

Date: January 21, 2010
Time: 4:00 p.m. - 4:38 p.m.

Location: City Hall
Mayor's Large Conference Room

ATTENDEES:

CARC Members

Jim Rinaman, Chairman, CARC
Joey Duncan, P.E., Director of Public Works
Honorable Don Moran, Chief Judge, 4th Judicial Circuit
Honorable Don Redman, Council Member District 4
Ron Salem, Chairman, BJP Citizens Oversight Committee
Chris Flagg, Flagg Design Studio, Chairman, DDRB (Not Voting)

City Staff

Honorable Mallory Cooper, Judge, 4th Judicial Circuit
Angela Corey, State Attorney, 4th Judicial Circuit
Honorable Lance Day, Judge, 4th Judicial Circuit
Caroline Emery, Courts Counsel
Brian Garner, SAO
Denise Henkes, Public Works
Jim Klement, JEDC
Eric Lindstrom, JEDC
Alan Mosley, P. E.; CAO, Mayor's Office
Rick Mullaney, General Counsel
David Schneider, P.E., Public Works
Marty Terry, SAO
Mike Weinstein, SAO

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Rinaman called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m. Jim opened the meeting by explaining the role of the Courthouse Architectural Review Committee (CARC) is to review and make recommendations on issues that come up. Although most issues have been previously solved, one issue is still pending; the bridge between the new courthouse and the Old Federal Courthouse which may or may not affect the west façade of the Old Federal Courthouse. Additionally, Dave Schneider will discuss the construction schedule.

Jim asked for introductions (name and who you are representing) of those present. Upon completion of introductions Jim asked Dave to present insight relative to construction.

Dave responded that the 4th slide of the presentation contains information relative to the construction schedule. Jim asked that Dave begin the presentation with slide number 4. Dave provided the following information relative to the construction schedule:

-
- Start date was May 12, 2009
 - Currently in the 9th month of construction on a 36 month project
 - Primary work at this time is concrete work
 - Building will top out in May 2010
 - Precast (skin) (exterior façade) and windows are scheduled for completion in the Fall, 2010
 - Roof is scheduled to be complete by the end of 2010
 - By this time next year, the building will be closed in and work will be on the inside
 - With respect to the bridge, the expected start date for the bridge is in 2011. However, because the courthouse concrete frame is under construction we will need to make some structural modifications to the courthouse as early as a month from now in order to be able to accept the bridge
 - With respect to the current schedule, due to freezing temperatures over the last couple of weeks, we are about eight days behind and recently met to discuss how that time will be made up

PRESENTATION

Dave briefly discussed City Ordinance No 207-401-E which authorized and funded a new unified courthouse and continued the CARC which had previously been created in a previous Ordinance which charged the CARC with the responsibility for reviewing and approving the exterior architectural design as well as the interior design to ensure the goals of quality, durability, security and functionality are achieved.

Dave summarized the previous CARC meetings (November 2007 and May 2009). In November 2007 the CARC recommended proceeding with a Unified Courthouse rather than splitting them which was the original plan. In May 2009, the CARC met and approved the design of the interior of the Unified Courthouse. The City now desires to add an elevated pedestrian bridge. The meeting today seeks the approval of the CARC to add an elevated pedestrian bridge connecting the third floors of the OFC (State Attorney's Office) with the new Unified Courthouse which is presently under construction.

Dave summarized today's presentation consists of conceptual design slides of the bridge as well as the other necessary approvals. The Downtown Development Review Board (DDRB) approval is to ensure the proposed bridge design is consistent with the Downtown Master Plan, and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) approval is because the OFC is under jurisdiction of SHPO and we have some restrictions on us from the State.

Dave presented slides of the downtown area, one of which had the new courthouse superimposed on it which showed how the bridge would look over Pearl Street. A couple slides exhibited the bridge north and south on Pearl Street. Dave explained the color in the slide is more yellow than the actual bridge and courthouse would be. Dave explained the windows on the bridge preserve views and they are bullet proof. The elevation between the two 3rd floors of each building have a couple of feet difference in elevation so the bridge will have an approximate 4% ramp. This ramp will not be such that there would be an impact for the transport of files or comfortable negotiation in a wheel chair.

A couple of slides showed a 3-D view from the southeast and discussed dimensions. The bridge is elevated 54 feet above street level. The bridge itself is about 18 feet tall, 12 feet wide on the outside and 10 feet wide on the inside. The next slide is looking south along Pearl Street. The opening in the courthouse is the entrance to judicial staff parking; the entrance to SAO is through the driveway on the left. Pearl Street will have 2-lane traffic.

Slide: 3rd floor layout of the new courthouse: Shows the bridge will connect at the 3rd floor where you would enter a corridor for access to courtrooms and elevators.

In summary:

Functionality provides direct connection to OFC which facilitates future expansion of unified courthouse into the OFC to meet future courts space needs and provides covered, weather proof walkway for safe transport of files between SAO and courtrooms per Dan Wiley Program Report.

Security of course is of concern. The access to and hours of operation of the walkway will be strictly controlled and limited by administrative orders of the Judiciary. A uniformed guard will be stationed only at the courthouse side of the bridge to reduce security costs long term and will eliminate chance public encounters between prosecutors and defendants and their families. People with bridge access will be controlled and limited.

Durability; steel structure with no exposed steel; corrosion and rust will not be a factor. Exterior cladding is very low maintenance; pressure washing every couple of years.

Quality; this bridge connects two LEED certified buildings. We will use what ever Leed points available to make the bridge itself as green as possible (air quality, recycled materials, etc.).

Jim Rinaman asked where does the bridge connect at the SAO? Dave responded it will connect at the 3rd floor. We are presently working on the SAO layout. Angela Corey added the connection would be in one of the felony divisions.

Question: Is it feasible/sound that a building can be built for expansion in the open space in front of the new courthouse? Dave responded (showed slide #5) that there are two large parcels (30,000 square feet); can accommodate a 25,000 square foot building. Additionally, with respect to the lot where the construction trailers are currently located, the City does not have any specific plans for future use at this time. Upon completion of the project, this lot could be used for parking or private firms, etc.

This concludes the presentation. Jim asked if anyone that is not on the committee has any questions or comments.

Questions from Judge Cooper. With respect to the OFC, are there going to be other functions in that building? Dave responded, yes. Guardian Ad Litem and we need to have discussions about Domestic Violence. Is there excess shell space for additional offices? David replied, yes. The building has a total of 240,000 square feet of which 170,000 square feet is designated by the Wiley Report for the SAO. Is non-SAO space going to connect to the bridge? David replied yes. It will have to be able to connect in order to be functional. Judge Cooper further clarified her question; are there functions in the OFC other than the SAO that would be able to have access, if the administrative order allowed for it, for the office to use the bridge as well? Is the bridge going to connect to a lobby or some other space that will allow access by the SAO and other function(s)? Mike Weinstein responded, as it comes into the OFC it opens up into a hallway, with nearby elevators. Whether or not others can access it will be up to the Chief Judge. Judge Cooper explained she wants to make sure we plan ahead with allowing other functions to access the bridge without interfering with SAO functions. Jim Rinaman explained that would also be important if we had court functions over there. Currently the design detail has not been worked out yet, but the intent will be any OFC function will be able to access the bridge; Judge Cooper's request is noted.

Jim Rinaman asked if anyone else had any other comments or questions. Judge Cooper asked if the uniformed guard is Wackenhut or Sheriff's office person? Dave responded that it will be a uniformed person with a gun, whether it will be Wackenhut or JSO is not known at this time.

Jim Rinaman asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. No response.

Jim Rinaman asked if any of the CARC members had any questions or comments.

Chris Flagg, DDRB, advised that he is "wearing his DDRB hat" and that he is the landscape architect on the courthouse design-build team. Chris asked if the bridge concept was an original idea to the building design and value engineered out, or was it discovered throughout the process that we needed to add that level of secured walkway to the facility? Dave responded that his research, which included the original 2002 design competition, concluded some competitors had a bridge whereas others did not. Certainly the notion of a bridge was there.

Judge Moran further explained that the original proposal to the five contestants was to provide access between those two buildings. Some of the contestants had the walkway on the ground; others had it elevated, but that was part of the requirements to participate in the competition. And, the reason was that was that building (OFC) was designed to house several functions. We thought it would hold more functions than it would (SAO, PD, Guardian Ad Litem, etc.). Subsequently, we found out that the building couldn't hold all of those functions, but that is why the bridge was there. As you know I was somewhat opposed to the bridge, but I misunderstood who was going to be using the bridge. Mike Weinstein and Angela Corey were kind enough to come over and outline what their thoughts are for that building. I don't necessarily see the necessity, but I am not opposed. I think they have worked it out and explained everything to the judiciary.

Jim Rinaman noted there were a couple of other historical notes. At some point, not sure when, we discovered we could not build anything on the ground due to underground utilities that could not be moved; is that right? Dave confirmed there are a lot of underground utilities on Pearl Street. Jim also noted that it may be less expensive to build on the ground although an elevated bridge is better because it allows the personnel utilizing it to be in the appropriate space(s). Jim asked Dave to confirm that Dan Wiley recommended a connection. Dave confirmed Dan Wiley's recommendation was a level, covered walkway for the safe transport of files; more for functionality than security standpoint. Jim Rinaman repeated, not necessarily secure? Dave confirmed, correct. Jim Rinaman stated cannot build a ground level structure because of utilities. David replied there is a challenge for foundations but we will figure out a way.

Councilman Redman asked if we had any pictures of the backside of the new courthouse. Dave responded that yes there are pictures but not in this presentation. Jim Rinaman asked if it looked similar to the front. Dave replied, yes, similar, but not as big; more institutional (used for defendants).

CARC DISCUSSION

Jim Rinaman: Do I hear a motion as to whether we build the bridge or not? Joey Duncan made a motion to build the bridge. Ron Salem seconded motion.

Jim Rinaman: Any discussion? Ron Salem explained that he does not use the courthouse frequently, but is aware we have gone to great pains over the last 6 or 7 years to design it for functionality and protection of staff, and I believe this is appropriate; all citizens and judges should be safe. I believe the bridge is as Wiley indicated for functionality but there is also a security issue present. I am very much in favor of it and plan to vote for it. Jim Rinaman: Any other comments or discussion?

Jim Rinaman stated he has studied this as much as he can and it is his understanding it has been worked out so that during construction and the foreseeable future it will not increase the budget. Additionally, it will give us more flexibility in the future to use that space in federal building and block of property that can be almost anything we need; we may want to do that in 10 or 20 years, and we may have to build another bridge to that building. This looks like something that does not have any downside.

Rick Mullaney commented that Dave made a fine presentation and the presentation addressed the Chief Judge's concerns and issues relative to security and access, timing and cost. I met with Dave to address the Chief Judge's concerns and I think including these concerns in this presentation made for a better presentation.

Jim Rinaman: Any further discussion? All in favor say "aye". Those opposed say "no". Motion passes unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

David reminded everyone to sign the sign in sheet.

Meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

cc: CARC Members

Posted on COJ Website