

**Public Safety Committee  
February 20, 2003  
Scott Heyman Conference Room  
2 p.m.**

*Approved 3-20-03*

Present: B. Blanchard, G. Totman, M. Robertson, K. Herrera  
Excused: L. McBean  
Staff: S. Whicher, W. Skinner, A. LeMaro, P. Meskill, G. Dentes  
Guests: T. Basoni, WHCU; Channel 10 media, Dan Higgins, Ithaca Journal; A. Agnew, Drug Court; P. Myers; S. Herlitzka and J. Buck, Jacobs Facilities  
Board Members: T. Joseph, D. Kiefer

**Call to Order**

Ms. Blanchard called the meeting to order at 2 p.m.

**Domestic Violence Prevention/STOP-DWI**

Ms. Blanchard said at the last meeting she told the Committee she would be working on an additional alternative to submit in advance of this meeting; however, she has not completed work on that at this time. She requested this item be postponed until the Committee's first meeting in April.

It was MOVED by Ms. Herrera, seconded by Mr. Totman, and unanimously adopted by voice vote by members present, to grant authorization to extend the length of employment of John Beach, STOP-DWI Coordinator, from April 30, 2003 to May 30, 2003.

**Changes to the Agenda**

An appointment to the Local Conditional Release Program was added to the agenda.

**Presentation and Discussion: Proposed Jacobs Facility Scope and Contract**

Ms. Blanchard said the purpose of this discussion is to discuss the proposed Scope of Work that was distributed and come to an agreement with Jacobs Facilities representatives on the basis of the study that will be performed.

At this time everyone present introduced themselves.

Ms. Blanchard provided a background, stating four years ago the County contracted with Labella Associates to perform a major Public Safety Building Study. The study projected a need for approximately 200 beds and additional space for the Sheriff's Office administration. It didn't appear at that time the County needed to make any decisions on renovations and engaged in a variety of aggressive new alternative to incarceration programs. During the last four years there have been meetings with the New York State Commission of Corrections. The Commission has instructed the County to be proactive in making provisions for how the population of the Jail will be dealt with on a permanent basis since the County is operating on variances.

Mr. Meskill explained the two variances the Jail is operating under and stated the County received its first variance in 1996 for 18 additional beds in the medium/maximum areas of the Jail; the second variance was modified to allow 12 additional beds in the dorm areas. The two variances provide a total of 30 additional cell spaces, bringing the total capacity of the Jail to 103 which includes the holding cell.

Ms. Blanchard said the Commission of Corrections has directed the County to move forward to make plans for how it will proceed if the various alternative to incarceration programs are not successful

in reducing the population to a level where the Jail could function without variances. She said the County issued a request for proposals for architectural engineering and justice planning services and received several responses. Following in-depth interviews with three firms, the County selected Jacobs Facilities to help with this project. She said they have provided the County with a proposed scope that will be discussed today. She hopes suggestions will be made and that the representatives of Jacobs will be prepared after today's meeting to develop a final Scope of Work.

Mr. Herlitzka said Jacobs is very excited about this project and hopes to be able to help Tompkins County determine the best and most cost effective solution to this problem. He said Jacobs does more prison and jail projects than any other architectural/design firm in the United States; therefore they have several resources to draw from. Mr. Herlitzka spoke of his position and said he has been involved in the planning, design, and construction of over 120,000 prison or jail cells. He said he will be the contact person for Tompkins County. He briefly told of the other company representatives and their responsibilities.

Mr. Herlitzka said Jacobs' focus is to make the County's job as easy as possible by providing information; they will look to the County for direction. In their two-level process they will need to work with someone designated from the County at the staff and technical level.

At this time Mr. Herlitzka distributed a copy of a draft work plan schedule. Mr. Herlitzka explained how he would expect the different phases of the project to take place during an 18-week period. He said there are four major phases during the project, each approximately four weeks apart:

- Project Initiation/Coordination
  - Project Initiation
  - Review of Existing Information
  - Project Review Committee Meetings
  - Coordination Meetings
  - User Group Meetings/Workshops
- Review Capacity Requirements
  - Criminal Justice Agency Interviews
  - New York State Standards Review
  - Operational Analysis
  - Data Collection
  - Offender Population Projections
  - Alternatives to Incarceration Options
  - Target Planning Capacities
- Document Existing Conditions
  - Site Conditions/Development Analysis
  - Site Survey/Infrastructure Investigation
  - Existing Utilization Plan
  - Existing Systems Analysis
  - Reuse Scope of Work
  - Existing Conditions Report
- Preliminary Design
  - Facility Tours
  - Refine Facility Program
  - Site Development Analysis
  - Concept Design Work
  - Options Evaluation Charrette
  - Preliminary Design Work
  - Energy/Engineering Systems Analysis
  - Design Presentation/Approval
  - Schematic Design Package

Mr. Herlitzka said he is missing approximately the last three years of data on population and that needs to be collected and evaluated in conjunction with what was done in the LaBella study. He said

going into the process there are two underlying assumptions: planning will be done for the long-term and this is going to be an incremental solution.

Ms. Kiefer asked if Jacobs will also entertain other ideas such as separating sites for areas such as pre-trial and conviction. Mr. Herlitzka responded that Jacobs' has looked at some of these options in the past and wouldn't rule them out. Mr. Herlitzka said the LaBella study looked at what could be done for a twenty-year period within the existing site boundaries. He said this is not the best configuration or solution because there are fewer opportunities for creative, cost effective solutions for staying within those boundaries. They expect to propose some expansion of the site to the north and/or east.

Ms. Blanchard clarified that the Committee will be receiving information and options that will allow the County to make wise decisions. While that information is being compiled the County is continuing to work very hard on the jail population and alternative to incarceration programs. She said if this is being done with the idea that if the County has to do something in terms of expanding capacity, that it will be in a position to do it.

Mr. Joseph agreed with Ms. Blanchard. However, he felt a lot of what Jacobs is proposing takes a large step backwards to decisions that the Board has already made. He said the capacity projections were heavily debated by the Board and although there were many differences in philosophy there was agreement to hire a company to produce a design that addresses the problems that exist on the administrative side of the building. He said at the same time, options to expand to the range of 135 cells would be prepared. Mr. Joseph said his understanding of what the County has agreed to is to proceed with an option to expand to 135 with a decision to be made at the end of the process of whether or not to accept that option. Mr. Herlitzka said Jacobs is not revisiting the population analysis; however, it needs to obtain the last three years of population so that it can break it down by classification. Mr. Joseph said although he understands the need to obtain some of these answers, he does not want to begin re-making decisions that have already been made. He also expressed concern for unnecessarily paying for items to be studied during a time when the County is in a serious financial situation.

Ms. Robertson asked whether we should look at the data for the last three years, and analyze, whether new cells are needed. The other question is renovating the civil side and how to most effectively address those issues.

Mr. Meskill questioned how the alternative to incarceration data could be measured without looking at the data for the last three years and trying to draw some type of analytical conclusion. He also expressed concern that the LaBella Study did not address classification issues. He stated his immediate objections to some of the renovated block designs didn't take classifications into consideration.

Ms. Herrera said in reading the Scope it seems there is another assumption that there is an existing ATI program that is going to be added to the Jail. She expressed concern about this classification because the County does have an off-site justice center that houses alternative to incarceration programs. This year the County took funding away from those programs and it appears to her there is an ATI component that is going to be added which will change the classification. Mr. Herlitzka said it doesn't necessarily mean that something will be physically located at the Jail except staff work place. He said if someone is arrested there will be a need for space to divert them. He said this has an impact on the design of the Jail in terms of who is left in and has an impact on the long-term total capacity requirements. Mr. Herlitzka said Jacobs has proposed nothing in the Scope of Work to perform any mathematical analysis on the new data. He said Jacobs will perform an expedited review to confirm the 135 to 200 is still the planning target.

Mr. Meskill stressed the importance of taking classifications into consideration and stated classifications dictate many things with the population. He said the Jail experiences many different cycles of population. He can move inmates around; however, there are operational issues addressed

everyday in order to keep the facility safe and secure. He said he wasn't pleased with the LaBella report and hopes the Committee will allow Jacobs to explore all options that maybe available.

Ms. Blanchard clarified the direction being given to Jacobs is to analyze the last three years of data and to validate the target figure that was produced in the LaBella report of 135 to 200. Mr. Whicher said it appears classifications are the major piece that is missing in the logic of how this will come together; therefore, he believes an analysis of the classifications over the last few years should be looked at. Added to the direction given to Jacobs was for them to make recommendations for solutions on an incremental basis and to consider classification impact.

At this time there was discussion of the classification impacts on the capacity of the Jail. Ms. Robertson said to the extent the County has discretion over inmates at the Jail, she would like Jacobs to make sure inmates whom the County has an option of housing are not included in headcount.

*Ms. Herrera said she would like to receive a list of the different classifications.*

Mr. Herlitzka said Jacobs will be presenting the County with an incremental solution. The reason they have made the assumption that this needs to be an incremental solution is that they understand there is no unanimous opinion about all of this being needed now. He said they are advising that an entire design be prepared with the building blocks for the Board to build at whatever timing it desires. Mr. Joseph said the Board has already decided upon incremental solutions and wants Jacobs to provide options that make sense from a design standpoint. It was noted this is a total building project and not focused primarily on the Jail side.

During the discussion it was noted that OAR (Offender Aid and Restoration) would be included as this process moves forward.

At this time the Committee commented on the draft Design Project Scope with the following comments offered:

### **Section 3.1 Facility Tours**

It was stated that a number of Committee members participated in facility tours several years ago. Although this may be an option for new Committee members, it would not be necessary for the entire Committee.

### **Sections 3.10/3.11 - Design Presentation/Approval**

It was requested that the full Board receive a presentation in addition to the Committee. Mr. Herlitzka said because the planning target is already known, the design process can begin immediately.

An explanation was given on the Jacobs Peer Review. This is basically a quality control tool where a qualified individual in the firm but not directly involved, reviews the project.

### **Section 0.3 - Project Review Committee Members**

A question was raised as to why the Commission of Corrections is included as a participant on the Project Review Committee. Mr. Herlitzka said typically the Commission of Corrections doesn't participate greatly in the meetings; however, he said they will have to sign off on the design details and the capacity target. He said it is helpful to have them in attendance at those meetings.

### **Section 3.5 - Options Evaluation Charrette**

Mr. Herlitzka said they will ask the Committee to look at three ideas. After those three are agreed upon, Jacobs will ask the Committee to agree to a list of evaluation criteria.

Requests were made that Jacobs give consideration to areas such as NYSERDA grant opportunities and receiving input from all stakeholders during the design process, including inmates.

Mr. Joseph noted that while much of today's discussion has focused on the operations of the Jail side of the Public Safety Building, a great deal of attention needs to be placed on the administrative side where significant space issues exist.

The Committee requested Jacobs to present the Committee with a revised Project Scope that includes dollar figures by March 6<sup>th</sup>. The Committee will plan to act on the Scope at the March 20 meeting.

### **Report from the County Administrator**

Mr. Whicher distributed a document from Downing Associates.

### **Chair's Report**

Ms. Blanchard said she is working on developing a tentative schedule for the entire year for this Committee's work and will distribute a draft to members when it is complete.

### **Approval of Minutes of December 17, 2002 and February 6, 2003**

It was MOVED by Ms. Herrera, seconded by Mr. Totman, and unanimously adopted by voice vote by members present, to approve the minutes of December 17, 2002 and February 6, 2003. MINUTES APPROVED.

### **Sheriff's Department**

Mr. Meskill informed the Committee that bid specifications have been prepared for Jail and inmate supplies and clothing and Sheriff's uniforms. He asked what level of involvement the Committee would like to have in awarding this bid. The Committee requested copies of the bid specifications; however, they agreed to allow the Sheriff and the Purchasing Division to award the bid and report the outcome back to this Committee.

### **Appointments**

It was MOVED by Ms. Robertson, seconded by Ms. Herrera, and unanimously adopted by voice vote by members present, to confirm the County Administrator's appointment of Marilyn Ray to the Local Conditional Release Program.

It was MOVED by Ms. Herrera, seconded by Ms. Robertson, and unanimously adopted by voice vote by members present, to approve the appointment of Christine Manning to the Family Court Advisory Council as a Department of Social Services representative for a term expiring December 31, 2003.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Michelle Pottorff, Board of Representatives' Office

**\*A copy of a meeting summary prepared by Jacobs' is attached.**