

# Ad Hoc Jail Planning and Specifications Development Committee

## Progress Report

In April 2014 the Pierce County Board of Supervisors created an Ad Hoc Jail Planning and Specifications Development Committee (the Committee) pursuant to §4-51 of the Pierce County Code and charged the Committee with the following duties:

- narrow the alternative site locations for Board consideration;
- more specifically identify, review and analyze significant issues and conduct certain tasks related to the narrowed alternative site locations including the following - performing soil borings, zoning, road access, utility access, operational/staffing costs, DNR issues, current borrowing status and proposed financing options, etc. - in order to allow the County to make a final decision on the ultimate site location and design specifications of the jail, in order for the County to obtain financial information and bond for the costs, and in order for the County to bid out the project;
- obtain more detailed engineering/architectural plans and specifications; and
- assist the County as necessary in its research and analysis.

The Committee is providing this progress report on their efforts thus far to the Pierce County Board of Supervisors with a request to approve the site and size of a new jail and sheriff's department facility.

### Background

Two Ad Hoc Committees were created prior to the (current) Committee to deal specifically with the operational and liability issues and concerns related to the Pierce County jail. The charge of the first Ad Hoc Committee (AH1) was to research and analyze jail issues and liability concerns in order to identify and consider potential corrective alternatives. AH1 was comprised of three citizen members. The second Ad Hoc group was called the Ad Hoc Jail Planning Committee (AH2) and was comprised of three County Board Supervisors. AH2's charge was to retain the services of an engineering/architectural firm to identify more specific parameters associated with the option recommended by the AH1. Both of these Ad Hoc Committees completed their work, submitted their final reports, have accomplished the purpose for which they were created, and have been dissolved.

As a result of their work, detailed in their comprehensive Final Report dated June 27, 2013, AH1 recommended the County construct a stand-alone building with Sheriff's Department and 50 bed jail, allow for the possibility for future jail expansion, and remodel the existing Courthouse Annex jail space into a Justice Center, and allow for consideration of construction of a courthouse at the jail/sheriff's department site (and any other associated modification that might become necessary). AH1 also recommended the new facility be built on property the county currently owned. The data gathering and analysis that led AH1 to this conclusion and recommendation is outlined in detail in the Final Report.

AH2 was created and charged with retaining the services of an engineering/architectural firm to identify more specific parameters associated with the option recommended by AH1. Specifically, AH2 was to obtain a more solid estimate of cost for the recommended option and to identify property owned by Pierce County that may be a suitable site for a new stand-alone Sheriff's Department for the Board's consideration.

AH2's work culminated in the following list of six potential county owned sites as alternatives and project cost estimates:

Option A: Properties on West Grove Street generally located across the street from the Pierce County Office Building and east parking lot. The site is bordered on the north by the southernmost edge of the Pierce County fairgrounds property. The site includes the parcel on which the county maintenance building (the blue building) is located. The site is divided into five parcels, two of which are zoned commercial (blue building property and parcel immediately to the east) and three are zoned residential. Some of these parcels are currently included in the Pierce County Fairgrounds Master Plan and designated as future phased land acquisition. The site is a total of approximately 3.6 acres. Rough project cost estimate ranges from \$10,444,468 to \$11,213,218.

Option B: The parking lot to the east of the Pierce County Office Building. There are several challenges related to this site outlined in the Potter Lawson report. This site is zoned commercial. Rough project cost estimate ranges from \$11,572,338 to \$12,775,688.

Option C: Property on the southwest corner of State Highway 65 and Outlook Drive/Lucas Lane. This property is northeast of the Highway and Solid Waste/Recycling properties and south of Shopko. This site is about 9.2 acres and has a Northern Natural Gas Company pipeline running east-west through the property just north of half way between the north and south limits identified for a building project. The easement for the gas line is 80 feet wide. This site proposes a building foot print to the south of the easement. The entire site is zoned commercial. Rough project cost estimate ranges from \$10,659,718 to \$11,428,468.

Option D: This site is the same as listed in 3 above, except that it places the proposed building to the north of the 80 foot gas line easement. Because the easement is on a bit of an angle, this location is a tighter fit than south of the easement for the building foot print. Rough project cost estimate ranges from \$10,567,468 to \$11,336,218.

Option E: Property located approximately 1,600 feet west of the property listed in 3 and 4 above. There is currently no road to access the specific site. Access would be an issue with this site as a road would need to be constructed. The site is 6.7 acres and is zoned commercial. Rough project cost estimate ranges from \$11,643,718 to \$12,412,468.

Option F: Property located on Crosstown Road, west of State Highway 65. The site is wooded and is known as the County Demonstration Forest. The site is 22 acres and is zoned agricultural. Rough project cost estimate ranges from \$10,382,968 to \$11,151,718.

Significant detail regarding each of the potential sites including the advantage and disadvantages, utility and roadway access issues, and the ability to expand to a larger jail facility in the future was included in AH2's Final Report dated January 15, 2014.

With this background information, the Ad Hoc Jail Planning and Specifications Development Committee (the Committee) began its work.

Activities and efforts of Ad Hoc Jail Planning and Specification Development Committee members in response to their charge

The Committee began their work by identifying tasks and a methodology to begin addressing them. The Committee's work has focused on two areas: the size of jail facility that should be constructed for optimum use of county resources; and which of the identified sites is the best location for current and future needs.

Size of a new jail facility

The Committee's first focus was the size of the facility that should be included in the analysis of the sites. The size of the facility, specifically the number of beds, was a topic of discussion in both AH1 and AH2 meetings. AH1's recommendation was to build a facility with 50 beds and continue to house inmates at other facilities. However, AH1 was not charged with considering ongoing operational costs as it relates to the size of the facility, including the number of beds. AH2 had expressed concern with the facility size in terms of number of beds, even though that was also not in their charge. AH3 determined that before they could begin to do a thorough analysis of the sites, a definitive facility size in terms of number of beds needed to be determined. In order to determine the number of beds, some of the financial information must be considered.

As the county contemplates any new facility, three costs should be considered over the life of the facility: the cost to construct the facility; the cost to maintain the structure over time; and the cost to operate the facility. By far the biggest cost over the life of the facility is the operating. The Committee determined that operating cost needed to be considered when facility size was determined.

As operating costs are the largest of the lifecycle costs of a facility, staffing is the largest piece of the operational expenses. The Committee began by considering how the size of the jail affects staffing costs and other operational costs. To address this question the Committee contracted with Potter Lawson to do an Operations Study (attached as Appendix A) that compared staffing and other expenses of the existing 29 bed jail to three potential new facilities: a 50 bed facility; a 50 bed facility with a pod large enough to add more beds in the future; and a 70 to 80 bed jail. The study showed no additional staff would be needed to run an 80 bed jail than needed for a 50 bed jail.

In considering the number of beds the Committee also looked at the savings that would be realized if the new facility was large enough to house all inmates in Pierce County. If a 50 bed facility were built, an estimated 14 beds would still need to be contracted out at a cost of \$47 per day and 365 days per year (the contract price is for the full year) for a total of \$240,170 or a savings of \$97,505. However, an 80 bed facility would no longer require inmates to be housed outside the County and those savings would be substantial. The County currently pays a minimum of \$337,675 to house prisoners in other counties. The question that the Committee wanted to answer was if a jail is built big enough to eliminate the need to house inmates outside the county, will the savings be enough to cover the increased costs of the larger facility such as utilities and debt service. Since the 80 bed jail will have the same staffing costs as a smaller facility and will eliminate the need to house inmates outside the county, the \$337,675 currently used for out-of-county housing could be used to offset the other increases in operating. This conclusion is substantiated by the study and is the basis for the Committee's decision to recommend a 70 to 80 bed facility. Based on the average daily population and the number of inmates an 80 bed jail would hold, the County would be able to house all inmates with no increase in staffing costs and save all the expense of housing out.

The Committee also considered the increased construction costs with the larger 80 bed facility. The County again contracted with Potter Lawson to look at estimates for a 50 bed facility with and without Huber accommodations, a 50 bed facility with space shelled in the pod to eventually add 30 more beds, and a finished 70 to 80 bed jail. Based on those estimates (attached as Appendix B) a 70 to 80 bed jail would cost about \$1.1 million more to add the space needed to build and support the additional 20 to 30 beds into the project. Based on all this information, the Committee recommends building an 80 bed jail to house all inmates in the County and use the savings from the contracted beds to support the increased utility and debt service costs.

Because the Committee acknowledges that AH1 made the initial determination of 50 beds and the Committee values their contribution to addressing the issues with the existing jail, all three former members were contacted with the Operations Study information to get their feedback. When they reviewed the study, all three indicated they would support a larger facility given the information on the cost of housing out inmates versus increased operating costs on a larger facility.

#### Location of a new jail facility

With a recommendation for the size of the facility addressed, the Committee began information gathering and analysis to look at where the County should build a new facility. AH2 was charged with identifying potential sites and concluded their work with six potential sites, and the Committee began to examine each of those sites.

Once the Committee recommendation for a 70 to 80 bed jail was determined, the limited size of two of the potential sites became problematic. At the August 13, 2014, Committee meeting (minutes attached at Appendix C) a vote was taken that eliminated Option B (parking lot site) as one the Committee would recommend because of the need for a multi-level building, no onsite parking, confined site, displacing existing parking, and proximity to residential zoning being among the reasons stated. Also at the meeting the Committee voted to eliminate Option D (north of the pipeline site) as an individual site but

stated that this site would still be considered in conjunction with Option C (south of the pipeline site). This left four potential sites for the Committee to concentrate their efforts.

The Committee moved forward focusing on two things: first, how a facility would fit on each of the sites both now and in consideration of any future expansion on the site, and second, all the other issues and related costs affecting each individual site such as access, utilities, zoning, potential expansion, and any unique features of the sites (forest, pipeline) for all the sites.

Supporting materials resulting from these investigations are attached. Regarding how a facility would fit on each site, the Committee contracted with Potter Lawson to develop site plans on how an 80 bed jail would fit on each site. These site plans allow for initial parking, future parking that would be needed if the courts were added at a later date as a second story on the jail administration and sheriff's department spaces, and consideration as to whether a Huber component would be included in the project. The Committee wanted to assure the option of including Huber as that decision will eventually need to be made by the County Board as a part of the project. These site plans show two footprints for each site, one including building and parking space for Huber and one without Huber. The site plans are attached as Appendix D. Note the site plan for Option E in Appendix D also includes three possible access roads to the site.

The Committee requested some additional site plan work from Potter Lawson to consider an alternative where the courts were added as horizontal expansion (a new building foundation) instead of being added as a second story above the jail administration and sheriff's offices. These site plans for the four options only included the Huber option and are attached as Appendix E.

The Committee then looked at the general development issues connected with the project for each remaining site. This information is also attached and includes information from: Land Management on zoning and access issues (Appendix F); Highway on cost estimates for the three possible jail access roads for site Option E (Appendix G); and Administration on water, sewer and updated electric utilities availability and costs (Appendix H), and the pipeline on Option C (Appendix I). The following two tables present brief summaries of the issues with each site. The first table covers the general information for each site and the second table deals with the cost to provide road and utility access to the border of each of the sites.

Table 1: Summary of zoning status, size and expandability potential, road access, utility access, and unique conditions to each site

	Option A – Grove Street	Option C – Hwy 65 South of Pipeline	Option E – Northwest of Solid Waste & Highway	Option F – County Forest
Zoning status	Rezone or Conditional Use Permit required. Village of Ellsworth makes decision	No rezone or use permit required	No rezone or use permit required	Rezone required. Village of Ellsworth makes this decision.
Site Size and Potential Expansion	Relatively small site (less than 4 acres). Expansion could only be into Fairgrounds	About 5 acres when easement and area north of pipeline are removed. Expansion is limited without using area north of pipeline.	About 7 acres. Adequate for potential future expansion	About 22 acres. Ample room for future expansion
Road access	Current Village street network. Multiple directional access	No access from Hwy 65 (1). Access available from Lucas Lane or Burton Circle.	Off existing road network. Road needs to be built.	Access on Crosstown Road.
Utility access	All utilities available at the borders of the site	Water and electric are available at Lucas Lane to the north. Sewer main is on the site. Gas is available.	Utilities not located near site.	Electric across from property on Crosstown. Water and sewer about 800' from site
Unique conditions both positive and negative	Would be part of the current County Campus	Pipeline presents some design challenges/constraints. Encroachment agreements (2) would be needed for driveways and water lines to connect to Lucas Lane.	Very challenging site for road and utility access.	Trees would have to be removed.

Table notes: (1) Due to an Agreement signed in 2007 between Pierce County, WisDOT and the Village of Ellsworth regarding the scope and timing of improvements connected with the development of the Crossing Meadows Business Park, access to the site is limited to Lucas Lane or potentially Burton Circle (the private road that accesses the Solid Waste facility). Direct access from the site to Hwy 65 does not appear to be feasible. (2) Encroachment agreements with Northern Natural Gas Company do not appear to be difficult or costly. Restrictions on what can be done in the easement area appear to be reasonable.

Table2: Summary of approximate cost to bring services and road access to property line of each site

	Option A – Grove Street	Option C – Hwy 65 South of Pipeline	Option E – Northwest of Solid Waste & Highway	Option F – County Forest
Road access	Existing street - Grove	Existing street – Lucas Lane	Upgrade existing and construct new roadway from Crosstown \$474,000	Existing street – Crosstown Road
Water	Existing at property line	Existing at north property line on Lucas Ln	Add looped line to property \$253,500 plus cost for two pipeline easements (unknown)	Add looped line to property \$126,750
Sewer	Existing at property line	Existing on property	Extend main about 1,100 to 1,500 feet to serve property, lift station probable \$265,500 - \$325,000	Extend main about 1,000 feet to serve property , lift station possible \$255,000 - \$305,000 w/lift \$105,000 w/o lift
Electric	Existing at property line	Existing at north property line on Lucas Ln	Possible cost of \$15,000 to \$20,000 to bring service to property	Existing at property line
Natural gas	Existing near property	Existing near property	Information unavailable	Information unavailable
Total investment needed	\$0	\$0	\$993,015 - \$1,079,520 plus easement costs	\$231,750 - \$431,750

Conclusion

Committee members spent time discussing all the information gathered and assessing the challenges with each of the sites. The Committee agreed that there was no site that was without some challenge, but there were sites that would work. After continued discussion on the advantages, disadvantages and costs related to each of the four sites, the Committee voted to eliminate all but Option C (pipeline site). While the pipeline poses some challenges, it appears the facility would fit well on the site and allow for possible future expansion. Initial discussions with the pipeline owner, Northern Natural Gas Company, indicate they are willing to work with the County on this project. The Committee is exploring the possibility and related cost to move the pipeline in order to determine the cost/benefit of such a project, but at this point the Committee is confident that the site is workable whether or not the pipe is relocated. The Committee has also contracted with Cedar Corporation for a survey of the property to further assess the suitability of the site as a building location. Based on the totality of information presented in this Progress Report and Appendices, the Committee requests the Pierce County Board of Supervisors make a final determination that the site location for the potential jail facility be Option C as identified in the report and that the facility contains approximately 70 to 80 beds.