



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

Planning • Architecture • Engineering • Interiors • Facility Management

PROJECT: Henry County LEC – Citizens Committee Meeting #3

LOCATION OF MEETING: Mount Pleasant, IA – Courthouse 2nd Floor Meeting Room

PROJECT NO.: 160811 **DATE:** December 12, 2016 **TIME:** 6:30 PM

PERSONS INVOLVED:	COMMUNITY/ORGANIZATION:	EMAIL ADDRESS:
Nancy Davis	Winfield	cndavis1994@gmail.com
Kay Denning	Mt. Pleasant	kaydenning2@gmail.com
Kurt Garretson	Jackson Township	kurtgarretson@gmail.com
Steve Gerling	Mount Union	grrman@louisacomm.net
Mike Hampton	Iowa Wesleyan University	mhampton@iw.edu
Gary Lauger	Swedesburg	gary@lauger.com
Bob McPheron	New London	bjmcp1983@gmail.com
Kirby Moon	Mt. Union	kirbymoon02@gmail.com
Linda Mortland	Mt. Pleasant	601 S. Locust St., Mt. Pleasant, IA
Kate Newman	Mt. Pleasant	newmank82@gmail.com
Steve Nichting	Salem	snichtingconst@hotmail.com
Judy Sammons	Mt. Pleasant	jsammons@lisco.com
Cherry Sandeen	ISU Extension; Mt. Pleasant	cherry.sandeen@gmail.com
Jerry Wells	Mt. Pleasant	bricklayer245@gmail.com
Marc Lindeen	Henry County Board of Supervisors	supervisors@henrycountyiowa.us
Greg Moeller	Henry County Board of Supervisors	supervisors@henrycountyiowa.us
Gary See	Henry County Board of Supervisors	supervisors@henrycountyiowa.us
Rich McNamee	Henry County Sheriff	rmcnamee@henrycountyiowa.us
Julie Pilling	Henry County Jail Administrator	jpilling@henrycountyiowa.us
Steve Riley	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	sriley@prochaska.us
Jim Classe	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	jclasse@prochaska.us
<i>Members unable to attend:</i>		
Brad Roth	Mayor of Wayland	bradroth@yahoo.com
<i>Guests in attendance:</i>		
Theresa Rose	KILJ Radio, Mt. Pleasant	
Ted J. Mohrfeld	Mt. Pleasant	

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the meeting was to review further progress for *Phase 2 Preliminary Concept Planning*. **Options 1A** and **1B** were presented to the Committee for discussion. These options focus on site/building improvements for the existing property occupied by the Sheriff's Office/Jail.

1. Committee Chair Mike Hampton opened the meeting and welcomed the committee and guests in

attendance. He mentioned several school projects in the region that have pursued bond referendums but have recently failed. The farm economy is not as strong currently, which may have contributed to the bond failures. It was noted that it is often more difficult to pass bonds for jail projects than other types, so publicity and education of the public are critical to the success of a jail bond election. The Committee is integral in this educational process. After an open-minded review of reasonable options, the goal is that all committee members will select and unanimously support the best option for Henry County.

2. It was asked whether sales tax can be used to fund the jail project instead of needing to pass a bond referendum. Sales tax has specific designated uses that are allowable, such as rural garbage collection, but it would not be available to fund a jail project.
3. Steve Riley of P&A noted that postings on Facebook, the sheriff's website, etc. can be used to keep the public informed and provide factual information about the needs of the jail and law enforcement offices.
4. A PowerPoint presentation was used to introduce the information to be presented for the evening. The Project Schedule was again presented to show the project's current status.
5. A list of the five options that have been proposed was again reviewed. **Option 1** (Renovate & expand existing Sheriff's Office & Jail) will be presented tonight. **Option 2** (Build a new Law Enforcement Center on "greenfield" site) will be presented at the next meeting. **Option 3** (Hold & Transport) will also likely be presented at the next meeting. After a facility tour by P&A, **Option 4** (Renovate Mt. Pleasant Women's Mental Health Institute facility) is not considered to be a practical scenario due to State and DHS site/building ownership issues and the configuration of the facility. The committee was asked to comment about **Option 5** (Addition to the Henry County Courthouse) to determine if the option should be pursued.
6. Discussion regarding **Option 5** brought up many important considerations. It is possible that construction of an addition to the existing courthouse might be viewed negatively due to the historic nature of the existing building. Also, if the addition replaces the existing south parking lot, this could also be an issue if people must park farther away. It was noted that the addition could be built largely as a separate building and use a link to join to the courthouse, to minimize any necessary changes. A new addition would need to be very respectful of the existing courthouse architecture. It was noted that even if parking is moved, spaces for handicapped or elderly visitors could still be provided near the main entrance. One option was proposed to build an addition which is elevated above the parking lot, allowing parking to remain below at the ground level. Sheriff McNamee commented that he had not strongly considered **Option 5** originally, but after reflection it did offer some definite advantages. When detainees and inmates must appear in court, they are currently walked across the street by the Sheriff's staff. This situation can allow potentially dangerous interaction between victims/victim's families and the offender/offender's families, especially in high profile cases of rape or murder. A direct link from the jail to the courthouse could dramatically reduce potential for interaction. It was noted that if a sallyport and elevator were added to the courthouse, inmates could be transported by vehicle and more safely access the courts. It was decided to allow the Committee more time to reflect on **Option 5**, and it will be discussed again at the next meeting to determine if this option should be evaluated further.
7. The completed Facility Program was briefly viewed which lists all of the anticipated rooms for the proposed Law Enforcement Center and projected sizes. This Program is used to develop floor plans for any of the Options being considered. As discussed at the previous meeting, the Program anticipates a **44 bed jail**, consisting of 36 beds in cells and 8 dorm beds. When all building areas are totaled, the sum is currently about 24,270 gross square feet (excluding a freestanding vehicle garage for large evidence).
8. **Option 1** planning must include phasing of construction, since the Sheriff's Office and Jail must continue to operate while any new work is being built. The existing boiler building which contains small package boilers could potentially be removed if the boilers/storage can be relocated. General evidence storage is programmed within the proposed office area. However, large evidence (such as

vehicles) is often stored in a freestanding, less expensive building type. For **Option 1**, it is possible this building would be off-site.

9. The existing Sheriff's Office/Jail is on a site zoned B-1, Limited Business and Professional Office District. Required building setbacks are 25 feet for a front yard, 25 feet for a side yard when adjoining a street right-of-way or residential district, and 30 feet for a rear yard. Maximum building height in this zoning is 45 feet, and maximum stories allowed is 4. Minimum landscaping is 20% of the gross land area. Required off-street parking is 2.5 spaces per 1,000 gross square feet of building. When next to a residential district, parking lots must be set back 20 feet and screened from view. This building use would probably require a Special Use Permit for the zoning district.
10. An aerial photo was shown of the existing site. Next, an image was presented which superimposed a drawing of the current facility site over the aerial photo. This drawing also showed the building setbacks and how much space remains for construction. Two adjacent properties to the south (also zoned B-1) could be purchased to allow for future expansion when the need arises. The site slopes about 7' to 8' down from the west property line to the east property line. Two **Options, 1A and 1B**, were presented which provide alternative approaches to expand the LEC/Jail.
11. A modern jail layout was briefly discussed, showing how a central control station can have a view into many day rooms/cell areas using angled, radiating walls. This allows minimal staff to safely observe a large number of inmates. Interior exercise space eliminates any visible exterior fenced areas for inmate exercise. Service chases behind the cells allow access to utilities without entering the secure perimeter of the jail. Skylights provide required natural light in the dayrooms, eliminating the need for exterior windows at the perimeter walls. These elements make up a modern jail and help to keep the building from appearing like a traditional jail from the exterior.
12. **Option 1A** proposes to renovate the existing Sheriff's Office building and construct an addition attached on its south side. The existing building already crosses the side yard setback, as it is built right up to the property line. To fit the addition on the site as a single level, the new office area would also need to be built within the setback area, requiring a waiver from the city. (A rooftop mechanical penthouse would be used to contain mechanical and electrical equipment.) Due to a very low floor-to-floor height, the basement of the existing building is only planned for storage and/or mechanical space. The need for ductwork to comply with current ventilation requirements would make the basement very impractical for occupied uses. Since the building has many issues with current codes and ADA requirements, the first floor interior would be gutted, insulated and reworked with a new floor plan. This will require phasing of the construction, so that some offices would be temporarily moved to the new addition while renovation occurs in the existing building. The addition would contain more office space, the intake area and jail. Another needed waiver would involve the parking area, since there isn't space available on the site for required off-street parking. It is anticipated that the public could continue to park along Clay Street as done currently, and 19 staff vehicle curb spaces would be located along South Adams Street.
13. **Option 1B** attempts to work within the setbacks of the B-1 zoning district. To do this, the existing buildings would be demolished. A new building is shown within the setbacks, using a two story office area and rooftop mechanical penthouse to accomplish this. The construction would require phasing so the existing building could be removed and replaced by new construction. This option would still require a waiver regarding the use of curb parking instead of off-street parking. This option anticipates the continued use of existing curb parking for the public and provides up to 30 parking spaces for staff along the alley and along South Adams Street.
14. Sheriff McNamee will work to set up a tour of a nearby jail so that Committee members can see a modern jail layout. The best possibility may be in Louisa County. Rich will contact them for possible dates and forward this information to the Committee.
15. Due to the approaching holidays, and with the New Year holiday recognized on Monday, January 2, it was decided that the next meeting should occur on **Monday, January 9th at 6:30 PM**. The focus of the meeting will be to discuss **Option 2** and **Option 3**.

BY: 
Jim Classe, AIA
Vice President/Design

December 16, 2016
Date

If any of the parties present take exception to these meeting notes, please notify Prochaska & Associates within five (5) days of issuance for correction or they shall stand as written.

PROCHASKA & ASSOCIATES

11317 Chicago Circle • Omaha, Nebraska 68154-2633

Telephone: (402) 334-0755

FAX: (402) 334-0868

E-Mail: mail@prochaska.us