

## **PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES**

**October 8, 2003**

The Public Services Committee of the DeKalb County Board met on Wednesday, October 8, 2003 @ 6:30p.m. in the Legislative Center's Gathertorium. Chairman Marlene Allen called the meeting to order. Members present were Pat LaVigne, Eric Johnson, Steve Faivre, Julia Fullerton, Sue Leifheit, Richard Osborne and Robert Rosemier. Ms. Dubin was absent. Others present were Ray Bockman, Gary Hanson, Sheriff Roger Scott, Lt. Joyce Klein, Ronald Matekaitis, Robert Pritchard, Mark Goldman, Len Witke, Jeff Metzger, Roger Steimel, Patricia Vary, Denny Sands, Steve Slack, Jim MacMurdo, Julia Fauci, Frank Van Buer and quite a few neighbors who live by the Sycamore Campus.

#### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Mr. Osborne amended the minutes from September 8, 2003 on the last paragraph of the last page, line two, where the word should read ...carried to approve the request, not deny.

**Moved by Mr. Faivre, seconded by Mr. Johnson, and it was carried unanimously to approve the amended minutes.**

#### **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Moved by Mr. Rosemier, seconded by Ms. Leifheit, and it was carried unanimously to approve the agenda.

Chairman Allen told the committee that the monthly reports for Court Services Department and the Public Defender's Department were included in their packets, however, they will not be heard tonight because of the jail project. If they should have any questions regarding these reports to please call Ms. Margi Gilmour, Director of Court Services or Ken Johnson, Public Defender.

#### **SUPERVISOR OF ASSESSMENTS REQUEST**

Ms. Margaret Whitwell, Supervisor of Assessments, said that this is a resolution to extend the board of review from November 7, 2003, which is a date they are supposed to close by statute. This is an annual request that they make because they take care of every document that comes into the county through December 31<sup>st</sup>. Therefore, they can't adjourn on November 7, 2003.

**Moved by Mr. Faivre, seconded by Mr. Rosemier, and it was carried unanimously to recommend the resolution to the full board for approval.**

---

Chairman Allen then introduced Chairman of the Board, Robert Pritchard, to begin the discussion on the Jail Project. Chairman Pritchard welcomed everyone to the meeting. He said that they had asked county board members to submit any questions that they may have regarding this project whether they are their own or from people in the community. We have compiled about thirty questions that will be answered by the panel of experts here tonight. The Ad Hoc Jail Committee was a committee formed by the County Board to invest the time over a period of months to explore options, gather the facts, to listen to community concerns as well as those of experts and bring a recommendation forward to the full board in July. That then was brought forward to the full board in August and brought for action in September. The panel that we have before you this evening are Ronald Matekaitis, State's Attorney, Mr. Len Witke and Mr. Mark Goldman, the Consultants involved in this project, Mr. Ray Bockman, County Administrator, Sheriff Roger Scott, Lt. Joyce Klein and Mr. Gary Hanson, Deputy County Administrator as well as the Financial Officer of the County. We have organized these questions into three general categories. One with the Sycamore Campus, one dealing with the Alternatives and one dealing with general questions. We will discuss the questions under each category and then open it up to discussion under each section.

### **Questions Pertaining to the DeKalb County Jail Project:**

#### **Questions about the Sycamore Campus**

1. What would become of the Courthouse Campus if the jail and all related judicial offices were moved to another location?

*Ray Bockman: The Sycamore Campus is home to 216 of DeKalb County's employees. They are divided into three distinct working groups. The largest group is the Administration of Justice/Public Safety Group that contains about 3/4ths of the total Sycamore employees. This has remained constant for many years. Each of the three groups is interdependent but non more so than the Public Safety Group (see sheet attached to these minutes). In the most recent 20 years the two non Judicial Groups have grown by a total of 15 employees. Nine of those additional employees work in the Information Management Department that did not exist in 1984. If we were to remove everything judicial except the 911-call center, we would be moving 135 employees off of this campus to somewhere else. The question is what would happen to this campus? Who would be attracted to this campus and how long would it take to absorb the space that we left here? If we look at the growth rate in these non - judicial offices, have only added 15 people in the last twenty years. At that rate, if you take 135 people out of this space and watch them grow into the space vacated, it would take about 111 years. No one would build a building with that type of capacity nor would it be reasonable to expect these buildings to be maintained. There is a carrying cost.*

---

*Who would be attracted to these buildings? Someone suggested that we could rent space to lawyers. They wouldn't be attracted to space if the courts weren't here. People can get very creative when a public building is vacated.*

2. What would the cost be to move all of these facilities elsewhere?

*Gary Hanson: A very conservative answer would be \$35 million and would be very easy to reach \$40/\$45 million to move our campus to another site. What gets difficult with those kind of numbers is paying off a debt and you need to issue bonds to do that. The proposal that we come up with is ½ cent sales tax we would actually have to increase that figure to 1 ¼ cent to pay for it. Or you would need a property tax increase of \$350.00 for a \$200,000 home.*

3. Can the County Seat be moved?

*Ron Matekaitis: Yes, it can be moved to a different community with a referendum by county voters. The boundaries of the existing county seat, which is Sycamore, can be adjusted by resolution of the board up to one mile from the boundary limits of the existing county seat provided that expansion is into unincorporated territory. So if you were to draw a mile around Sycamore any area that lies within that mile that isn't in another municipality could be included in an expanded county seat boundary area.*

4. Must the County do its business in Sycamore?

*Ron Matekaitis: By statute, the only two functions that are indicated as being required to be performed in the county seat are the county law library and the other is the Sheriff's Office must be in the county seat.*

5. Are there any concessions we can make with the residents that would allow us to expand here?

*Len Witke: The team could reconfigure expansion of Jail to provide a larger buffer to the Library and residences. What the building does on the site and how it relates to its surroundings is important to everyone. The building can be moved away from the library. It can take a different shape and a different approach of how it sits on the site.*

6. Is expansion here really the cheapest alternative? Are there ways to even out the cost of expanding elsewhere and are they practical?

*Ray Bockman: He displayed a Round-Trip analysis that was conducted a few years ago that is germane to the current discussion because it addresses separating work groups. The largest group of employees, the Administration of Justice work group (State's Attorney's, Public Defender, Circuit Clerk, etc.) is an Interdependent work group. They did a series of trips from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Administration Building and the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the courthouse and it was done several times. The same person made the trip from there to the Farm Bureau*

*building over two and half miles and back. These trips were done in ideal conditions. At that time the cost per minute is just over .42 cents. The mileage reimbursement rate was .345 cents per mile. If you look at the difference in each of those trips the increment is about \$8.30. If you move 50 people 2.5 miles away, 5 miles round trip the first year cost and only go to one meeting a day the cost would be \$107,000.00 (see sheet attached). The point that we are trying to get at is if you don't look at lost opportunity cost, incremental cost of the trip, you are not analyzing the project. There's more the cost of a project than land costs.*

7. If we are going to expand "off-site" should we be looking at a "judicial complex" since we are running out of space in the courthouse too?

*Ray Bockman: This campus has been one for over 100 years, since 1900. In 1900 the county occupied 3.25 acres of land and 88,000 square feet of occupied building area plus the Sheriff's residence. In the year 2003 we occupy 6.13 acres of land and 123,450 square feet of occupied building area. We have been pursuing a policy of acquiring property in the two-block area east of Locust St., West of Walnut St., between Sycamore Street and Route 64 to provide for future expansion. These acquisitions will eventually add approximately 4.7 acres. To date the acquisitions are about 40 % complete.*

*That square footage is divided amongst the work groups as follows: 98,000 sq.ft. for the Administration of Justice Group; 11,450 sq.ft. for the Property Group; and 14,000 sq.ft. for the Administrative/Support Group. The Administration of Justice Group accounts for 74% of employment on the Sycamore Campus and also occupies 79% of the building space. If a "judicial complex" was created elsewhere there would be very little left here.*

8. How much would it cost to acquire enough space to build a big facility?

*Ray Bockman: Our land acquisition costs in the campus are very expensive. We've been paying between \$10/\$15.00 a square foot including demolition costs. There are two alternative locations that we could look at. One would be alternative site that had utilities. This site runs about \$2.00 - \$4.50 a sq. ft. that's fully improved. You could also look at a rural site that would run about \$4,000 an acre (see sheet attached).. One of the problems is that there is an assumption that there's a site somewhere that you could put a jail where no one would object. There aren't many spaces that would work well.*

9. Was the 100-year line negotiated with residents? Will the jail fall within that line? When will we hit that line (guesstimate)?

*Ray Bockman: All that has been negotiated are the land acquisitions themselves. This is through a program started twenty years ago. He contacts whoever has offered the property, find out what the asking price is, check the assessed value, go the executive committee and see if they will authorize the acquisition and if the do he gets a number and negotiates the acquisition. The 100-year line includes the entire two-block area east of the existing campus. If we divide it in half, we would use the first half for the first fifty years and the second half for the last fifty years. The line is set based on historical trends in our land use. We have not invested in any parking yet. If you look at placement of the courthouse, which*

*occupies an entire city block of real estate, you can see that the square footage of the of the building could easily be doubled or tripled without any land acquisition.*

10. How good is the data that projects such an increase in inmates and how would the alternative programs that have been proposed impact the data?

*Mark Goldman: The historical data is good data – it came from the DeKalb County Jail and Sheriff's Office, the Circuit Clerk's Office, Illinois Department of Commerce & Community Affairs, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ILCJIA), the Census, and Woods & Poole Economics.*

*No one can accurately predict the exact numbers of offenders who will be housed in the DeKalb County Jail in the future. There are too many variables that impact bed needs, which cannot be controlled. These variables include:*

- o changes in the numbers and characteristics of people who move into DeKalb County;*
- o economic conditions, and unemployment;*
- o changes in laws impacting pre-trial incarceration, misdemeanors and felonies, sentences to jail, and length of sentences;*
- o availability of, capacity of, and success of various alternatives to incarceration;*
- o availability of, capacity of, and success of prevention programs in DeKalb County – especially programs that address alcoholism, drug addiction, anger management, and other mental health issues;*
- o court processing time – from initial hearings to final disposition, which is impacted by the numbers of courts/judges, state's attorneys, public defenders;*
- o backlog (if any) in State prisons (those sentenced to DOC could have to wait longer in the DeKalb County Jail before being transferred to a State facility)*

*A major objective of alternative programs is to foster personal change so that individuals are less likely to continue to commit crimes. If crime rates are reduced, then arrest rates should also come down. Consequently, the numbers of jail bookings and court filings compared with the general population should also be reduced. In summary, alternatives should have a positive impact on future data.*

11. Could the Resolution be reworded to reflect the larger number of beds that the Sheriff has indicated he will preserve in the existing jail? Won't this addition to the supply of beds greatly retard the need for Phase II?

*Ray Bockman: Yes, it has been reworded. It focuses on the projected bed need for the year 2025. It limits Phase I to 75 beds and preserves as many of the existing beds as reasonable.*

Chairman Pritchard not opened up the meeting to questions on the first section of questions.

Some of the concerns voiced by fellow board members and the public were:

---

Mr. Steve Faivre, DeKalb County Board Member, asked, what's been the feedback from some of the other counties that have moved their campuses? Sheriff Scott spoke to Kane County and Champaign County regarding this issue. Kane County said that their initial plan was to keep the campus together, but they couldn't because of a major gas line problem. Because of the splitting the campus they have experienced significant manpower and transport costs issues. They incorporated holding cells created in the courthouse where inmates wait until their case is called. These are maintained by one or two officers and issue is further complicated when there are multiple inmates with hearings at the same time. They feel that the Sheriff's Department and the Judicial System should keep the complex together at all costs.

Champaign County had the same problems as Kane County. They have a satellite jail that is located 1.5 miles away from new courthouse complex. They also occupy an old jail across the street from the new courthouse. They provide transportation to the new courthouse twice a day, they have video arraignment and video bond call. They have to maintain a holding cell on each floor of the courthouse and this requires manpower and equipment. The citizens wanted them to stay in the downtown area and therefore expanded the courthouse complex on the existing site. They made that commitment to the citizens of Urbana to stay downtown per their request. They strongly advised keeping the court and jail operations as close together as possible.

Steve Kuhn asked, what would the jail look like in 2050? How big will it be? He feels that we need to reassess the 100-year plan. Mr. Goldman said that there is plenty of land for at least 100 years for expansion. Mr. Bockman said that the jail is a response to population. He doesn't feel that this will grow like Kane County in the next 50 years. Mr. Witke said that the jail will expand north and around the existing structures.

Another person asked, how tall will the building be? Mr. Witke said that some sections will be one-story higher and some will be lower.

Another question was, 160 people that work in public safety and administration of justice. How many of those are directly related to the jail and civil activities? Judge Klein said that there are 3 judges for criminal, traffic, misdemeanor, felony and 1 judge for civil. We all work with each other, said Judge Klein

Another question was, with regards to the acquisition of land, if we've acquired 40% of the 4.7 acres for the Sycamore Campus that works out to \$12.50 sq.ft. to \$1.5 million more. If we were to acquire 7 acres at \$4.50 sq.ft. we would pay \$1.3 million to acquire. Is the acquisition of land really the issue should play in this decision? Mr. Bockman said that one should look at the human cost vs. building costs.

Mr. Jerry Bliujus asked how many employees would have to move with the jail? Mr. Bockman said that he didn't really know. He's heard people say that we would not want to move the telecommunicators and there are 25 of them. There are other pieces that we certainly wouldn't want to move. It would be our recommendation

---

that everyone stay here. Mr. Bliujus said that's obvious, but if you move a jail to a remote location, how many people would you need to move? Mr. Bockman said that the analysis that he did involved 50 people. Sheriff Scott said that the State's Attorney and Public Defender have to make that contact with inmates and the Sheriff's Department. In a courtroom you have many people involved with the one defendant.

If we have to split the location of the jail and courthouse we would need to replicate security positions at 2 different jails. We need to have two security systems to do that @ \$55,000.00 a person, for three to four people, that's a lot of money, said Mr. Bockman.

Ms. Vary, DeKalb County Board Member, how much it would it cost to move everyone to another location? Mr. Hanson said \$35 million. We would then have to deal with what to do with 120,000 sq. ft. here. What else would happen is that the ½ cent in sales tax would be increase to .1 ¼ cents to be used for public safety purposes only. We couldn't use that money for administrative group, Mr. Hanson explained.

Mr. Matt Woodstrup thanked the county board and staff for holding the meeting for everyone this evening. He asked if the Ad Hoc Jail Study Committee had gotten all of the paperwork that was given out this evening? Mr. Bockman said no, that the county board was given the information two to three years ago. He also asked to have the public safety building named the jail so that people know where the jail is.

Mr. Dennis Sands, DeKalb County Board Member, asked if the community could be involved in the steps in Phase I? Mr. Witke said absolutely. What they, as consultants for the project, have done before and will do here for DeKalb County, will place this all on the County's website as a link. This will include all the design information, issues, public announcements and each major step that is taken and will be taken, to hear from the public also. Would encourage the public to view the link. Chairman Pritchard stressed that all the meetings that the county board holds and standing committees hold can be attended by the public.

Ms. Noel Smith, asked who appointed the Ad Hoc Committee Members? Why was no one representing the neighborhood? Chairman Pritchard said that he nominated the people and the county board confirmed those appointments. It included 17 people on this committee. What is typical of in selecting members of an ad hoc committee, we look for people with expertise that come to bear on the decisions, like the Sheriff, State's Attorney office, Public Defender, Central Plant Division and Sue Leifheit who is a county board member from Sycamore. He asked the Mayors of DeKalb and Sycamore to recommend citizens of their cities to sit on the committee. They each choose to appoint their police chiefs, he said. We had a sampling of people with lots of interest. We also have people from outside DeKalb and Sycamore who he wanted to have some voice of areas outside the two largest municipalities in this community. There was no one from 500 feet of the jail, but there were people in the community that were on that community. These were open meetings, and he felt that the public that could be represented at the public meeting discussions.

---

Ms. Smith asked, how much money did we pay the consultants to give the county their recommendation and is that money included in the grand total? Mr. Hanson said that the move is \$35 - \$40,000.00 and no it is not included in the grant total.

What about the costs that are incurred by the City of Sycamore by losing all of the tax dollars because the county is buying all of these homes? Mr. Bockman said that there is a substantial tax loss when private property is taken over by a public body. It would be the same no matter which land we took over. If we moved this to a county owned property we wouldn't be losing any tax dollars, Ms. Smith said. Mr. Bockman said that is correct, the fact that we own property takes it off of the tax rolls. What we would be losing is the opportunity for that land to develop or be sold by the county. That land has an asset value to the county whether there's anything on it or not, said Mr. Bockman. We just finished a ten-year project that converted 130 acres of farmland into an asset that produces over \$1 million a year in tax revenue.

Ms. Smith asked another question said that the footprint of the new facility will take up parking spaces around here. Where are you going to put parking around here with the new facility, where are people going to park? Mr. Hanson said that we own a lot of land around the campus and if the project goes ahead the first thing that we would do is build additional parking spaces.

Ms. Smith asked if the consultants gave your recommendation to keep it here or move it answer to the ad hoc committee members or just give them information? Mr. Witke said no, we looked at the advantages and disadvantages of both sites. It's not strictly a bottom line decision of what's looks good for constructing a building initially. He has built many, many facilities. The first time costs that he deals with all the time. It's the operational costs that are far in excess of what we spend to build a structure. We try to build it economically, that it functions well, staffed efficiently and operates at a low cost to the owner. Like Mr. Bockman said, about 5 to 7% capita costs initially compared to 90% to 93% of the cost of operating that building for 50 or 100 years is pretty much operating costs, staffing and daily operation of the jail.

#### **Questions Pertaining to Alternatives to Incarceration**

1. Will investing even more in alternatives (e.g. Drug Court) decrease the need for Phase I at this time or delay by several years Phase II?

*Mark Goldman: A Drug Court was explored with justice system leaders and the Ad Hoc Jail Subcommittee. Although Drug Courts can be effective and reduce bed needs (e.g., in Kane County), there was concern about having too many programs that drew from the same population. Many of the same categories of offenders who might go to Drug Court would also be candidates for the Mental Health & Substance Abuse Jail Diversion Program. As DeKalb County's general population grows, at some point there may be enough people in the justice system to warrant both the Mental Health & Substance Abuse Jail Diversion Program and a Drug Court.*

---



*Another concern about a Drug Court in DeKalb County is that Drug Court judges see Drug Court participants frequently – often, once a week at first, with this frequency gradually declining. Several judges stated that a Drug Court would require another judge in DeKalb County, and since judges are state funded in Illinois and the state is in a fiscal crisis, it is believed that DeKalb will not get another judge during the near future.*

*Furthermore, alternatives are not suitable for everyone. No matter how many excellent alternatives are in place, there are and will always be some people who need to be incarcerated. For example violent offenders, those who have mandatory pre-trial time or jail sentences, chronic offenders, those with holds from other jurisdictions, felons sentenced to the State who are waiting to be transferred, and many of those who fail programs need to be incarcerated.*

2. Is the Judiciary willing to implement the proposed alternatives if they are approved by the referendum?

*Ron Matekaitis: His first and foremost concern is public safety and from that stand point he would not look to release anyone that himself or someone in his office feels is a threat to the public safety. Certainly not to merely reduce the length of the sentence to say six months in the county jail to let them out thirty days early without no additional supervision. That is not what's being proposed by the alternatives. The alternatives would start those types of programs while that person is still incarcerated and as an incentive to a release earlier than the original sentence would otherwise have provided. It would allow them to get out earlier provided they stay in contact with an intensive type of probation and the court system. He could support that alternative as it would maintain contact with that person and provide a greater likelihood that that person would not be a threat with that types of programs. There will be some selection process with this program. There will be some people who are not candidates for this alternative program. It would provide some additional measure for the safety of the public, he feels.*

*Judge Klein said that he doesn't know of any judge who would say they don't want alternatives. Every judge wants as many alternatives that he can work with to deal with the problems that are in front of him or her. Many of the alternatives that he has reviewed in the proposal are being tried in other jurisdictions and have had success. However, we are a different community than some of those jurisdictions. If it makes sense to devote the time, manpower, energy and money to the problems that we have in this community, of course, we should consider every alternative. For a judge, it is his or her last resort to send someone to prison. The system has failed this person and the community has failed with them.*

3. How often does weekend bond call happen?

*Judge Klein: Weekend bond call happens most weekends, perhaps three or four weekends that they don't.*

4. How much detail do we need in the planning stages to assure that the alternative measures are implemented?

*Mark Goldman: A tremendous amount of planning is needed for each alternative. Each operational plan should include the following: target population, activities, programs, schedules, personnel, costs, fees, job descriptions, policies and procedures, what happens when violations to various rules occur, and security measures.*

*New programs should be implemented gradually, each with relatively few participants at first. Testing and fine-tuning should precede full implementation.*

5. With regard to the Court Date Reminder System – who will do the calling? Sheriff? Clerk? States Attorney? Will an updated phone number be part of the bonding system? Can current staff do the calling and save money?

*Mark Goldman: The current plan is for part-time staff hired by the Circuit Clerk will do the calling. These part-timers may be high school or college students or others who want to work late afternoons and early evenings.*

*Yes, the Court Date Reminder System will need phone numbers and addresses. It is recognized that some offenders do not have phones, so the program will have to have some flexibility.*

*Reportedly, current staff could not handle the magnitude of additional work that will be required.*

6. With regard to Electronic Home Monitoring – the price of \$55,000 (same as three other alternatives) is suspect. What does this include? Can this be included in the current electronic monitoring program? Why isn't this done already?

*Mark Goldman: The \$55,000/year consists of \$45,000/year for salary and benefits and \$10,000/year for a vehicle for one Sheriff's Officer. The staff for the current EHM program cannot increase their caseload without negatively impacting their work and effectiveness. The additional staff will have a caseload of about 36 at a time.*

7. With regard to graduated sentences – what is this? Will this be coordinated with the judges? Will additional Staff be needed?

*Mark Goldman: Instead of jail sentences followed by release to the community with little to no supervision or treatment, some offenders would be sentenced to jail for shorter periods of time followed by intensive probation supervision, case management, and participation in (non-custody) treatment programs.*

*In 2002, the ALOS for sentenced inmates was 41 days (Sheriff's Office Annual Report). The target population for Graduated Sentences would be those with relatively long jail sentences. On average, time sentenced to jail would be reduced by 60 days. The average length of time on the Graduated Sentences program once released from jail would be 12 months. There would be several phases of the program, with the first 4 months being the most intensive.*

---

*One Intensive Probation Officer / Case Manager employed by Court Services would work with about 25 offenders/year for 12 months in the community following short periods of incarceration.*

Chairman Pritchard asked to go back to the question #6, can this new alternative be included in the current electronic monitoring program and if so why isn't it being done already?

*Mr. Goldman: Basically because of caseload. If we want to have effective programs we need to have small caseloads otherwise there is very little supervision. Mr. Bockman said that this cost summary to cover all of these programs is around \$620,000 that's an ultimate cost. That's after these programs are fully functioning and populated. The first year's cost would be small.*

8. With regard to the pretrial release program – Why isn't this being done already? Does this just need to be formalized? Can this be absorbed by an existing program? Who would handle the paperwork? What will the \$55,000 pay for?

*Mark Goldman: Pre-Trial release is currently being handled informally by the Public Defender, and it does not have any staff whose primary job is this program. By formalizing the program and assigning one Court Services staff to work as a full time Pre-Trial Release Officer, more people can be screened, released, and supervised. This program would screen pre-sentenced inmates within one to two days after booking for eligibility for release under PTR supervision and, in many cases, EHM monitoring.*

9. With regard to weekend bond call has this been coordinated with the judiciary? The jail study has the cost as a question mark what is it?

*Mark Goldman: Weekend bond call has been discussed with the judiciary. Some of them would prefer not to formalize it. If judges and others can rotate and get time off for the one or two hours that they spend conducting bond call on Saturdays, then there would be no costs associated with this program. The jail study's excel spreadsheet had a dash, not a question mark.*

10. With regard to expanded work release what will the \$55,000 pay for? Is the current work release program at full capacity? Could this be combined with the Home Monitoring Program to save some money? At a cost of \$55,000 why aren't any beds saved?

*Mark Goldman: The \$55,000 will pay for one Sheriff's staff to serve as Work Release manager. Mr. Goldman explained that the \$55,000.00 includes salary, benefits and vehicle expenses.*

*This position's responsibilities will include screening WR candidates, assisting with employment, providing supervision, monitoring activities and schedules, and completing reports. No, it cannot be combined with EHM without overly compromising responsibilities, supervision, security, and treatment.*

---

*Beds are not saved because Work Releases sleep in the jail. Rather than reducing the total number of beds, expanding Work Release would result in a different mix of beds, with a greater portion of low security, dormitory style beds. WR beds are much less costly than other jail beds because dormitories may be used, along with fewer security measures. Finally, expanding Work Release would reduce operational costs (as Work Releasees pay a per diem), compared with sentenced offenders who serve their time in jail.*

11. Could the expanded explanation of the alternatives submitted by our consultants be copied in time for everyone to review at the next Public Services meeting?

*Mark Goldman: Yes, it has been.*

Chairman Pritchard opened up the questions to the audience now.

Mr. Rosemier asked if it's possible for one inmate to participate in more than one program and are we double counting beds that might be save?

*Mr. Goldman said that with a smaller county there's some concern about having too many programs and having the same criteria for each of the programs. Some of them can overlap. Some of people on pre-trial release should be on Electronic Home Monitoring. Some programs work better for some people than others. A lot of what this is about is trial and error and that there may be some adjustments made as time goes on. It takes time.*

Judge Klein said that some of the programs are a good idea. Some of the suggested alternatives can be expensive. The drug courts can be expensive. Kane County started one and it lengthened the court calls, assigned probation officers to the drug court too. He doesn't know what the costs were, but that it was very expensive. He feels that someone needs to find out what the costs are for this program. The purpose of the program is to help the person out and get them back on track so that we don't have to send them back to prison.

Mr. Steve Slack, DeKalb County Board Member, informed the committee about drug courts. He said that in 1994 there were 6 drug courts in the United States, ten years later there are over 1,000 drug courts throughout the country. This is because it works and we have the statistics to indicate that it does work. In the county east of here the drug court operates on a staff of four. When it was implemented the county board authorized \$250,000.00 for that. The point is that the alternatives, particularly the drug court, it's not the duty of the judiciary or the consultants to tell us when the drug court makes sense. It is the obligation of our community when we want to seriously do something about substance abuse. About 50% of the people in our jail have a substance abuse problem. Kane County will graduate 70 people from the drug court process. That's two years, drug-free, he said. Drug court has reduced recidivism to 10%. It will save 63 people from coming back into the judicial system. To save beds is not the 1<sup>st</sup> goal of drug court, but if we didn't have 63 people to incarcerate this year, we wouldn't be here. He wants us to look seriously at drug court and explore it more.

---

Mr. Dennis Sands, County Board Member, said that as county board members we have a unique opportunity right now to do something that is significant. Not only to build a jail, but to look at alternatives to keep people out of jail. This is an opportunity that we will not get for a long time and we need to seriously look at the alternatives and pick and choose the ones that are right for us. We have an excellent Mental Health Department in DeKalb County and we need to help them with funds they are worth every penny. He would like to have this board come out of this with a 23 to 1 vote with us all united on this. If we are not united behind this the public will not get behind it.

Ms. Leifheit said that what Mr. Slack is suggesting that if we accept this resolution that we will never investigate a drug court. As far as she understands it, we are open to all alternatives and if a drug court is a good idea, that's included as an alternative and no reason to stop this resolution. Obviously we are not going to "spit" on a good idea. To stop the resolution because a drug court has not been fully explored, does not hold its merit.

Mr. Slack asked that in this resolution we will be appropriating a certain amount of money towards these alternatives, right? Chairman Pritchard said yes. Mr. Bockman said that one of the questions that will be upcoming this evening deals with timelines of the project (see sheet attached). He then explained the timeline to the committee.

Mr. Steve Kuhn, said that he agrees with Mr. Bockman about the alternative sentencing plans. It is a very soft area in this report, where you could save 135 beds. Mr. Bockman said thank you, a lot of them are good faith estimates. We don't know the future. There will not be a point in time what the future is. We would need to know what the population of this community will grow to, whom the criminal judge will be. That one position changing could have a dramatic effect on a jail, either fill it up or slow down it's filling up.

Another person asked if it's possible to do the alternatives without the expansion of the jail or move? Mr. Goldman said that it doesn't have enough effect in reducing bed needs. There are certain offenders that pose a risk to the community who need to be incarcerated and those numbers have gone up in time. Mr. Bockman said that the people in the jail need to be in the jail today. Those people are not eligible for these programs today. If we had implemented these alternatives ten years ago the assumption is that a percentage of the people in the jail who would have availed themselves to those programs would not be in the jail today. Conversely, what the numbers suggest is that ten years after we implement the first alternatives, there will be fewer people in the jail than there would have been. That number of absolute people in the jail will continue to grow but not as large as it would without the alternatives.

Mr. Goldman said that the alternatives are based on data from many other counties. It is really a trial and error thing that we need to develop the programs, tweak them, test them, see what's working, and replace them with other better programs that come along.

---

Ms. Noel Smith asked who is in our jail?

Lt. Joyce Klein said that there are murderers, several for robberies. The difference between a jail and a prison is that we hold people who are waiting to go to trial.

Ms. Smith then asked, what is the greatest amount of time that these people could sit in prison before they are sent to prison? Lt. Klein said that we will see inmates sit in jail for six to nine months. Murderers sit in jail longer.

Mr. Jerry Bliujus then asked how effective are the home monitoring systems to keep people from repeating their crimes? He further said like automatic dialing system. Mr. Matekaitis said that people that are on home monitoring are otherwise candidates to be sent to jail to begin with. In terms of what it means to people on EHM, to provide an incentive for them not to come back, it's a restriction on freedom and there's a cost associated with it. The courts do order the people to pay a portion of the cost of a person placed on EHM.

Ms. Pat Vary, County Board Member, said that with regards to the alternatives, we need to keep going on it. She sees the alternatives as major things we have as a selling point for getting this referendum. We will be prolonging the life of the jail without utilizing Phase II. She has gone on the tour of the jail like other county board members, and the condition of the jail is appalling for both inmates and sheriff's deputies. They need a new facility right now not in 2006.

Chairman Pritchard said that the county has had a long record of looking at alternatives and implementing them. We have had three separate studies that have suggested anywhere from six to eight alternatives that he believes have all been implemented.

Ms. Julia Fauci, County Board Member, said that there was a third alternative that was to do nothing. What would happen if we did nothing? Mr. Goldman said that the county could contract with other counties. That would be more costly, not only per diem, but also it would take a significant addition of Sheriff's officers to transport the prisoners back and forth. There is no guarantee that nearby counties have beds available. Everyone's numbers are rising so there is no guarantee. Also people who pose a threat to others could be released and that could be a problem for the community.

Mr. Steve Slack, County Board Member, asked how much money is being appropriated to this resolution for alternatives? Drug Court is supported by President Bush and the Attorney General Ashcroft, and therefore, there are several funds allocated for these courts. His concern would be that we would appropriate a specific amount for all of the alternatives now, when later we may say we could have used and "x" amount of money .....to produce a tremendously more successful drug court program.

Mr. Dennis Sands, County Board Member, asked the press to let people know that we are looking at alternatives to make the county better and safer.

---

**Other Questions**

1. Do mandatory sentencing requirements (for drug arrests for example) contribute to the increased need for jail beds?

*Ron Matekaitis: Yes, it does.*

2. What is the economic impact to Sycamore if we move the judicial complex out?

*Ray Bockman: We asked an economist that question and they said that the economic impact would be direct annual compensation to Sycamore residents of \$1.6 million, \$3.3 in increased sales and services in Sycamore and a \$1.4 million annual addition to the gross city product of Sycamore. That's the entire impact.*

3. What process will be followed with regard to the jail project? Will the board have to approve intervening steps between this resolution and the referendum?

*Ray Bockman: It's the timeline that we previously discussed.*

4. Will the cost of construction and the cost of implementing the alternatives become clearer as more details emerge?

*Len Witke: Yes, we used national standards (see summary sheet). They used net space like wall dimensions, planning phases, etc. They allocated for cost per square foot and established a reasonable cost per square foot that type of space. The bottom line will not change, we will make changes to design, but not the bottom line.*

5. Are jail visitors primarily family members?

Chairman Pritchard asked if the jail visitors are primarily family members? Lt. Klein said that 70% are family members and significant other, the rest would be friends as a best guess.

6. Has jail crowding lead to behavioral problems by the inmates?

*Lt. Klein said yes, obviously when space is limited and the inmates become more irritable and intense. They do experience discipline problems at the time of overcrowding.*

Mr. Pete Paulsen, asked if the board would consider a third option proposal. He proposes the building of one criminal justice center, which includes the Sheriff's Department, Courtrooms, and Jail, under one roof. Transportation of inmates to a courtroom would be eliminated between buildings and the street. This would result in an operational savings of \$15,000.00. Expansion of the existing jail limits future expansion opportunities. The new construction option allows for easier, more economical expansion of all related facilities including courtrooms, jail beds

---

and state's attorney's office space. This allows for the use of existing offices in the Legislative Center to be used for the additional staff required for the alternatives spoken about this evening. This third option also reduces the number of staff needed by eliminating the need for officers to transport the inmates to a level at or below the expansion option. By reducing the number of staffing by two the county will save \$116,000.00. The existing courthouse will be used for civil court cases. The old jail would house the 911 center. The sheriff's offices could be used for other offices and jail floor could be used for storage space. The offices in the Legislative Center and that would be vacated by the State's Attorney's Office, would be available for other staff needs for alternative programs.

Mr. Bockman, County Administrator, said that the operational costs is seriously flawed in terms of operational costs. In terms of splitting up work groups, the cost of moving people back and forth and the inefficiencies that come with dividing the court system in two different pieces or more. The replication of the security system alone would cost more than those efficiencies that you spoke about. The loss in coverage in the judiciary. It also leaves half of the system behind.

Mr. Matekaitis, State's Attorney, said that they do more than just criminal work. They do juvenile, child support and forfeitures. The Civil Clerk's office has both a civil and criminal division and it would make it difficult for her to supervise her operation in two different locations. His attorneys and other attorneys move freely between civil and criminal court every day. The judicial do to. It's not uncommon for a volume court call for one judge to take a portion of the other judge's court call in their own court room in the same physical facility.

Mr. Faivre, County Board Member, asked Mr. Paulsen what his logic was to keep the civil here and not bring it with the new complex? Mr. Paulsen said so that the county would not have to build as big of a new facility. You would be able to add to the new facility much easier than here. Mr. Faivre said that he hoped that he realized that the costs, based on dual security and that, would probably be higher to split it than to combine it.

Judge Klein said that he was concerned about how people were talking this evening about the existing courthouse. He feels that the courthouse mean a lot to this community.

Mr. Rosemier said that he was very concerned about one of the alternatives and that was the mental health portion. In the most recent document it shows about 1/3 the cost that was originally proposed. He presumes that it is a general reduction across the board of the kinds of services and people they treat. On page 3-9 he sees the projected staffing costs to contract out to an outside agency and he can't imagine why we would have their costs added to ours. If it includes benefits, utilities, overhead, and rent, and it doesn't belong there, can we reduce the \$386,000 figure further? Mr. Goldman said that it's possible.

After a brief discussion, it was **Moved by Ms. Leifheit, seconded by Mr. Johnson to recommend this resolution to the full board for approval.**

---



Mr. Faivre asked to amend the resolution on page two to include an Item #C.) stating The County consider implementing a Drug Court Program.

**Moved by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Rosemier, to approve the amendment to the resolution by a roll call vote. The vote was unanimous.**

Moving back to the main motion, all members unanimously voted to forward the Amended resolution to the full county board for approval at their next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Moved by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Rosemier, and it was carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting.**

Respectfully submitted,

---

Robert W. Pritchard, Chairman

---

Mary C. Supple, Secretary

---

## **Jail Project Approvals/Timeline**

**10/15/03** County Board authorizes referendum for ½ % sales tax for public safety and defines total project scope.

**11/19/03** County Board provides notice of intent to issue alternate revenue bonds. Sets maximum for capital portion of project at \$16,000,000.00.

**11/03 – 3/04** Educational activities undertaken to inform voters of the need for the additional jail capacity and the alternative programs.

**3/16/04** Referendum approval of Public Safety Sales Tax.

**4/21/04** County Board and DeKalb County Public Building Commission enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement identifying the PBC as the General Contractor for the project and designating the County Board as the approval authority for the exterior appearance of the building including parking, lighting and landscaping. Public Building Commission transfers site to the County.

**4/01/04** County Board begins work on final design of alternative programs. (6-7months).

**4/30/04** Public Building Commission begins construction-drawing phase. (8-9 months).

**5/1/04** County Board resolves any remaining building exterior/site development issues.

**7/01/04** Revenue collection begins.

**9/01/04** Alternative Program design finalized. Where appropriate bids are solicited.

**10/01/04** First revenues from Public Safety Sales Tax arrive. Bids, if necessary are awarded and alternative programming begins.

**11/04 – 12/04** Construction documents are completed and are accepted by PBC. Bids are published.

**2/05** Bids are opened and awarded by Public Building Commission. Mobilization begins.

**3/05 – 6/06** Construction/renovation work proceeds.

**6/06 – 7/06** Substantial Completion/occupancy.

## SYCAMORE CAMPUS – EMPLOYMENT

### MOST RECENT 20 YEARS

The Sycamore Campus is home to 216 of DeKalb County’s 486 employees. They are divided into three distinct working groups. The largest group is the “Administration of Justice/Public Safety Group” that contains about 3/4ths of the total Sycamore employees. This has remained constant for many years. Each of the three groups is interdependent but none more so than the Public Safety Group.

<u>GROUP</u>	<u>EMPLOYMENT LEVELS</u>	
	<u>12/1984</u>	<u>FY 2003</u>
<u>1. Public Safety/Administration of Justice</u>  Sheriff, Circuit Clerk, Judiciary, States Attny., Public Defender, Coroner/ESDA, Court Svcs.	111 (73%)	160 (74%)
<u>2. Property Group</u>  Supervisor of Assmnts., Treasurer, County Clerk/Recorder	21 (14%)	25 (12%)
<u>3. Administration/Support Group</u>  County Board, Finance, Planning, IMO/GIS, Cent. Plant	20 (13%)	31 (14%)
Total	152	216

In the most recent 20 years the two non Judicial Groups have grown by a total of 15 employees. Nine of those additional employees work in the Information Management Department that did not exist in 1984.



COST ESTIMATES OF SEPARATING INTERDEPENDENT  
WORK GROUPS

Round trip time analysis: Interbuilding 9.8 min.  
Remote site (2.5 miles) 25.2 min.

Cost per min.: \$ .426

Transportation: \$.345/mile

Campus to remote location Trip cost:

Time:	25.2 min. X \$.426 =	\$10.73
Transportation	2.5 miles X2 X \$.345 =	<u>1.73</u>
	Total	\$12.46

Building to building cost.

Time:	9.8 min X \$.426	\$ 4.17
Transportation	-0-	<u>-0-</u>
		\$4.17

Difference: \$8.29 per trip

Using this cost analysis relocating 50 employees who are interdependent and average one trip per day (5 miles round trip) has a first year cost of \$107,770.00. This cost over the 50-year life cycle of a building inflated at 2.5% increases to \$10,505,838.00 over the life of the project.

## SYCAMORE CAMPUS – LAND/BUILDINGS

The Land area occupied by the buildings and parking areas in the Sycamore Campus has grown over time along with employment.

Land Area occupied in 1900	3.25 Acres
Building Area Occupied in 1900	88,000 Sq. Ft. (+Sheriff's res.)
Land Area Occupied 2003	6.13 Acres
Building Area Occupied in 2003	123,450 Sq. Ft.

The County has a policy of acquiring property in the two-block area east of Locust St., West of Walnut St. between Sycamore St. and Rt. 64. to provide space for future expansion. These acquisitions will eventually add approximately 4.7 Acres. To date the acquisitions are about 40% complete.

## BUILDING UTILIZATION BY WORK GROUP

<u>GROUP</u>	<u>SQUARE FT.</u>
1. Administration of Justice Group	98,000 Sq. Ft. (79.4%)
2. Property Group	11,450 Sq. Ft. (9.3%)
3. Admin/Support Group	14,000 Sq. Ft. (11.3%)
Total	<hr/> 123,450 Sq. Ft.

Not surprisingly the Administration of Justice Group that accounts for 74% of employment on the Sycamore Campus, also occupies 79% of the building space.

## ALTERNATIVE SITE/BUILDING COST ESTIMATES

Land Costs: Sycamore Campus \$10.00 - \$15.00 Sq. Ft.  
Alternate Location - with utilities \$2.00 - \$4.50 Sq. Ft.  
Rural location +/- \$4,000.00 acre

Land needed: Parking requirement = 4 to 5 spaces per 1,000 Sq. Ft.  
Buffers/landscaping adds 25%

Infrastructure costs: An urban section road with water, sanitary and storm sewer lines, sidewalks, seed, sod and engineering now costs approx \$500 per lineal foot or \$2.6 million/mile. A mile of road also requires an additional 9.7 acres of right-of-way.

Building costs: Average costs now approach \$200 Sq. Ft.

Replicating the Sycamore Campus, assuming one-story construction would require approximately 7 acres of land.

Under this analysis 7 acres of rural land would cost \$28,000.00 but if were ½ mile from utilities the total cost would be \$1,328,000.00 and require an additional 5 acres of right-of-way.

The land with utilities costing \$3.00 Sq. Ft. (\$130,680.00/Acre) would cost \$ 914,760 for the same 7 acres.

Projects, however must be evaluated not only in terms of capital costs but, more importantly, in terms of total costs.

DeKalb County Jail - New Site Option (132 Beds)  
Summary of Areas and Costs

Space	Net SF	Grossing Factor	Gross Area	Cost/SF	Cost
<b>PUBLIC ENTRANCE AREA</b>					
1.0 Entrance Lobby	1,170	1.42	1,661	\$145	\$240,903
2.0 Video Visiting	635	1.5	953	\$130	\$123,825
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>2,614</b>		<b>\$364,728</b>
<b>SHERIFF'S OFFICES</b>					
3.0 Sheriff's Administration	11,930	1.42	16,941	\$130	\$2,202,278
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>16,941</b>		<b>\$2,202,278</b>
<b>JAIL ADMINISTRATION</b>					
4.0 Offices and Support	1,880	1.42	2,670	\$130	\$347,048
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>2,670</b>		<b>\$347,048</b>
<b>RECEIVING/ADMISSIONS AREA</b>					
5.0 Sallyport	3,320	1.15	3,818	\$160	\$610,880
6.0 Booking	4,560	1.67	7,615	\$180	\$1,370,736
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>11,433</b>		<b>\$1,981,616</b>
<b>MEDICAL UNIT</b>					
7.0 Infirmary/Health Services	1,570	1.54	2,418	\$225	\$544,005
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>2,418</b>		<b>\$544,005</b>
<b>HOUSING - GENERAL POPULATION</b>					
8.0 Typical Maximum Security Housing Unit (2 units)	5,070	1.67	8,467	\$195	\$1,651,046
9.0 Typical Medium Security Housing Unit (1 at 16 units)	1,690	1.67	2,822	\$195	\$550,349
10.0 Typical Medium Security Housing Unit (2 at 8 units)	3,100	1.67	5,177	\$195	\$1,009,515
11.0 Typical Minimum Security Dormitory Housing Unit (3 units)	6,525	1.67	10,897	\$160	\$1,743,480
12.0 Trustee Housing Unit	1,425	1.67	2,380	\$160	\$380,760
13.0 Special Needs Housing Unit	1,590	1.67	2,655	\$195	\$517,784
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>32,398</b>		<b>\$5,852,933</b>
<b>SEGREGATION/HOUSING</b>					
14.0 Segregation Housing Unit	2,010	1.67	3,357	\$165	\$553,856
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>3,357</b>		<b>\$553,856</b>
<b>HOUSING - TYPICAL CORE/FACILITIES FOR GENERAL POPULATION FLOORS</b>					
15.0 Core Facilities	3,550	1.42	5,041	\$165	\$831,765
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>5,041</b>		<b>\$831,765</b>
<b>JAIL SUPPORT SERVICES</b>					
16.0 Food Service	3,071	1.67	5,129	\$200	\$1,025,714
17.0 Commissary	300	1.67	501	\$130	\$65,130
18.0 Laundry Room	650	1.67	1,086	\$200	\$217,100
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>6,715</b>		<b>\$1,307,944</b>

DeKalb County Jail - New Site Option (132 Beds)  
 Summary of Areas and Costs

Space	Net SF	Grossing Factor	Gross Area	Cost/SF	Cost
<b>911 DISPATCH AND EMERGENCY GOVERNMENT</b>					
19.0 911 and Dispatch	1,310	1.67	2,188	\$250	\$546,925
20.0 EEOE Room	1,200	1.67	2,004	\$130	\$260,520
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>4,192</b>		<b>\$807,445</b>
<b>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST FOR BUILDINGS</b>					<b>\$14,793,617</b>
<b>COST FOR SITE UTILITIES EXTENSIONS AND ROADWAY DEVELOPMENT - ALLOWANCE</b>					<b>\$650,383</b>
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COST</b>					<b>\$15,344,000</b>



DeKalb County Jail - Expansion Option (132 Beds)  
Summary of Areas and Costs

Space	Net SF	Grossing Factor	Gross Area	Cost/SF	Cost
<b>PUBLIC ENTRANCE AREA</b>					
1.0 Entrance Lobby	1,170	1.42	1,661	\$145	\$240,903
2.0 Video Visiting	635	1.5	953	\$130	\$123,825
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>2,614</b>		<b>\$364,728</b>
<b>JAIL ADMINISTRATION</b>					
3.0 Offices and Support	1,880	1.42	2,670	\$130	\$347,048
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>2,670</b>		<b>\$347,048</b>
<b>RECEIVING/ADMISSIONS AREA</b>					
4.0 Sallyport	3,320	1.15	3,818	\$160	\$610,880
5.0 Booking	4,560	1.67	7,615	\$180	\$1,370,736
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>11,433</b>		<b>\$1,981,616</b>
<b>MEDICAL UNIT</b>					
6.0 Infirmary/Health Services	1,570	1.54	2,418	\$225	\$544,005
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>2,418</b>		<b>\$544,005</b>
<b>HOUSING - GENERAL POPULATION</b>					
7.0 Typical Maximum Security Housing Unit	2,045	1.67	3,415	\$195	\$665,954
8.0 Typical Medium Security Housing Unit (2 units)	3,380	1.67	5,645	\$195	\$1,100,697
9.0 Typical Minimum Security Dormitory Housing Unit	2,175	1.67	3,632	\$160	\$581,160
10.0 Trustee Housing Unit	1,075	1.67	1,795	\$160	\$287,240
11.0 Special Needs Housing Unit	1,590	1.67	2,655	\$195	\$517,784
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>17,143</b>		<b>\$3,152,835</b>
<b>SEGREGATION HOUSING</b>					
12.0 Segregation Housing Unit	2,010	1.67	3,357	\$165	\$553,856
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>3,357</b>		<b>\$553,856</b>
<b>HOUSING - TYPICAL CORE FACILITIES FOR GENERAL POPULATION FLOORS</b>					
13.0 Core Facilities	3,550	1.42	5,041	\$165	\$831,765
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>5,041</b>		<b>\$831,765</b>
<b>JAIL SUPPORT SERVICES</b>					
14.0 Food Service	3,071	1.67	5,129	\$200	\$1,025,714
15.0 Commissary	300	1.67	501	\$130	\$65,130
16.0 Laundry Room	650	1.67	1,086	\$200	\$217,100
<b>SUBTOTALS</b>			<b>6,715</b>		<b>\$1,307,944</b>
<b>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST FOR BUILDINGS</b>					
					<b>\$9,083,796</b>
<b>RENOVATION OF 2nd FLOOR JAIL (PSB) - RADIO TOWER</b>					
					<b>\$2,362,204</b>
<b>TOTAL COST OF NEW ADDITION &amp; RENOVATION</b>					
					<b>\$11,446,000</b>