

Date: August 13, 2010

Location: City Hall

Time: 3:00 p.m. - 4:38 p.m.

Mayor's Large Conference Room

ATTENDEES:

CARC Members

Jim Rinaman, Chairman, CARC
Joey Duncan, P.E., Director of Public Works
Honorable Don Moran, Chief Judge, 4th Judicial Circuit
Honorable Don Redman, Council Member District 4
Ron Salem, Chairman, BJP Citizens Oversight Committee

City Staff

Brian Barnhart, SAO
Honorable Mallory Cooper, Judge, 4th Judicial Circuit
Honorable Angela Corey, State Attorney, 4th Judicial Circuit
Honorable Lance Day, Judge, 4th Judicial Circuit
Caroline Emery, Courts Counsel
Denise Henkes, Public Works
Dan McCarthy, SAO
Gayle Petrie, OGC
Tom Rensing, AIA, KBJ
Jennifer Savage, PIO
David Schneider, P.E., Public Works
Marty Terry, SAO
Mike Weinstein, SAO

Other Attendees

Joe Camerlengo, JBA
Jim Cobb, JBA
Harvard Coker, Bar
Rutledge Liles, JBA
James Moseley, Sr., JBA
Alan Pickert, JBA
Joe Wilhelm, Daily Record

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Rinaman called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. Jim said there may be a few more past bar presidents joining us on the Courthouse tour; they will be waiting for us at the Ed Ball Building. Jim requested Dave Schneider commence the presentation.

PRESENTATION

Dave explained that because the Committee is formed under City Ordinance No 207-401-E the meeting will be taped and minutes will be published and distributed. Secondly, there is a sign-in sheet; please sign it so all present can be reflected in the minutes. Dave also mentioned that Council President Webb and DDRB Chairman Jonathan Garza had unavoidable conflicts with today's meeting and cannot be present.

Discussion today will include the pedestrian bridge and the Old Federal Courthouse (OFC) west façade.
General slides and discussion:

- Main Courthouse Building – what it will look like upon completion.
- What it looks like today; 40% complete. Current work includes structure, exterior, precast, curtain wall, windows, high and low roofs. 800,000 square feet; construction began May 12th, 2009, substantial completion is schedule for May 14th, 2012.
Chairman Rinaman asked if the 800,000 square feet includes the OFC. Dave responded, no, 800,000 square feet is the square footage of the new courthouse.
- In addition to approval by the CARC, the pedestrian bridge must also receive final approval from the Downtown Development Review Board (DDRB); DDRB conceptual approval was received in January, 2010. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) must also approve the pedestrian bridge under the terms of an agreement between the City and the State over the purchase of the OFC; this is a process currently ongoing.
- CARC was created under City Ordinance No 207-401-E. The purpose under the Ordinance is CARC will have the responsibility to review and approve the exterior architectural design and the interior design to ensure the goals of quality, durability, security, and functionality are achieved in the Unified Courthouse.
- CARC has met three times prior to today's meeting:
 - November, 2007: Reviewed and approved the Unified Courthouse vs a split civil/criminal facility.
 - May, 2009: Reviewed and approved the Unified Courthouse design just prior to going to construction.
 - January, 2010: Reviewed and approved design of the elevated pedestrian bridge connecting the 3rd floors of the OFC (future SAO) with the Unified Courthouse over Pearl Street (presented slides of bridge shown in the January presentation, north and south side views).
- Chairman Rinaman noted that we will be seeing some interesting developments in the next few slides; the pedestrian bridge design was intended to be consistent with appearance of both the OFC and the Unified Courthouse, which I believe it was.
- Subsequent to the January CARC approval, SHPO reviewed the proposed design. SHPO concluded the design looked too much like the OFC. SHPO's thought process is that because the design is too much like the OFC it ruins the historic nature (the OFC is 70-80 years old) (people would think the bridge has always been there). SHPO advised that the bridge should either look like the new courthouse with a transition to the OFC or design it to look like neither building, as long as it is compatible.
- AECOM (OFC design team) and Tom Rensing of KBJ Architects (courthouse architect) collectively designed a neutral, compatible appearance (presented slides). Sleek and contemporary, a lot of metal and glass. The new proposed bridge will need approval by DDRB and SHPO. We believe this new design will be approved by SHPO.
- Presented slides of new design: The new bridge design is the same height and width, same cost, but with different materials and a different look.
- There is an alignment change where the 3rd floor public corridor of the new building and the corridor of the OFC, horizontally do not align perfectly; about 4-5 feet offset; there needs to be a jog in the bridge somewhere. Originally the jog was on the new courthouse roof. In the new design, it

was thought it would be better to minimize the impact to the new courthouse and locate the jog at the OFC. The only changes are the location of the offset and the architectural appearance.

Ron Salem asked if you can see through it. Dave responded you can see out, seeing in is more difficult.

Tom Rensing commented that the black glass makes it a secure corridor (same glass used in the courthouse). Tom further elaborated on the appearance of the new design with respect to SHPO's comments relative to preserving the historical nature of the OFC.

- Dave continued with his presentation focusing on the goals of functionality, security, durability, and quality.

Functionality: Direct connection between the OFC which facilitates future expansion of the Unified Courthouse into the OFC to meet future court space needs; provides connectivity between the two buildings. Provides a covered, weather proof walkway for the safe transport of files between the SAO and courtrooms, per the Dan Wiley Report.

Security: Access to and hours of operation will be strictly controlled by administrative orders of the judiciary; a uniformed guard on one side only. Eliminate the possibility of chance encounters between prosecutors, defendants, and their families.

Durability: Steel structure; no exposed steel provides longevity.

Quality: The exterior cladding is pre-finished, insulated metal panels, high impact glazing, very low maintenance. This bridge does connect two LEED certified buildings.

We believe this meets the standards of what this committee is looking at.

- Slides of the OFC Building (exterior):
 - SW Corner: The façade does not change; will be cleaned up. This is the proposed public lobby entrance.
 - SE Corner: Proposed staff entrance.
 - East Side: No doors or access points.
 - NE Corner: Proposed entrance for outside agencies (guardian ad litem; domestic violence) entrance.
 - NW Side: Proposed entrance for law enforcement.
 - West Side: Currently has a loading dock and large delivery door. The area is currently being used to store materials being used to construct the new courthouse. The proposed design for this area is to make this space useful and functional (parking and receive supplies). This would be a totally secure area. Roof would be extended about 20 feet beyond the loading dock.

Dave mentioned the proposed design meets the threshold of functionality, security, durability, and quality. It provides a secured covered space for SAO staff. Maintains a portion of the existing loading dock to safely receive deliveries. Provides covered parking; protection from inclement weather; a utilitarian side of the building (deliveries, dumpsters, parking, etc). This side will be completely enclosed with decorative fencing making it a secure area accessible only by card key holders; provides a safe space for prosecutors to avoid public encounters with defendants and their families. Roof will be designed to withstand hurricane force uplift winds; pre-finished metal roof panels; very low maintenance; high performance UV resistant finish which will resist fading or dulling over time.

CARC DISCUSSION

Much discussion with respect to the look of the new design looking like an afterthought although there was also understanding why SHPO disapproved the original design. In depth discussion included specifics relative to the new design's appearance as well as a possible alternative design that will look as though it belongs and meets SHPO approval.

Ron Salem commented he would not be in favor of doing anything to slow the construction; i.e., changing designs.

Judge Cooper: Can we ask the designers to make the jog appear to go straight across (fake front)? Tom Rensing replied that in doing that it would interfere with the OFC tower/façade. We need to minimize intrusion; SHPO requires minimizing the intrusion as well and the "fake front" would intrude upon the OFC facade.

Brief discussion relative to the jog being at the Unified Courthouse vs the OFC.

Presentation Concluded

Chairman Rinaman addressed the Committee: We need to decide whether to approve the new concept for the elevated pedestrian bridge and to decide/approve the west façade of the OFC.

Judge Moran mentioned he believes people have a misconception of what the SAO is. One reason for the bridge is for the expansion of the courthouse into the OFC. The SAO has always been a high traffic building and the single door entrance for the public is not sufficient to handle the heavy traffic. The original concept (renderings from the design competition) had a large, welcoming entrance for the public in the loading dock area and in my opinion, that concept is more appropriate; the right thing to do for the public. He also mentioned the cost for both (\$700,000 for the elevated bridge and \$250,000 for the west façade). Judge Moran respectfully suggested that what is being proposed is not appropriate.

There was continued discussion relative to Monroe Street staying closed or open, parking at the judicial complex, elevated bridge cost, proposed public entrance and the original concept for the public entrance, outside agency entrance/parking, services expanding into the OFC; is there ample shell (45,000 to 50,000 square feet) space available, adjacent property, upcoming project management meeting regarding allocation of space at the OFC.

Angela Corey explained that the original concept for the public entrance was primarily designed because the new courthouse faced east, facing the OFC. The current proposed entrance is closer access from the new courthouse. Additionally, Ms. Corey explained that the public traffic flow is not sufficient enough that would demand a large entrance; the single door is sufficient. Also, there is not any room on any side of the OFC to house large deliveries, dumpsters, etc.

Angela Cory asked where the figures quoted by Judge Moran, \$700,000 for the elevated bridge and \$250,000 for the west façade came from. Dave Schneider answered from the City.

Chairman Rinaman asked Dave Schneider if the current design team designed a west façade for the OFC. David replied, no.

Question from attendee: Has the current proposed design for the loading dock area been approved by SHPO. Dave replied, no.

It was mentioned that because the loading dock area does not have historical significance, SHPO approval will not be necessary. Dave replied he has not spoken with SHPO previously about the loading dock area.

Judge Moran commented the issue of parking (loading dock area); if that is the purpose, Sam Mousa has ideas for parking to satisfy the SAO. With that being said, the concern should be aesthetics of the building. Respectfully, the parking lot does not add to the building.

Chairman Rinaman said the issue is not parking but rather is there a need for a larger façade and entrance. Also, how much time will it take and what will the cost be for a new design; we do not know the answer. We do not know the answer to allocation of space yet; perhaps we, the Committee should attend those meetings.

Chairman Rinaman suggested that we vote on the new design for the elevated bridge. With respect to the west façade, Chairman Rinaman asked for the original design concept to be presented to the Committee and coordinate with SHPO relative to their approval of the original design concept, if SHPO will need to approve.

Dave said this process would add time to the project; we need to be in design at this point.

Chairman Rinaman asked the committee to vote on the new design for the elevated bridge. No further discussion. Unanimously approved.

Chairman Rinaman asked the committee to entertain a motion to adopt the plan that has been presented for the west façade of the OFC or entertain a motion to defer until we have design, pricing, SHPO information and user group information. Dave commented it will take longer than two weeks for that process; it will probably take several months; SHPO has not ever seen the design competition concepts. Chairman Rinaman felt we should be able to get this information within a couple of weeks.

Ron Salem expressed great concern for possible construction delay of this project while gathering design competition renderings and researching design/construction costs, SHPO approval, etc. Ron asked Dave to clarify the timeframe to gather requested information. Dave responded the longest lead time would be SHPO approval, should SHPO approval be required.

Chairman Rinaman asked that CARC convene at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, August 26th.

Further discussion relative to the design on the west façade of the OFC, 2002 design competition renderings which include the façade (renderings owned by COJ), and whether or not approval by SHPO is required.

Ron Salem thought it would be appropriate to have a motion that if SHPO says that they will need to approve the façade design then CARC would agree to approve the present design. Motion seconded. Judge Moran asked how long SHPO would take to look at a design should there be one available.

Further discussion regarding SHPO approval; Dave Schneider stated SHPO has not approved any OFC west façade design. Dave explained he is somewhat caught in no mans land – go to SHPO first for approval or go to CARC first for approval. Dave believes he needs CARC approval prior to going to SHPO for approval. Chairman Rinaman stated it does not matter how many renderings there are; any rendering would need to be designed by the current design team for CARC and SHPO approval. Judge Moran asked if we could have Sam Mousa give us a better idea relative to time and cost; he believes his opinion would be valued by all.

Chairman Rinaman asked again that the Committee convene on Thursday, August 26th at 4:00 p.m. Pending motion and a second to find out if SHPO has to approve the façade on the west end of the building. If SHPO approval is required, the Committee will accept what Dave Schneider presented today. Vote: 3 Ayes; 1 No. Motion passes.

Clarification of Motion: Chairman Rinaman stated the motion was to find out if SHPO would need to review the façade. If yes, we will move forward with the design presented today. In the meantime, the Committee would like to see the renderings. Question is will SHPO need to approve design presented today and will SHPO need to approve design competition renderings. The main issue is will the public entrance be as presented today or a larger entrance located at the loading dock area?

Angela Corey invited all to visit the SAO office to look at the current entrance and witness low traffic volume.

Chairman Rinaman again stated, the issue before the Committee is whether or not the western façade is to be the main entrance for the public, the issue is not a question of parking. Ron Salem asked if SHPO would approve enlarging the doorway for current proposed public entrance. Dave agreed he would speak with SHPO. Ron Salem asked if Dave would have a response from SHPO prior to the user group meeting on Wednesday, August 18th. Dave responded probably not.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Rinaman thanked everyone for coming. Reminded all of the courthouse tour and asked Dave to distribute minutes.

Meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

cc: CARC Members

Posted on COJ Website