

April 15, 2010

**LONG-RANGE PLANNING/REAL ESTATE & BUILDINGS  
COMMITTEE REPORT**

The Long Range Planning/Real Estate & Buildings Committee met Tuesday, April 15, 2010 at 5:30 p.m., in the Quorum Court Meeting Room, Third Floor, County Administration Building, 215 East Central, Bentonville, Arkansas

Committee Members Present: Sandlin, Brown, Lewis, Winscott  
Absent: Hubbard

Others Present: JP Kurt Moore, JP Tom Allen, JP Jay Harrison, Circuit Judge John Scott, Comptroller Richard McComas

Media: Tabatha Hunter –Morning News

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by JP Winscott at 5:30 p.m.

**Public Comments**

None

JP Winscott went over the chronology of the Long Range Planning Committee and how the Committee has arrived to the point they are at now. He stated that the number one priority has been the Juvenile Detention Center; and addressing the issue from the standpoint of size and location, including the courtrooms and probation offices. He added that in 2008, Hight-Jackson had made a presentation to the Quorum Court about building a new tower between the Courthouse and the Administration Building, and that plan is still available.

He stated that in 2008, the Long Range Planning Committee formed a committee comprised of himself, County Judge Gary Black, Juvenile Detention Director Dennis Cottrell, and Director of Environmental Services Jim Ecker to look into the Juvenile Detention Center. He said at that time the Committee began looking at Juvenile Detention Centers and hardened facilities in Missouri, Kansas and South Carolina, and the number one priority was to interview architect firms with experience in designing hardened facilities -- specifically Juvenile Detention Centers. He said that as a result of the interview process, the county engaged in negotiating a contract with Johnson-Troillet Architects, and that contract is still active and effective today. He added that the Committee then interviewed contractors, and after interviewing several, Crossland Construction was selected and that contract is still available and on file today. He stated that Johnson-Troillet Architects developed a layout of the Juvenile Detention Center and the court system for the Highway 102 property.

He stated that at the April 13, 2010 Committee of Thirteen meeting, the Committee approved the funding of \$300,000 to Johnson-Troillet Architects to develop the bid design and specifications for the Juvenile Detention Center and it will be presented to the Quorum Court next week for

final approval. He added that the Committee had gone through a very orderly process and that the selection and decisions were made based on the information that they had.

Further discussion was held on the proposed master plan and the needs assessment for the county.

County Attorney George Spence stated that instead of calling the new facility the Juvenile Detention Center, that it will be referred to as the Juvenile Justice Center because of the inclusion of the courts and probation offices.

### **Master Plan Proposal**

Tom Johnson of Johnson–Troillet Architects and Tim Sorey of Sand Creek Engineering presented the “*Benton County Master Plan Proposal*”.

Tim Sorey stated that the presentation is a master plan looking at the overall courts system on the Highway 102 property, and that step one is the Juvenile Justice Center.

Tom Johnson stated that the presentation takes a quick overview of the study proposal we have developed for a master building plan for Benton County that could be completed in three phases. He stated that Phase I is an information-gathering phase to include a demographic study; interviews with department heads and selected personnel to determine how relocating the Juvenile Justice Center affects their departments; and how the county might best manage their future space needs and potential growth patterns. He added that at the conclusion of Phase I, a “Review of Findings” will be held with the Long Range Planning/Real Estate & Buildings Committee for them to consider the acceptance of Phase I. He added that acceptance of Phase I by Benton County would be requested prior to the architect proceeding with Phase II.

Tom Johnson stated that Phase II would be the Highway 102 property Master Plan and current county building utilization study, and will include updates to the 2008 concept master plan of the Highway 102 property and downtown buildings. He stated that as part of the study, they will look at how downtown county property and courthouse space vacated by the current JDC, Juvenile Court, and Probation offices might be re-used for expansion or relocation of other county departments. He added that a site analysis and site zoning study will be done on the county property. He stated that the short range growth plan would be from five to fifteen years, and the long range plan out to 50 years. He added that a “Review of Findings” with the Long Range Planning/Real Estate & Buildings Committee and the acceptance of a site concept will be requested from Benton County prior to proceeding with Phase III.

Tom Johnson stated that Phase III consists of updates to the Highway 102 property Master Plan and the development of conceptual drawings for a county courts building option selected from Phase II in order to develop a projection of costs. He added that concept drawings consisting of site plan, floor plans, building elevations, and a color rendering will be the product of this phase. He stated that a final “Review of Findings” meeting will be held with the Long Range Planning/Real Estate & Buildings Committee for acceptance of the design concept.

Tom Johnson explained the fee proposal provided for each phase: Phase I - \$32,504.00, Phase II - \$29,605.80, and Phase III - \$21,064.80, for a total cost of \$83,174.60. He added that receipts for actual costs incurred in association with the project will be provided.

Further discussion was held on costs involved with the different phases, and the services to be provided by James J. Brennan, AIA of Brennan Architects.

JP Moore stated that he felt that the price is reasonable for the amount of design work being done, and for having a master plan that will take us 20 or maybe 30 years into the future. He added that the money would be well invested.

Further discussion was held on the process of the different phases and costs involved with each phase.

County Attorney George Spence stated that moving forward, this could be set up where the county could commit to each phase individually as they are prepared to proceed, allowing the county to opt out if desired.

Discussion was held regarding the needs assessments to be completed and the options presented.

Larry Perkin of Hight-Jackson Architects stated that he wanted to go on record that Hight-Jackson had submitted a proposal to do a needs assessment for the county in December of 2009.

Bob Clinard commented on the needs study proposals that were presented.

Lengthy discussion was held on the proposals submitted by Larry Perkin of Hight-Jackson Architects and the presentation presented by Johnson-Troillet Architects.

JP Moore stated he wanted to hear the pros and cons of leaving the court facility downtown as opposed to moving it out to Highway 102, and have as much information as possible before making a final decision.

JP Brown stated that the committee needs to look at both proposals before making a decision.

JP Winscott called a meeting for Tuesday, April 20, 2010 at 5:30 p.m. to hear Hight-Jackson's proposal that was previously submitted.

Larry Perkin of Hight-Jackson Architects stated that he wanted to be clear that County Judge David Bisbee had asked Hight-Jackson Architects last December to do a needs assessment for all of the county buildings and then to decide what the needs were and where to go from there.

County Attorney George Spence stated since ultimately this question has to be based on qualifications and not based on fee proposals, that it would be appropriate to give both Johnson-Troillet Architects and Hight-Jackson Architects the opportunity to make their presentations to the Committee.

### **Questions & Answers/Discussion**

None

### **Other Business**

None

### **Adjournment**

After motion and second the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.