
Greg David	Bldg. & Grounds	Χ	Χ
Curt Backlund	Bldg. & Grounds	Χ	Χ
Laura Payne	Bldg. & Grounds	Χ	Χ
Mary Roberts	Bldg. & Grounds	Χ	Χ
Roger Lindl	Bldg. & Grounds	Χ	Χ
Tammie Jaeger	Bldg. & Grounds	Χ	Χ
Anthony Maas	Maas Brothers	Χ	Χ

Name	Organization	P	ED
Doug Beilke	Maas Brothers	Х	Χ
Beth Prochaska	Potter Lawson		Χ
Ron Locast	Potter Lawson	Х	Χ
Kevin Anderson	Potter Lawson	Х	Χ
Jared Ramthun	Design Engineers	Х	Χ
Kelly Harrer	Design Engineers		Χ

(P=Present ED=Electronically Distributed)

#### Discussion:

- 1. The Building Committee stated that after discussing the project with other County Board members, most would like to see the project move forward. However, there is apprehension on the large dollar amount of \$33 million. The Board members also appeared to understand the necessity of the project and setting a goal of creating a 30 plus year solution.
- 2. Anthony M. stated that there are a couple of options to reduce the initial cost of the project:
  - a. Phase the project into a series of smaller projects. An initial phasing concept discussed was to divide the project into two phases. Phase 1; Courts and Administration, Phase 2; Sheriff/Jail. This can be further analyzed to see if there are other phasing scenarios.
  - b. Reduce the scope of the project and define "wants vs. needs".
- 3. A few amenities that could be eliminated are the green roof, skylights, Judges' elevator addition and some piping at the Jail. Anthony M. stated that eliminating these elements will help to reduce the budget but won't reduce the cost by millions of dollars.
- 4. Another option discussed was to just move forward with the MEP renovation which is estimated to be approximately \$17 million. The Building Committee's concern is that the County may need to revisit the architectural renovations within ten years which may require modifying the new MEP systems.
- 5. Comments from the Building & Grounds Committee/County were as follows:
  - a. Laura P: Appears to make sense to move forward with the entire scope as presented. It will be important to clearly define the scope of the project to the County Board and explain the advantages of constructing the entire project now vs just upgrading the mechanical systems.
  - b. Curt B: Has discussed the project with other Board members and hasn't found anyone that has any major concerns on the \$33 million budget. Need to be very clear on defining the project scope with the County Board.
  - c. Roger L: Also talked to Board members. Seem to be in favor of moving forward. The Committee and Design team need to scrutinize the "wants vs needs" when finalizing the project scope.

- d. Mary R: Concern on how much the cost of the project will increase if the project is phased. Mary also asked how Covid has impacted the County's coffers. Ben W stated that the County's budget is looking better today than earlier in 2020.
- e. Greg D: Liked the idea of constructing the project in a single phase but questioned the amount of project scope and budget. Are there ways to reduce the overall project budget? The people that Greg had talked to were unanimously against spending \$33 million. The project should define what the need is now. Greg also questioned what the impact on the project scope would be if staff were allowed to work from home.
- 6. The Building Committee stated that one more Joint Committee meeting should be held towards the end of February and depending on the outcome of the meeting, the project could be presented at the March County Board meeting.
- 7. The presentation to the County Board should clearly define the project scope, budget, financing and "needs vs wants" for the project. The presentation should also discuss the Pros and Cons of the full project vs just the mechanical upgrades.
- 8. Mary R. stated that the public needs to be informed about the project and questioned if a brochure should be developed for public presentation. Jefferson County will review strategies for informing the public and County Board.

## **Issues Requiring Resolution:**

Action by: Issue:

Jefferson County Schedule a Joint Committee meeting.

Jefferson Co/Design Determine scope of work and strategies to move forward with presentation to the County

Team Board.

#### Next Meeting: February 19, 2021

The above constitutes items discussed and decisions reached. If there are any additions and/or comments, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ron Locast Project Manager