

**Public Safety Committee  
November 11, 2003  
1 p.m.  
Public Safety Building**

Present: G. Totman, M. Robertson, K. Herrera, L. McBean  
Excused: B. Blanchard  
Staff: P. Meskill, D. Neimi, R. Bunce  
Jacobs Facilities: A. Cupples, J. Buck, M. Thav, D. Voda

**Called to Order**

Mr. Totman called the meeting to order at 1:12 p.m.

Mr. Buck explained what Jacobs has been doing since the last Committee meeting where direction was given to continue with the base of 104 beds and to start working with the Sheriff on design details, and to also explore building more to the east. He said Jacobs came up with three sequential schemes which are variations of the options previously discussed. All schemes have one central public access point which goes to the Jail lobby and to the Sheriff's Office. There is a staff parking area, an official vehicle circulation area, and access in the back.

Mr. Buck said in each of the schemes, plans include reuse of existing dormitories, use of the existing Jail for program space, cell housing, Jail administration, civil records, Sheriff's Office, road patrol, criminal investigation, and staff services. He said additional housing has been added beyond the 32 dorm beds, a service area that has a warehouse, food service area, maintenance shop, laundry, intake, Jail visiting area, recreation space, housing space, and a front entry. Mr. Buck said one concern raised was how far it was to get to "point a" in the building to "point b". He said when the scheme was revised the result was not a significant impact in the distance between those two points, but makes the design harder to add on to the building at a later time. The other problem with the scheme is that it would require the existing service bay, emergency generator, and other equipment to be relocated to another area. This would result in additional expenses to the County.

Mr. Cupples said the activities in the dormitory housing and the cell housing would be much different. Inmates housed in the dormitories would be doing things such as washing Department vehicles, working in food service, maintenance, and laundry; these activities are tied to that side of the building. The side of the building where cell housing is located would be focussed on delivery of programs and activities at those housing units, with the goal of removing those inmates from that area as little as possible.

Ms. Robertson asked if there was any benefit to moving the cell housing area to the back of the building. Mr. Cupples said the design as presented is based on cost avoidance, and that Jacobs was looking to not replace anything if possible to avoid additional expenses. He said that scheme also does not allow for potential growth because of Airport restrictions and privately-owned land.

Mr. Cupples said since the last meeting they have been dealing with the difference between 46 and 64 pod cells. As they studied that they looked at what it would mean to build 104 beds and how to get classifications within smaller units and what does it mean if more than 104 beds had to be constructed. He said if the Commission of Corrections says there needs to be more than 104 beds, there needs to be a plan to go beyond that. At this time Mr. Cupples explained the layout for the proposed scheme. He noted their primary guide was to stay within three to four housing units so that they can get base staffing at existing or lower levels.

Mr. Cupples said the minimum scenario being proposed by Jacobs is one 48-bed unit, one 32-cell unit, and the 32 dorm beds. This brings the total to 112 authorized capacity beds (8 of which are special classification beds). As they worked with the staff, they talked about subdividing units and decided that the design was for 104 beds. They would subdivide the 32-bed unit to allow for 16 females, 8 maximum security or segregated inmates, and 8 juveniles. He noted they are proposing to put showers in each dormitory pod so they can be treated much like housing units. Mr. Cupples also said this design offers a lot of options for program delivery. He said an outdoor recreation area is also available for each pod and that their goal is to provide different environments in order to reduce tension in the facility.

Ms. Robertson said the proposed scheme shows one staff person to supervise 48 inmates, and questioned if this was too much responsibility for one person. Mr. Meskill responded that this supervision style is acceptable, but noted it would require funds for training officers to supervise this setup. He said the national standard for supervision in this design is one officer per 60 inmates. He said it offers a much better interaction between inmates and officers and the Commission of Corrections stands behind this type of design. Mr. Cupples said they backed the number from 60 down to 48 because of the future potential for double-celling.

Ms. Robertson questioned Mr. Cupples' comment that the County could house 16 females and could potentially house up to 30. Ms. Robertson stated the female population is significantly lower than 30. Mr. Meskill said the female population figures are difficult to predict and this design is based on what the population might be in 20 years.

Mr. Cupples said Jacob's goal is to go with the County to the Commission of Correction and present a base plan for 104 beds; however, they are designing options as a contingency plan if the 104-bed design is not acceptable by the Commission. He said if the Commission does not accept the 104-bed design, they believe the support functions are adequate because the chassis is being planned for 192. Mr. Cupples said they would suggest building a 48 cell unit, a subdivided 48 unit, and use 32 existing cells; this would bring the capacity to 128, with options for additional housing.

Mr. Cupples stated the existing design would place the Jail at a maximum capacity of 200. At the November 20<sup>th</sup> meeting the Committee will be asked whether Jacobs should plan for additional expansion beyond that at any time in the future. Another policy decision that will need to be made by the Legislature is how the County feels about double-bunking at any time in the future. He noted he is not advocating one way or another, and that is a policy decision that rests solely on the Legislature. He said they also looked at what it would mean to provide for a third 48-bed pod. Adding the additional beds would leave everything the same as the other options with the exception of intake, which would relocate from the back to the front side of the building.

Mr. Cupples stated that food service, maintenance, and the sally port are all located at the rear of the building. Public and staff parking would be in the front of the building; however, Department vehicles would also be parked at the back for security purposes.

During discussion of particular aspects of the building, Ms. Robertson said she wanted to be sure the kitchen would not be more than what is needed. Mr. Cupples said it would be constructed to meet the maximum capacity but would not be equipped until there is a need. He said as the project moves forward they will obtain a recommendation from a kitchen specialist with regard to what space is most appropriate.

There was discussion of the intake area; Mr. Cupples said there are many more people coming through the front door that do not end up in the Jail, but are placed in other programs rather than incarceration. The intake area would be planned to allow for keeping people out of the Jail. Mr. Cupples stated the design is supportive of diversion programs, and includes an office for Alternative to Incarceration staff. During discussion of diversion programs, Ms. McBean stated she wouldn't label the

area as Alternative to Incarceration area, but would identify the rooms spoken of by Mr. Cupples as interview rooms. Ms. McBean said she liked the layout that is being discussed

During the remainder of the meeting there was general discussing about various design aspects of the building as well as areas such as staffing, surveillance, and technology. Mr. Cupples noted these are very early design discussions and further exploration will need to be done prior to any recommendation is brought forward.

Mr. Cupples spoke of the recreation area and stated it is accessible from inside or outside the building and could also be used by staff. The visiting area is also right off the sally port so that visitors will have access to lockers and restroom facilities prior to entering the search area. There is a non-contact area in addition to attorney rooms.

There was discussion about what discussion needs to take place at the next meeting on November 20, 2003 and also what coordination needs to take place to respond to the correspondence from the Commission of Correction.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Michelle Pottorff, TC Legislature Office