

MONTGOMERY COUNTY JAIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

June 23, 2009

The Montgomery County Jail Committee met Tuesday, June 23, 2009, at 6:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room of the Red Oak Fire Station. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Donna Robinson. There was a roll call of members with Ron Brown, Dan Cain, Roger Ehmke, Jim Parker, Drue Powers, Ken Rech, Julie Rubey, Donna Robinson, Jim Sifford, Brad Wright, Clint Rubey, Joe Sampson, Margaret Stoldorf and Jon Young present. Steve Ratcliff was the only audience member.

Motion to approve the agenda by Sifford, second by C. Rubey. All in favor. Motion carried.

Motion by C. Rubey, second by J. Rubey to approve the minutes of June 22nd as read. All in favor. Minutes were approved and stand as read.

Chairman Robinson welcomed Michael Morman, Project Manager of Durrant to the meeting. Morman presented his company's information and stated that Durrant has worked with more Iowa justice and jail projects than any other firm in Iowa. He stated their strong points are a clear understanding of the Iowa Code and how it applies to jail standards, they work closely with Chief Jail Inspector Delbert Longley, and will work in the best interests of the county, making the recommendation that will be best for the county.

Morman reviewed Durrant's schedule which was eight total weeks. The discovery phase was two weeks, evaluation and scenario development four weeks, and recommendations two weeks. He stated that they would seek funding from outside sources such as Iowa Greenstreets and IJobs. The fees for Durrant's services in Phase I were hourly-not-to-exceed \$10,000, and \$5,000 for referendum assistance if needed. He said that if the project proceeded, the \$10,000 would be credited to Phase II.

Morman took questions from the committee. Sampson asked about being over budget in Ringgold County. Morman responded that was in 2007, and the sheriff of Ringgold County had tried to hire local contractors, and in the end put them over by \$1.5 million. Rech asked about their success on their referendums. Morman said out of the last twelve, they had one close call and one failure. Robinson asked if he was familiar with PONI and if he would be willing to attend. Morman said he was not familiar with the program, but would attend if the county were to pay the additional time and travel expenses.

The committee broke at 6:45 p.m. for a scheduled break and reconvened at 7:00 p.m. for the Prochaska and Associates interview. Present was Mike Wicht, Client Services, Don Prochaska, Principal-in-Charge, Steve Riley, Project Manager, and Scott Lundberg, Project Architect. Prochaska said they don't subcontract out the engineering services, which adds to the cost of a project, and that they would be able to assist all the way through a successful bond issue. Prochaska believed his firm would be the best to negotiate through difficult economic times, and they understood the inequity of the taxing structure which put a large burden on the rural taxpayers, as his staff has roots in agriculture and ranching.

Lundberg detailed three recent jail projects of Prochaska. They included a 34-bed project in Butler County, a 30-bed structure in Cherry County, NE, and a 24-bed facility in Mills County, IA. He reviewed how he thought they would be similar to Montgomery County's needs.

Prochaska reviewed their proposed schedule, with Phase I consisting of pre-bond election services such as reviewing previously compiled studies, on-site evaluation of existing facility, developing master plan concepts and selecting the top-ranked concept

and bond campaign assistance. This phase would take approximately six months followed by Phase II which would be the bond campaign, and Phase III which would be the design and construction phase. The fees for these services would be not to exceed \$15,000 through the bonding process.

Sampson asked Prochaska about being over budget in Cherry Point. Prochaska responded that they couldn't be over budget as they hadn't taken bids for the facility yet.

At 8:02 p.m. the committee took their second scheduled break of the evening and reconvened shortly after. The Chair asked for additional items to come before the committee. There were none. She then asked for public comments. There were no comments.

Next the committee discussed the four firms interviewed. C. Rubey stated that in his opinion, cost was not an issue at this point. Consensus that cost was not an issue, as three firms were similar in cost and the fourth had a much abbreviated schedule. Wright suggested throwing names out to narrow down the group.

The committee considered the possibility of meeting another night to review the candidates. Motion by Stoldorf to limit the selection to two firms this evening, then meet again at a later time, second by Young. In discussion, C. Rubey stated that he wouldn't know anymore tomorrow than tonight. Ehmke called for the question. Roll call: Yes: Young, Stoldorf, Sampson. No: Wright, C. Rubey, Robinson, Powers, J. Rubey, Parker, Sifford, Rech, Ehmke, Cain, Brown. Motion failed.

An informal poll took place next with each committee member naming their top two firms with a result as follows: Wright- Durrant, HMN; C. Rubey- Durrant, Prochaska; Robinson- HMN, Prochaska; Powers- Durrant, DLR; J. Rubey- Durrant, HMN; Parker- Durrant, DLR; Sifford- HMN, Prochaska; Young- Durrant, Prochaska; Rech- HMN, Prochaska; Stoldorf- DLR, Prochaska; Ehmke- Durrant, DLR; Cain- Durrant, DLR; Brown- HMN, Prochaska; Sampson- Durrant, DLR. Final tally: Durrant-9, HMN-6, Prochaska-7, DLR-6.

Discussions followed with the committee sharing information and points of discussion for the group. After much deliberation, a vote was taken for the committee's top firm. Those voting for Durrant were Wright, Powers, Parker, Stoldorf, Ehmke, Cain, Sampson. Those voting for Prochaska were C. Rubey, Robinson, J. Rubey, Sifford, Young, Rech, Brown. The vote tied seven to seven.

J. Rubey motioned that the committee re-examine all four firms, seconded by Margaret. Roll call: Yes: Wright, C. Rubey, Robinson, Powers, J. Rubey, Parker, Young, Stoldorf, Cain, Sampson. No: Sifford, Rech, Ehmke, Brown. Motion passed. The committee discussed all candidates again, and decided that Durrant and Prochaska were still the top two firms.

At 9:30 p.m. J. Rubey motioned to vote again on the top firm and if the outcome were tied, they would consider meeting again. All in favor. Motion carried.

Those voting in favor of Durrant were Wright, Powers, J. Rubey, Parker, Stoldorf, Cain, Sampson. Those voting in favor of Prochaska were C. Rubey, Robinson, Sifford, Young, Rech, Ehmke, and Brown. Tied seven to seven. Ehmke asked for another vote.

Those in favor of Durrant were Wright, Powers, J. Rubey, Parker, Stoldorf, Ehmke, Cain, Sampson. Those in favor of Prochaska were C. Rubey, Robinson, Sifford, Young, Rech, Brown. Durrant received the most votes with eight to Prochaska's six votes.

Motion by Wright, second by Powers to recommend retention of Durrant for the Jail Study to the Montgomery County Board of Supervisors. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Robinson thanked the committee for their contribution in this recommendation, and stressed that now the recommendation was to be made, the committee must present a unified front to the public.

Motion by Powers, second by Stoldorf to adjourn. All in favor. The committee adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

DONNA ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: JONI K. ERNST, CLERK