

The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County
Judicial Center Site Selection Committee
Wednesday, October 5, 2022 @ 4:00 PM via WebEx
This meeting can be viewed at: <https://youtu.be/NRBOJnKeKMo>

1. **Call Meeting to Order/Welcome:** Commissioner Patrick Davenport, Chair

Committee Roll Call: Commissioner Davenport (Chair) _____, Deborah Lonon____, David Sweat____, Kalki Yalamanchili_____

Staff/Guests: Robert Cheshire, ACCGov Capital Projects Director
Laura Leigh Barrett, SPLOST Project Administrator
John Simoneaux, SPLOST Project Administrator
Chandler Garmon, SPLOST Project Administrator
Chinesia Thompson, SPLOST Program Support Specialist
Earl Smith, CROFT & Associates
Eric Pettingill, CROFT & Associates

2. **Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes**

- August 25, 2022

3. **Update on Public Engagement** - John Simoneaux

4. **Review Site Alternatives Analysis** – John Simoneaux

5. **Other Business**

- In-Person Meeting Requirements

6. **Proposed Next Meeting Date**

- October 27, 2022

7. **Closing Comments & Adjournment**, Chair Davenport

Attachments – Alternative Analysis



Judicial Center Alternatives Analysis							Updated: 9/12/22
Option 1 Renovate Current Building	Option 2A Expand using E Hancock Ave. R.O.W.	Option 2B Expand using Federal Building Site	Option 2C Expand Using Parking Deck Site	Option 3A New Building/New Site - Phased	Option 3B New Building/New Site - Full Buildout	Option 3C New Building on E Broad/Hickory Site	
Positives	1) ACCGov Owned 2) Parking available in existing courthouse parking deck 3) Maintain downtown location	1) ACCGov Owned 2) Adjacencies with current court functions not housed in new courthouse 3) Parking available in existing courthouse parking deck 4) Maintain downtown location 5) Close proximity to many ACCGov functions	1) Adjacencies with current court functions not housed in new courthouse 2) Parking available in the existing courthouse parking deck and surface parking lot for the Federal Building 3) Maintain downtown location 4) Opportunity for greenspace in existing federal building parking lot 5) Close proximity to many ACCGov functions 6) Site allows for future expansion of court/ACCGov functions	1) ACCGov Owned 2) Adjacencies with current court functions not housed in new courthouse 3) Maintain downtown location	1) New facility bringing the courthouse up to modern security standards 2) Phased approach would allow for all judicial functions to be located in the same facility/on the same site in the future 3) Existing Courthouse can be renovated/backfilled for departments that are being relocated	1) New facility bringing the courthouse up to modern security standards 2) All court functions located in one building 3) Existing Courthouse can be renovated/backfilled for departments that are being relocated	1) ACC Owned 2) Maintain downtown location and proximity to existing court functions
Negatives	1) Extensive renovations would be needed to bring the existing courthouse up to current security standards for courts and current ADA requirements for buildings 3) It is not anticipated that there will be adequate space to relocate non court related ACCGov departments to the courthouse building 4) It is not anticipated that there will be adequate space to house all court functions in the renovated existing courthouse 5) Extensive renovations will need to be made to the existing courthouse for judicial functions which will come at a high dollar per square foot cost 6) Temporary alternate location needed for court functions while renovation is taking place 7) Parking will need to be evaluated/modified to provide secure parking	1) E Hancock Ave between N Thomas St. and N Jackson St. closed to traffic 2) It is not anticipated that there will be adequate space to relocate all non court related ACCGov departments to the courthouse building 3) The width of the E Hancock Ave ROW limits the building area for expansion 4) Unknown what utilities exist within the E. Hancock ROW. Potential for added cost and coordination needed to relocated utilities 5) Floor to floor heights will likely not match up with the existing courthouse 6) Parking will need to be evaluated/modified to provide secure parking	1) Not ACCGov-Owned Property. Unknown if this is open for discussion with the Federal Gov't 2) It is not anticipated that there will be adequate space to relocate all non court related ACCGov departments to the courthouse building in the initial phase 3) Using/renovating the existing federal building for judicial functions would be challenging. Building footprint is likely not conducive to the layout of a judicial center. 4) Parking will need to be evaluated/modified to provide secure parking	1) Eliminating one of few major public parking decks available in the downtown area 2) Achieving the preferred building setback distances from the existing right of way will be a challenge 3) It is not anticipated that there will be adequate space to relocate all non court related ACCGov departments to the courthouse building 4) Need for alternate parking close to the existing courthouse for staff and the public 5) Secure parking for select staff onsite will be a challenge	1) Would not be able to relocate all judicial functions into the new judicial center at this time due to due budget constraints 2) Judicial functions in separate facilities until addition/expansion of the new facility which will likely affect the efficiency of court operations 3) Potential additional work/coordination needed for the Sheriffs office if inmate transport is split up 4) It is not anticipated that there will be adequate space to relocate all non court related ACCGov departments to the courthouse building 5) Additional master planning will be needed to ensure the selected site is able to accommodate all judicial functions in a future phase	1) Current construction budget is inadequate to meet the full needs of Athens Clarke County for a new building, a 172,000 SF judicial facility 2) No additional funding sources identified 3) Site area would need to be large enough to provide surface parking for staff and public	1) Would not be able to relocate all judicial functions into the new judicial center at this time due to due budget constraints 2) Judicial functions in separate facilities until addition/expansion of the new facility which will likely affect the efficiency of court operations 3) Potential additional work/coordination needed for the Sheriffs office if inmate transport is split up 4) It is not anticipated that there will be adequate space to relocate all non court related ACCGov departments to the courthouse building 5) Rock identified onsite expected to have major cost impact 6) Site not large enough to accommodate on-site surface parking and project budget does not support parking deck 7) Building expansion in a future phase would be challenging due to site constraints 8) Modifying the existing stormwater management facility onsite expected to have a major cost impact 9) Site is a part of the GA Power Voluntary Remediation Program, meaning soils on the site are potentially environmentally impacted.
Implementation Costs	1) Moving/relocation expenses for current courthouse functions to be housed during construction	1) Potential utility relocation needed for utilities located within the Hancock ROW	1) Potential Site Acquisition Costs 2) Cost to demolish interior of or the full federal building	1) Cost to demolish the existing parking deck	1) Potential Site Acquisition Costs	1) Potential Site Acquisition Costs	1) Existing rock and stormwater management facility are expected to have a major impact on the site costs 2) Environmental remediation of the site will likely add to site costs for soil import/export and potential groundwater
Maintenance/Operations Costs	1) Cost of space for ACCGov departments that are not able to move to the existing courthouse at this time	1) Cost of space for ACCGov departments that are not able to move to the existing courthouse at this time	1) Cost of space for ACCGov departments that are not able to move to the existing courthouse at this time	1) Long term cost of parking and potentially shuttling employees/public to the courthouse 2) Cost of space for ACCGov departments that are not able to move to the existing courthouse at this time	1) Cost of space for ACCGov departments that are not able to move to the existing courthouse at this time 2) Additional cost/staff needed for transport of individuals in custody if judicial functions are split up	1) Operating costs for a larger building than anticipated in initial planning/programming	1) Long term cost of parking and potentially shuttling employees/public to the courthouse
Financial Benefits	1) Additional funds available for Program vs exterior building envelope 2) Land Acquisition Costs could be applied to the program	1) Land Acquisition Costs could be applied to the program	1) Potential for cost sharing if the Federal employees utilize some of the space/parking	1) Land Acquisition Costs could be applied to the program	1) Dollar per square foot cost going toward construction of a new building rather than renovating/reworking courthouse 2) Lower long term maintenance costs for a new building	1) No future expansion needed, all functions accounted for in the new courthouse	1) Land Acquisition Costs could be applied to the program 2) Potential for cost sharing if a parking deck is constructed/operated by another entity
Schedule Impacts	1) Could potentially forego some of the site selection process	1) Could potentially forego some of the site selection process 2) Coordination needed on utility relocation to reduce schedule impact	1) No known impacts on the duration	1) Could potentially forego some of the site selection process	1) No known impacts on the duration	1) Additional time would be needed to identify/raise additional funding sources. No additional funding sources are known at this time	1) Additional time may be needed for the removal of rock and reworking of the existing stormwater management facility

Notes:

1) Options highlighted in green in the first row are being further evaluated by the design team. A more in depth analysis of these options will be presented at the Mayor and Commission Work Session on October 11, 2022.

2) Options in orange are not being evaluated any further at this stage. Through developing this alternatives analysis, these two options were found to not be practical due to the budget and parking constraints that were identified and are outlined in this document.

