

Commissioners' Journal
April 4, 2018

The Geauga County Board of Commissioners met in special session on April 4, 2018 at 10:00 a.m. in the Commissioners' Chambers located at 470 Center Street in Chardon, Ohio.

It is declared and determined that all formal actions of the Board of County Commissioners concerning and relating to the adoption of all resolutions that were adopted in this meeting, and that all deliberations of the Board of County Commissioners that resulted in such formal action were open to the public and were in compliance with all legal requirements, including section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

The President of the Board, Ralph Spidalieri opened the meeting at 10:06 a.m. by leading the Board and audience in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

The purpose of the meeting today was to discuss with Richard L. Bowen and Associates, Incorporated the scope, nature and technical approaches to the services to be provided regarding Professional Design Services related to the current and future uses of existing Geauga County assets and the potential construction of new office facilities and negotiating a contract with that firm, as provided by Ohio Revised Code 153.69.

Attendance included the Commissioners, County Administrator, Clerk, Allan Renzi, Ken Emling and Robyn Wolf from Richard L. Bowen and Associates along with an audience that included County Elected Officials, County Employees, City Officials and Staff Members, County residents and Media.

County Administrator David Lair explained that the Board had engaged Richard L. Bowen and Associates as a Consultant to do, in his opinion, a financial reality check on what would make sense to make County facilities more efficient, accessible and function better to serve the public over the long term. They got through what was considered Phase 1, which completed a detailed program of requirements after meeting with all the stakeholders and coming up with estimates of what was felt to be needed and necessary. At that point, the Board reviewed the process and looked at going forward at what was going to be needed. It was determined that they needed to stop and reboot due to specifics of structures, locations and details, and that an architectural design firm would be needed to do the technical things going forward on what should be considered to be done. A request for Statement of Qualifications was submitted and advertised notifications, and only one response was received from Richard L. Bowen and Associates. Mr. Lair stated that this is a restart of where we are at and taking a look at what we know today versus last fall, and to negotiate and see if an agreement can be reached on providing services going forward, but in order for that proposal to be reached they need to have a discussion on what needs to be included in the contract.

Ken Emling explained that they wanted to review the Scope of Services that was included in the RFQ and confirm that scope so they can develop a fee proposal based on the scope. Mr. Emling stated that once they clarify the bullet points, they will compile a proposal based upon those expectations and what they feel they can provide.

Mr. Emling clarified that the previous contract had been terminated and today they are reviewing the scope of services based on the definition of what was outlined in the statement of qualifications.

Mr. Emling stated that the first two bullet points in the scope of services is what they completed in Phase 1 of the previous contract and questioned whether the Board wanted them to re-exam anything. That report was approved, and their understanding is there did not seem to be a need to redo what they already completed.

Commissioner Claypool mentioned the previous contract and briefly noted the phases, and the current prime initiative that Berkshire Schools are doing with the proposed school project. Commissioner Lennon added that it brings up a good point, costs to refurbish or rebuild, and that it had been talked about with real estate evaluators. Allan Renzi stated that the real estate asset evaluation is outside of the architectural services. Mr. Lennon stated that no matter what else we get out of this, that we need to do something with the Job and Family Services building, adding that there is an interest in the building.

Mr. Emling asked for clarification if they needed to do any additional assessments outside of what they completed in the previous reports. Mr. Renzi stated that there is no reason for them to

Commissioners' Journal
April 4, 2018

repeat the first two bullet points in the proposal. The next three bullet points are viewed as an evaluation of options, and where they want to take the program (first report) and see what we can do with it. Can we work with the existing buildings, can we work with code issues or is there another option. The remaining bullets are a different type of service, it's no longer programming and evaluating structures, its evaluating the buildings and assets, the worth, marketed for, options if the County no longer occupies them, but more of a real estate evaluations and market analysis that would require a third party to assist them. Mr. Lennon stated that we are not there yet, and can be something that can be addressed down the road, but a value can be assessed to the building in a generic, ball park range, but a cost analysis on a building, for a breakeven point can be done. Mr. Emling added that they see that as being part of the project, but as a third part of the project. Mr. Renzi added that it is a combination of workforce and labor, and where the savings is and this is a deep down analysis that professionals do, but that is not Bowen's expertise. Mr. Lennon asked them to include that as a line item for a partner who could provide the analysis. Mr. Claypool added that we know something about efficiencies and inefficiencies in our current situation, another option, a one campus versus multiple campuses, they have different efficiencies, those translate to dollars that help us make decisions. Cost or evaluation of real estate assets will help us, asking about two layers of assessment. Mr. Claypool added that Auditors evaluation is not an accurate value of the property. Mr. Renzi stated that yes the Board needs to have this information, but gave the example of two departments being consolidated would save money, that's the next level and they couldn't give you a breakdown, but a third party would need to be brought in to do that. Mr. Claypool stated that at some point you need to make a decision, adding that there has to be a middle ground, their expertise might be enough, adding that once they get enough facts to make a decision then they don't need to spend a lot of money to make a decision. Mr. Renzi stated that how the scope is written is asking for detail that someone would have to base their reputation on it.

Mr. Emling asked for a definition of quantity of options, otherwise it would be open ended. Mr. Renzi gave the example of two options, one we stay where we are, what they would have to do to bring the current facilities up to date and code compliant. Mr. Claypool added that they are the experts, that this is something that they needed. Mr. Renzi gave a second option of consolidation of some or all the facilities. Mr. Lennon stated that in his mind, there are lots of options and a lot is dictated by budget and what you can afford. Bring what we have up to code. Mr. Emling stated that we could come back and throw out 8 options and the Board could say did you look at these 4, so Mr. Emling asked to define the options. Mr. Lennon stated that we would leave it up to their judgement and expertise as to what they feel would be the best and most efficient way to go. Mr. Claypool added that everyone in the room has their own ideas of where they should go and in his mind he feels there are 3 options. Mr. Renzi added that this is extremely large and complex program, but in order to do the proposal they need more of a definitive answer of point number 3. Mr. Claypool stated that the objective is to gain clarity.

Mr. Renzi provided an example of an early project, a police station, noting that the program designed their space based on the information in the program, and the difference with the County is that every room and space designed for them would be each department for the County, of a potential layout and square footage. Mr. Claypool stated that right now they need to decide what to do, stay where we are or build something new. Mr. Emling stated that point number 4 puts numbers to construction costs. Mr. Claypool stated that we know something about build costs today, noting the library started with an estimate of \$500.00 a square foot and Berkshire Schools have a lesser amount per square foot, and this give you what you currently have would give you an order to a thought process.

Mr. Renzi stated that they don't have a problem doing it, they just want clarity to base the proposal on something, citing three options that would develop a concept layout that could be looked at and focused on. Mr. Renzi added that they would then give an order of magnitude, a construction cost for each one to help you make a decision, adding that energy savings would be included in the decision making.

Mr. Lennon brought up the idea of an advisory committee of stakeholders to have a non-biased opinion about the information being provided, so they can say, look here is the clear path forward, asking if we should do it at the end or throughout the process. Mr. Renzi stated that the remaining points are to then choose an option and bring in some outside firm to provide potential use, which are considered outside of architectural services. Mr. Renzi stated that they would help with building but that there are other types of planning, like financial. Mr. Emling

Commissioners' Journal
April 4, 2018

added that it is not their intent to come up with what the properties should be, but that they could come up with ideas throughout the process. They are looking for clarification for the proposal of what is expected.

Referring back to the last sets of bullet points and briefly discussed the cost of the in depth analysis of cost savings of personnel. Mr. Emling noted that evaluation of potential or alternative plans would be limited, that a broker would have a better understanding and idea of what it could be, to do a market analysis. Financial options are based on the options that we come up with. Delivery methods are something they could definitely do, and phase in plans are things they do on a lot of different projects. Mr. Renzi added that everything in the last seven points are based on an option being selected. Mr. Emling inquired about ongoing consultation and if we get to this point we stop and look at where we go, that might bring another cost to it. Mr. Renzi added that it reads open ended, and that it would really mean another contract, if they chose to move farther ahead. Mr. Claypool added that they have to approach things differently since they are government, but that when we get to this point, we would have to make a decision.

Here are the Scope of Services being discussed:

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The Project's scope of services shall include the typical professional design services that are "within the scope of practice of an architect or landscape architect registered under Chapter 4703 of the Revised Code or a professional engineer or surveyor registered under Chapter 4733 of the Revised Code," R.C. 153.65(C).

The scope of services will include but may not be limited to the following:

- Evaluation of current and anticipated facility space needs for each County office (estimated square feet), taking into account the key locations under consideration for replacement/repurposing, including: 470 Center St.; the Geauga County Courthouse; the Geauga County Courthouse Annex; the Opera House; the Geauga County Department on Aging; the Geauga County Department of Job and Family Services, and other sites.*
- Development of a Program of Requirements ("POR") outlining each County office's current and future needs;*
- Evaluation of the most cost effective location for each County office, giving due consideration to the legal constraints limiting location choice for some offices, convenience of location for all county residents, and logistical efficiency between related institutional functions wherever possible and without negatively impacting project cost;*
- Evaluation of the net cost of new construction, factoring in potential resale value for existing facilities that may be replaced, the estimated build costs of new facilities, and development options (e.g., build/lease, build to own);*
- Evaluation of energy savings potential of new facilities;*
- Evaluation of personnel cost savings potential through facility / departmental consolidation, reduced travel, improved productivity, and reduced maintenance;*
- Evaluation of economic development potential for repurposed current facilities and potential private development of complementary business uses on new County facility development sites;*
- Development of conceptual alternative plans for future use of the County's current assets and real estate available for development;*
- Evaluation of financing options available to fund the potential construction of a new office facility or the repurposing of existing assets without having to increase taxes, insulating against potential fluctuation in interest rates over time, as well as presenting public – private partnership lease-to-own options, providing a range of approaches;*

Commissioners' Journal
April 4, 2018

- *Recommendations regarding potential construction delivery methods – e.g. general / multiple prime contracting, design-build, construction manager or construction manager at risk – for new office facilities*
- *Development of alternative construction sequencing options: one large project replacing all current facilities requiring long-term bonding of a \$35M+ investment; a phased approach, with an initial project covering all non-court/legal facilities in phase one with a ten-year payoff via notes, repeating that financing model to cover courts /legal services offices in the second phase; or another recommended option; and*
- *Ongoing consultation and development of preliminary plans and outline of specifications relative to potential new construction and the continued efficient use of existing County assets.*

Mr. Emling added that they feel more comfortable with the Scope. There was a brief discussion about the Job and Family Services building, they brought up the idea of the youth center, but at this point they don't want to include it. Mr. Renzi added that a police station is a complicated building but this is a monster project, to which Mr. Lennon added that it is, and it is scattered around in different areas. Mr. Renzi stated that they like large complicated projects but if you don't define the scope you can move in a lot of different directions. Mr. Lair added that you are serving 93,000 residents and ask if what you are doing now will take you thirty to forty years down the road. Mr. Renzi stated that you have to look at how you best spend dollars, operating an old building that is inefficient or build something more energy efficient.

Mr. Emling added that they try to make the buildings flexible and design them so that if needed down the road the ability to expand, to which Mr. Renzi added that it's more change of function versus growth. Mr. Emling added that the report that they completed in last year had a lot of information in it and will help towards this project and was an eye opener to some.

There was a brief discussion about when they might see the proposal, and noted that it would probably be the end of the following week.

Chris Hitchcock, Treasurer noted the cost of \$500.00 a square foot and if that is the cost, and that we don't have the funding available for \$25 million. It was noted that was the cost that the library had cited.

Denise Kaminski, Clerk of Courts asked when the Board was going to define the scope so they can provide a proposal, to which Mr. Renzi stated that they have an idea and at this point will go with 3 for the proposal and if they need to identify more it can be added.

BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD

Motion: by Commissioner Claypool, seconded by Commissioner Lennon to adjourn the meeting at 11:01 a.m.

Geauga County Board of Commissioners

Ralph Spidalieri

Timothy C. Lennon

Walter M. Claypool

Christine Blair, Commissioners' Clerk

Commissioners' Journal
April 4, 2018

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK