



## Richland County Council

### COURTHOUSE AD HOC COMMITTEE

June 21, 2017 – 2:00 PM

4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Seth Rose, Chair; Paul Livingston, and Dalhi Myers

OTHERS PRESENT: Kimberly Roberts

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Rose called the meeting to order at approximately 2:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

April 10, 2017 – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

- a. **Judicial Center Needs Assessment**

- b. **Objectives**

- c. **Consultant Introduction (MGA Partners)** – Mr. Seals introduced MGA Partners, the needs assessment firm, that will be conducting the needs assessment of the Judicial Center. They have been requested to look at a 70-year period of time.

Mr. Daniel Kelley and Ms. Amy Stein attended the meeting as representatives of MGA Partners. The firm is located in Philadelphia, PA. Mr. Kelley and Ms. Stein have been working on constructing new structures, renovations, expansions, and studies of courthouses for approximately 20 years.

MGA Partners presented several examples of courthouses they have worked on in the past.

- d. **Proposed process and schedule for the Needs Assessment** – Ms. Stein stated the needs of the judiciary and court change over time.

The first thing to be done is to have a team of architects to look at the building itself. The current courthouse is approximately 40 years old, which is a critical moment for any building. During this process there will also be meetings with stakeholders to obtain information regarding the short-term and long-term space needs.

The next stage will be design. The alternatives and conceptual budgets will be presented to the committee for review and feedback.

Once there is an idea of what final direction the County may want to go, one or two of those ideas will be further developed. The more precise picture will then be reviewed by the committee.

Lastly, the project will be presented to be vetted amongst Council and others for the purpose of funding.

The schedule is as followed:

- (1) Four months of study – Completed by October
- (2) Discover – Meet w/ stakeholders and assess the building in July
- (3) Design – Mid September/October
- (4) Deliver

Mr. Kelley stated they utilize the State and Federal standards for courthouses. There is a recent trend of having employees work in smaller square footage or open office plans.

e. Discussion of key challenges of the existing courthouse and the Committee's vision for change

Ms. Stein there was a mention of parking at the present courthouse in the RFP.

Mr. Rose stated he has been told there is a huge water tank in front of the courthouse and prevents an expansion toward the roadway. In addition:

- (1) The newer assistant solicitors, prosecutors, and assistant district attorneys park across the street due to not having seniority to get into the parking garage
- (2) The Solicitor has employees located on different floors
- (3) The detainee space is inhumane
- (4) Security Measures
- (5) Judge's Elevators not functioning correctly
- (6) Asbestos
- (7) Agency Housing (State Statute dictates who has to be housed in courthouse)
- (8) Putting existing building on tax roll?
- (9) Family Court location
- (10) Size of Courtrooms
- (11) Technology in Courtrooms

Mr. Kelley stated the existing courthouse is generous, but not a very handsome building.

Charleston and Florence Counties have courthouses that can be looked at as examples.

f. Discussion of key stakeholders involved and engagement

There is a potential list of stakeholders presently circulating.

6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:12 PM.