

Courthouse Architectural Review Committee
Meeting #1
November 16, 2007

Mayor's Large Conference Room

1:45 p. m. – 2:45 p. m.

Attendees:

CARC Members:

Jim Rinaman, Chairman
Honorable Don Moran, Chief Judge
Honorable Don Redman, Council Member
Ron Salem, Chairman, BJP COC
Joey Duncan, P. E.; Public Works

Council Aides:

Sarah Balme (Aide to CP Davis)
Alison Miller (Aide to CM Hyde)

Media:

Representatives from the Florida Times
Union, Jacksonville Business Journal,
WJXT, WJCT, WAWS, WTLV, WOKV

City Staff:

Alan Mosley, P. E.; CAO
David Schneider, P. E.; Public Works
Al Kinard, Public Works
Carol Mirando, Assistant General Counsel
Misty Skipper, Mayor's Office
Jim Klement, JEDC

Council Auditor's Office

Adam Matthews

Members of the Public

Welcome

Alan Mosley and Jim Rinaman welcomed everyone and stated that the purpose of the meeting was for the City to outline to the Courthouse Architectural Review Committee (CARC) what it believes are the three (3) courthouse program options to be considered in the development of a new Duval County Courthouse.

Presentation of Options

Alan Mosley made a PowerPoint presentation to the CARC of the three (3) options. He began by recalling the history of the courthouse project going back to the time of the Better Jacksonville Plan vote in September 2000. After the Mayor terminated the contracts of the previous project team, Ordinance No. 2004-1339, enacted on January 24, 2006, reset the courthouse project budget at \$263.5 Million. That figure included approximately \$60 Million which had been spent to date at that time.

Mr. Mosley then fast forwarded to the present where the \$60 Million spent to date has now become \$64.3 Million as work has continued on other portions of the project. At this point, Mr. Rinaman suggested that it would be a good idea to separate the \$64.3 Million into what's still applicable to the new design, and what's permanently lost on the old design. He thought perhaps that only \$16 Million could be considered wasted, while \$46 Million may still be applicable. Mr. Mosley stated that Public Works would differentiate between wasted and still applicable costs, but that the actual ratio is more on the order of 50%-50%.

Option I

Renovation and New Construction at Bay Street Location

Mr. Mosley stated this would be the least expensive of the three options, but that it contained the most problems. This option includes constructing a new building in between and among the current courthouse and annex, renovating the current courthouse and annex, constructing a multi-story parking garage, and continuing to lease space off-site for the Public Defender and State Attorney's Special Prosecution Unit.

This Option is estimated to cost between \$304 Million and \$360 Million, including the \$64.3 Million previously spent, and could be completed in 2015. It would have the longest construction period due to logistical challenges of moving building occupants during the building construction and keeping all courthouse services and departments open.

Option II(A)

Phased Construction Option in LaVilla - Initial Construction of Criminal Courthouse only; future construction of Civil facility

Mr. Mosley stated this option reflects the intent of Ordinance No. 2004-1339-E which consists of building a new 388,000 SF criminal courthouse in LaVilla, making interim repairs to the current courthouse and annex, renovating the Old Federal Courthouse for the State Attorney's Office and remodeling space in the Ed Ball Building for the Public Defender's Office (or perhaps some other building). This option would require the construction of a future 412,000 SF civil courthouse in LaVilla beginning in 2017.

While its initial cost would be the lowest of the options considered, it has the highest overall total cost due to price escalation over time. Mr. Schneider stated that the RS Means/ENR Construction Costs Index was used to predict the future cost. Mr. Schneider stated that this Index had grown 50% between July 1996 and January 2007, and if similar growth occurs between now and 2017, then we could expect future construction prices to be about 50% higher than today's.

This Option is estimated to cost between \$424 Million and \$469 Million, including the \$64.3 Million previously spent, and would be completed in 2020. It has more pros than Option I, but would require dual operating costs of about \$1.5 Million per year for each year that the City maintains two separate courthouses in different locations.

Option II(B)

Phased Construction Option in LaVilla - Initial Construction of scaled down unified facility; future construction of a Family Court facility

Mr. Mosley stated that this option relates to the work of the previous team, Auchter Perry-McCall, and had received some buy-in from courthouse users. This option consists of building a 650,000 SF Criminal/Civil courthouse in LaVilla, renovating the Old Federal Courthouse for the State Attorney's Office and remodeling space in the Ed Ball Building for the Public Defender's Office (or perhaps some other building). This option would require the construction of a future 150,000 SF family courthouse in LaVilla beginning in 2017.

This Option is estimated to cost between \$378 Million and \$418 Million, including the \$64.3 Million previously spent, and would be completed in 2020. It has more pros than Options I & II(A), but would require the construction of the family courthouse in a fairly short time. The future estimated cost of construction was also calculated using the RS Means/ENR Construction Costs Index discussed above in Option II(A).

Option III

Complete, Unified Courthouse Construction in LaVilla

Mr. Mosley stated this option relates to the work of the current project team, Turner Construction Company with KBJ Architects. It would immediately build the entire Dan Wiley 2025 courthouse program consisting of a new 800,000 SF Criminal/Civil courthouse in LaVilla, renovating the Old Federal Courthouse for the State Attorney's Office and remodeling space in the Ed Ball Building for the Public Defender's Office (or perhaps some other building). This option would require no further construction of any facilities until at least 2025, and is estimated to cost between \$358 Million and \$395 Million, including the \$64.3 Million previously spent.

This option contains the most pros of any option, but has the highest initial cost and could be completed the soonest, in 2011.

CARC Discussion

Mr. Mosley then turned the meeting over to the CARC and said he would entertain any questions. Mr. Rinaman then engaged the Committee and led them in discussion. Mr. Rinaman noted that the continued lease payments in Option I could and should be added to the base cost of that Option, and the same for the dual operating costs associated with Option II(A). Judge Moran then expressed his opinion and support for the construction and shelling of an additional floor in the courthouse - said this would represent good planning. He thought the additional cost of \$10-\$20 Million would be very marginal in the context of the entire project and would help to ensure the viability of the building past 2025.

Councilman Redman was interested in what the intended funding source was for the additional dollars needed and if those dollars would cause reduced funding for government programs and services. Mr. Mosley said that the City would not take dollars away from programs to fund the project.

Mr. Salem expressed his support for Option III on behalf of the BJP Citizens Oversight Committee, but said he'd like to see the impact of it on the entire City budget. Mr. Salem mentioned that the BJP COC has a meeting scheduled on November 29, and he'd like the same presentation made to them before voting. Mr. Mosley responded that he'd like for the CARC to take action today, but that the City would be happy to make a similar presentation to the BJP COC.

The discussion returned to the idea of shelling an 8th floor. Mr. Mosley stated the City was not warm to the idea but might consider once Turner's estimates are delivered. An additional \$12-\$20 Million is not enticing. Councilman Redman and Mr. Salem again requested information on where the additional dollars would come from, and wanted to make sure they were available. Judge Moran said that City Council would ultimately be the body to scrutinize the funding to ensure its availability against other City operating priorities.

Judge Moran then made a motion that the CARC recommend Option III to the Mayor with agreement that there would be some future consideration of an additional shelled out floor. There was then additional discussion about the availability of additional funding. Judge Moran then revised his motion to include that it was contingent on the City having the additional funding necessary for Option III. Mr. Duncan seconded the revised motion. During discussion on the motion as amended, Mr. Salem stated that he felt he had not had enough time to properly consider all the materials before him and was uncomfortable supporting the motion. There being no further discussion, Mr. Rinaman called for the vote to approve Option III which passed 4-1, with Mr. Salem casting the dissenting vote.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p. m.