

REPORT ON JAIL PLANNING ASSISTANCE

Introduction

The following text summarizes the main observations and recommendations resulting from my intensive two and one-half days of meetings, facility tours and interviews with a wide variety of County officials and citizens concerned with the jail project. The schedule for my on-site meetings is attached to this report as are a sample scope of services for jail planning and a copy of the public presentation on jail planning and design.

Summary of Recommendations:

1. The County should take immediate steps toward obtaining the services of a corrections planner.
2. The first main task for the corrections planner should be to update and expand the 2008 needs assessment, revising projections to account for the implementation of jail population management initiatives.
3. The County should create a Criminal Justice Planning (or Coordinating) Committee, in part to provide a forum for consideration and implementation of jail population management initiatives.
4. Expand the jail facility planning options under consideration – and the sophistication of their evaluation.
5. Consider establishing a construction budget for the project.
6. Assign or hire a project manager or a program management company to support and guide the jail project.
7. Get the key design and construction players on board early.

Observation 1: While the JPTF is clearly a very dedicated, hard-working and intelligent group, it has been charged with responsibilities well beyond the capabilities of citizens and corrections professionals.

Recommendation 1: In order to be in a position to make recommendations on many of the requested topics, the JPTF (and the County) need substantial input and analysis that can only be provided by a qualified and experienced corrections planner. **The County should take immediate steps toward obtaining the services of a corrections planner.** This will likely entail several steps before such services can begin. These include the preparation and publication of a request for qualifications (or for proposals), receipt and evaluation of submissions, interviews and contracting. Even if expedited, it is likely that this process will take three to four months and it could take as long as six months. To assist in this process, a sample scope of services for jail planning is attached to this report. The scope covers the first three main steps in jail planning (needs assessment, feasibility study, and facility programming).

Observation 2: While the needs assessment prepared by the Omni Group in 2008 contains some useful data and analysis, it is lacking in certain important respects. First, it fails to evaluate scenarios that would entail implementation of further jail population management measures. This is part of the reason why it results in projection scenarios which may entail over-building of the jail. Second, it does not appear to have included a detailed profile of the inmate population. This information would be of great utility both with regard to the first item and also in further detailing the types of facilities and programs needed to serve the anticipated population. Third, the study did not include an examination of release mechanisms; this would also allow recommendations to be made concerning potential improvements in processing and other programs that could reduce length of stay (and therefore population).

Recommendation 2: **The first main task for the corrections planner should be to update and expand the 2008 needs assessment,** including the three elements identified above.

Observation 3: The Whatcom County justice and corrections systems are progressive and the various agencies and components appear to work together well and command each other's mutual respect. However, an effective mechanism for shared problem-solving does not appear to be in place. (The Law and Justice Council, we were told, is perhaps a bit too unwieldy for such a purpose.)

Recommendation 3: In parallel with hiring the corrections planner, **Whatcom County should create a Criminal Justice Planning (or Coordinating) Committee.** While this committee could act on other issues, its main focus, at least initially, should be on reviewing practices and policies that impact the jail population. While jail population management is not an explicit objective of many of the justice agencies, the charge of the group can be couched in terms of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the system (including improvements in public safety and reduction of recidivism) – or other goals which are broadly shared. Of course, several of the key members of such a committee are elected officials with specific mandates – so they can only be invited, not compelled, to join and participate. Other jurisdictions which have created such an entity have found that it can have many positive outcomes.

Observation 4: Prior studies and current discussions have focused on two main jail facility options: a “vertical”/downtown solution or a “horizontal”/out-of-downtown solution. The former has been criticized as potentially extremely tall (with up to 2,450 beds, it would require a huge skyscraper) and the latter was said to require a very large site. Evidence and opinion has been marshaled that suggests that it is much cheaper to build and operate a horizontal jail. While construction may be cheaper, this consultant is not convinced by the evidence presented so far that horizontal version would be much (if any) cheaper to operate. In addition, there are many other costs and perhaps benefits (monetary and intangible) that result from or accrue to jail location (certainly including transportation) which need to be included in the evaluation of options.

Recommendation 4: Expand the jail facility planning options and the sophistication of their evaluation.

Revised (and likely lower) projections of need will reduce the scale of both of the options so that the vertical one may not be out of scale with downtown Bellingham and the horizontal one may not require as extensive or expensive a site. Abstract “rules of thumb” and results from other studies¹ about costs of construction and operation should be avoided in favor of broader and more specific analyses that take into account likely staffing patterns, types of construction, site acquisition and development costs, and ancillary costs and benefits including transportation and time taken for law enforcement bookings (weighted by frequency from the various agencies), as well as many other important factors. It may be worthwhile to perform a comparative life-cycle cost analysis of options which would provide an excellent contribution to decision making and selection among options and help the County understand the long-term operating costs they would be buying into.

In addition, the range and variety of options should be expanded to include at least the following two items. One is the **potential continued use (or expansion) of the existing work center**, which appears to be a serviceable and appropriate facility. Among the questions that should be explored are these: do the original planning permissions and agreements allow its continued operations; what would be the cost to replace it or the likely value to be obtained from selling it; can it be expanded and to what extent (for added beds or for support services that could support the balance of the jail system such as kitchen, laundry and warehousing, all of which would provide work opportunities for the inmates), etc.? If the existing ±150 beds were retained and support services expanded at this site, it would substantially reduce the scope of the remaining jail bed needs, and the required area of the building and site. This might allow options to be feasible which would not be if they had to accommodate the entire jail program.

¹ Arguments favoring horizontal over vertical have been marshaled from two sources: first, a study for the cities in King County (which, however, showed rather little added operating cost for the taller version - and some of the assumed costs were questionable) and, second, general directions from NIC jail planning manuals which are highly qualified and might not take into account ancillary benefits. For example, here are two quotes from NIC's Jail Design Guide (3rd Edition): "small and medium-sized jails tend to be most effectively developed as one-level structures" and "Before committing to a multilevel jail, jurisdictions should confirm that such a structure will not compromise the functioning and security of the building and will not increase staffing needs beyond acceptable and supportable levels". These comments are cautionary, but not definitive and "small and medium-sized jails" were defined in a prior edition of this guide as 20 to 200 beds, smaller than the Whatcom project.

Another potential set of options concern the **potential uses, if any, of the existing jail**. The County is about to spend about \$2.5M on upgrades to the structure and security systems. While the building may be currently unsafe and inefficient to operate as a secure jail, are there other correctional, law enforcement, or governmental uses that could reasonably be accommodated? If there are, what would the cost be to renovate and improve the building for these uses? Possibilities that could be considered include the following:

- temporary holding and staging for inmates who are appearing in court (if transported from a remote jail or if connected to a new, adjacent downtown jail)
- housing of lower custody level inmates who might be participating in work crews or work release to jobs (or education release to schools) in the downtown area, day reporting (if such a program were instituted – since the location is very accessible and served with public transport), or trustee housing for those who would be needed to work in a downtown jail if one were constructed on an adjacent site
- mental health crisis stabilization center (in addition to or replacing the existing triage facility) which requires security and is intensively staffed anyway
- release location for inmates who were otherwise held at a new, remote jail
- offices for the Sheriff (allowing divisions to be co-located; though parking might not be adequate)
- general county offices or other facilities.

Likely, there are other potentially interesting options which should be considered.

Note that the suggested analyses are mainly conducted during the “feasibility” phase of work (after the needs assessment establishes the overall scope).

Observation 5: Jail planning projects are often driven exclusively by projected need – and that is how this project started – sometimes without regard for what can be afforded. This has sometimes led to what can reasonably be considered to be disasters – such as jails that are built and then cannot be opened due to high operating costs, or jail operations absorbing so many resources that other equally important services and programs are curtailed.

Recommendation 5: **Consider establishing a construction budget for the project**, based on what the County can afford to pay or to finance, rather than allowing “needs” to be established independent of what can be afforded. This would encourage both that priorities be set (so that the most important ones are met) and also that cost-effective means be explored for achieve the priorities. It is my experience that having a project budget is a great help in focusing the minds and attention of participants in the planning process. It also encourages focusing on needs versus wants, eliminating the “wish list”. Too many projects proceed without a real budget and end up with so-called “value engineering” which can result in poor or short-sighted cuts and real damage to a project’s quality. At the same time as construction budgets are established, it is essential that operating costs be projected (as suggested in Recommendation 4).

Observation 6: This will be one of (if not the) largest and most important projects that the County has undertaken. It will be much more likely to succeed under the guidance of a project manager with intelligence, experience with planning, design and construction (if possible of correctional facilities), people/communication skills, and perseverance. Ideally (and with great benefit), this individual would stay with the project for the four or more years it will take until it’s open and operating.

Recommendation 6: **Assign or hire a project manager – or a program management company**. The County may not have the in-house expertise or staffing available to manage such a project and could consider either hiring such an individual or obtaining the services of a program or construction management firm. Ideally, this person or firm would come on board starting around the time the corrections planner begins work – but no later than the feasibility study phase.

Observation 7: Jails are highly complex buildings and their planning, design and construction are critical to their mission and long-term operations and maintenance. For most jurisdictions, including Whatcom County, a main jail is built only once every generation. Therefore, the expertise available within the jurisdiction is limited.

Recommendation 7: Having available a team with deep experience in jail planning, design and construction is of great benefit to the quality and cost-effectiveness of a jail project, providing input to decisions made at the planning and programming phases. Thus, it is recommended that Whatcom County **get the key design and construction players on board early**. This may require a decision about how the project will be procured (traditional, design-build, CM at risk, or other method).

Attachments

Consultant's Visit Itinerary (scheduled meetings)

Sample/generic scope of services for jail planning

Public jail planning presentation

Jay Farbstein, PhD, FAIA Interview Schedule

Meeting Location: Executive Conference Room (unless otherwise noted)

Date	Time	Stakeholder Organization	Attendees	Comments
October 11, 2011				
	2:30 – 4:30	Sheriff's Office	Wendy Jones	Tour both Jails
	4:30 – 5:30	Sheriff's Office	Sheriff Elfo	Sheriff's Office
	5:30 – 6:30	Right Size Coalition	Lisa McShane (360.201.0779)	Executive Conference Rm
October 12, 2011				
	8:00 – 9:00			
	9:00 – 10:00	County Executive	Pete Kremen/Dewey Desler	Executive Office
	10:00 – 11:00	Municipal Courts	Judge Lev, Comm. Smiley,	
	11:00 – 12:00	Prosecuting Attorney	Dave McEachran, Pros. Atty.	
	12:00- 1:00	County Judiciary	Superior & Dist. Ct. Judges	
	1:00 – 2:00	LUNCH BREAK		
	2:00 - 3:00	Muni Law Enforcement	Chiefs Ramsay, Knapp, Foster, Hogan	
	3:00 – 4:00	Public Defender	Jon Komorowski, Pub. Def.	
	4:00 – 5:00	Mental Health Services	Anne Deacon	
	5:00 – 6:30	DINNER BREAK		
	6:30 – 7:00	Prep for Presentation		
	7:00 – 9:00	Public Presentation	Stakeholders/Public	Council Chambers
October 13, 2011				
	7:30 – 9:30	Jail Planning Task Force	Task Force Meeting	Civic Center Garden Room
	9:30 -10:00	Re-entry Coalition	Irene Morgan	Civic Center Garden Room

SCOPE OF SERVICES

PHASE I: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Purpose: to complete a needs assessment for adult detention and correctional facilities including projection of inmate populations and description of in-custody programs as well as of alternatives to secure incarceration which may contribute to limiting custody population.

Task I.1.0 Project Initiation and Administration

Purpose: to orient all participants to the planning process, to identify data sources and systems available for the study, and to collect information for strategic planning, including prior studies and planning documents.

I.1.1 Review Background Information: The consultant will review relevant prior studies provided by the County.

I.1.2 Advisory Committee Meeting 1: The consultant will meet with the advisory committee to introduce the team, review the approach and schedule, and identify major planning objectives, issues and constraints. The consultant will make arrangements for data collection and request relevant prior studies for review.

I.1.3 Criminal Justice Policy Committee (CJPC) Meeting 1: The consultant will meet with the CJPC to introduce the team, review the approach and schedule, and explore major planning objectives, issues and constraints.

I.1.4 Interviews: The consultant will interview key justice system representatives to develop a more in-depth understanding of the issues related to provision of services, growth and change, and facilities of each. Approximately nine, one-hour will be conducted, including, but not limited to: Sheriff's jail commanders; County Executive Office; Superior Court; District Court; Municipal Court; Prosecuting Attorney and Defense Bar; Probation Department; Mental Health and Substance Abuse s agencies; Facility Services; Planning Department (to discuss the rate and character of local growth); in-custody and alternative program and service providers.

I.1.5 Project Administration: The consultant will maintain verbal and written communication with the County's project manager concerning the progress of the work.

Task I.2.0 Data Collection and Analysis

Purpose: the data collection phase will provide the foundation for subsequent analysis and projections. In this phase, the consultant will collect information on the community, its offenders, and the program and facility resources historically allocated to adult offenders. The precise scope of data collection will be negotiated with the client based upon availability from the jail's data system

and hard copy files; however, it is assumed that a limited amount of data from prior studies will be of use for the current study and also that the jail's information system will be able to generate needed data.

I.2.1 Program Survey and Best Practices Review: The consultant will coordinate with justice system agencies and community groups to identify currently available resources (both in-custody and alternatives to custody) for pre-trial detainees and sentenced offenders. In consultation with County officials, we will also identify evidence-based "best practices" potentially applicable to jail capacity issues in Whatcom County.

I.2.2 Profile Offender Populations: The consultant will collect data from existing jail records and additional information from all or a sample to develop a profile of inmate characteristics. The information collected will include charge, sentence status, length of stay, previous criminal history; criminal sophistication; gender; and special needs such as medical and mental health issues. Again, it is assumed that a limited amount of data from prior studies will be of use for the current study and also that the jail's information system will be able to generate needed data. The information will provide a basis for considering in- and out-of-custody program needs and their potential impact on jail capacity and housing configurations.

I.2.3 Intake and Release Study: The consultant will collect data on a sample (size to be determined) of previously released inmates. A sufficient period and number of inmates will be covered to ensure statistical reliability. Data will include arresting agency, charge, release mechanism, and booking and release date and time. This information will be used to determine how long various categories of inmates stay in the facilities and how they secure release. The analysis of the data will provide additional insight into who uses jail beds, what in-custody program durations may be expected, and how potential changes in release practices and resources would impact jail capacity needs.

I.2.4 Justice and Correctional System Trends: The consultant will collect information from the jail concerning trends in jail ADPs, classification levels, lengths of stay, and seasonal and weekly peaking factors. Information on trends in crimes, arrests, referrals and Probation caseloads, filings from the Prosecuting Attorney's office, and similar indicators will also be analyzed. The information will serve for analysis of the historical trends used as the basis for projections jail capacity.

I.2.5 County Population Trends: The consultant will collect data on the general (adult) population (in incorporated and unincorporated area and by geographic region where specific distinctions can be established from county, state and federal

sources. These data will be used to examine historical growth and future projections as one indicator of the demand for jail facilities.

I.2.6 Alternative Placement Study: The study is carried out in conjunction with local officials to develop a picture of the “ideal placement” for a sample of offenders from the snapshot profile. It is done without regard to the limitations of existing resources and thus helps to identify “missing” options as well as groups of misclassified offenders. “Placements” can range from continued incarceration to alternatives which might reduce incarceration levels (For offenders “placed” in custody during this exercise, further breakdowns will be done, identifying needed security level and type of housing (single or multiple), special programming needs, re-entry needs such as job training, etc. The impacts of implementing these options on the number and types of beds will be quantified (and, where beds would be saved, the impacts of non-implementation will be noted.

I.2.7 Briefing Paper: Consultant will prepare a briefing paper summarizing the findings from the tasks above and provide an electronic copy to the County for distribution and review prior to the meeting described in the next task.

I.2.8 Advisory Committee Meeting 2: The consultant will meet with the advisory committee to present an overview of findings. The presentation will report on project status and issues that have surfaced during data collection.

Task I.3.0 Jail Capacity Projections

Purpose: Based on the data collected in Task I.2.0, this task will develop projections of inmate populations and assess the fit between identified needs and system resources.

I.3.1 Develop Baseline Projections: The consultants will work with the advisory committee to identify the factors and assumptions to be used in projecting inmate populations. Three to five scenarios will be developed based upon different assumptions, but baseline projections will assume (as an exercise) that current law and policies will continue through planning period. Projections will be developed for 5, 10, 15, and 20-year planning intervals starting in 2012 (or other years if requested by the client).

I.3.2 Identify Potential Policy Changes: Inmate population levels result from two basic factors: admissions and lengths of stay, both of which are heavily policy-driven. The consultant will identify institutional and non-institutional policy changes (both local and state/federal statutory or regulatory actions) which may affect jail population and demonstrate their potential impacts on custody capacity needs. The scenarios showing potential impacts will be crafted through discussions with local officials and the planning team.

I.3.3 Briefing Paper: Consultant will prepare a briefing paper summarizing the findings from the tasks above and provide an electronic copy to the County for distribution and review prior to the meeting described in the next task.

I.3.4 Advisory Committee Meeting 3: The consultant will meet with the advisory committee. Discussion will include possible impacts due to future changes in types or levels of crime, services, programs, and operations. Consultant will work with the committee to develop a strategy which will be used to adjust the baseline projections.

I.3.5 Criminal Justice Policy Committee (CJPC) Meeting 2: The consultant will meet with the CJPC to discuss policy and implementation issues concerning future changes in types or levels of crime, services, programs, and operations. Consultant will seek the committee’s input to scenarios which will be used to adjust the baseline projections.

I.3.6 Develop Final Projections: The consultant will revise the baseline projections with modifications as discussed at the meeting above. Projections will be provided system-wide, and broken down by gender, housing classification, and type of program. Figures for five, ten, and 20-year planning intervals will be provided. The final projections will reflect two types of adjustments. First, as noted above, policy changes will be quantified to develop a final projection of future populations. Second, the average daily population (ADP) projections will be translated into bed projections, as a guide for facility planning in Phase II. Initially, the types and numbers of beds – by classification, gender and security/program level – will be identified within the projected total. Finally, projections will be modified to provide beds needed to account for peaking and other temporary population fluctuations. The number of beds projected is typically 10 to 25% higher than the projected average daily population. Bed numbers are also rounded off to standard housing unit sizes.

**PHASE II:
JAIL FACILITY MASTER
PLAN**

The purpose of this phase is to develop a master plan for jail and related facilities as a basis for capital planning. (Note that detailed architectural programming is not included.)

**Task II.1.0 Facility
Assessment and Future Needs**

Purpose: The purpose of Task II.1 is to determine preliminary facility requirements for the programs and populations identified above, and to assess the adequacy of existing facilities to meet these needs.

II.1.1 Facility and Site Inventory and Assessment: In reviewing existing facilities and the site, the emphasis will be on their capacity and suitability for intended uses and ability to continue to accommodate various elements of the projected population. This

task will consider the facilities' current and potential functionality relative to the detainee profile and proposed programs, operational efficiency, staffing efficiency, and ability to provide effective security and visual supervision. The evaluation will be in sufficient depth for the consultants to form recommendations concerning the site's and facilities' maintainability and suitability for renovation and adaptive reuse – or their need for replacement. Structural integrity will be assessed visually and the consultants will recommend whether further material testing or calculations (by others) are warranted.

II.1.2 Determine Space Needs: The consultant will determine space requirements for each major functional area of needed jail facilities using norms developed from state standards, national guidelines, and prior experience. We will conduct one workshop with staff to discuss requirements for housing (by classification), jail administration, security and control, visiting, program areas, food service and canteen, laundry, storage, reception/intake/release, property, and other major functional and support areas normal and customary in the correctional setting. Requirements for exterior areas including recreation yards, parking, buffers from adjacent uses, public queuing and waiting, staff patios, , vehicle accommodation (buses, vans & patrol vehicles and site circulation – as well as infrastructure – will be developed. These requirements will be presented for 5, 10, 15, and 20-year intervals.

II.1.3 Compare Program Needs to Existing Site and Facilities: The consultant will assess the ability of existing facilities to meet the spatial and functional needs identified in Task II.1.2 while considering the characteristics of the existing facilities as inventoried in Task II.1.1. The review will consider:

- types and quantities of space for housing and all other functions
- projection of shortfall by housing type
- ability to provide security and visual supervision
- ability to provide capacity and separations for inmate classifications
- potential for logical phasing at each projection period
- other constraints related to site and infrastructure.

II.1.4 Preliminary Jail Staffing Analysis. The consultant will review post-positions needed and shift relief factors with jail management in order to develop an estimate of needed staffing for the considered options (for this task, the consultants will rely heavily on prior studies of jail staffing needs).

Task II.2.0 Facility Options and Master Plan

Purpose: The purpose of Task II.2 is to explore options for meeting facility needs and to develop a master plan to guide future facility development.

II.2.1 Identify and Assess Development Options: Options for meeting facility requirements will be developed for review and discussion with the client. A range of potential options will be identified, with approximately three reasonable options selected (with the client) to be studied and described in greater depth. The options will consider alternatives for future use of existing detention space and coordination with court holding and hearing functions. The options will be assessed against a range of criteria and the most promising one selected in coordination with the Advisory Committee.

II.2.2 Advisory Committee Meeting 4: A briefing paper covering the facility planning tasks will be presented to the advisory committee for discussion and selection of the most promising development option. (Note that a meeting with the CJPC could also be included if done on the same visit.)

II.2.3 Document Master Plan: The selected projects will be described with text and conceptual/diagrammatic building and site plans.

Task II.3.0 Project Report

Purpose: the results of all prior tasks will be documented and compiled into a comprehensive report.

II.3.1 Draft Report: The consultant will prepare a draft report covering the results of all tasks described above. The draft report will include an executive summary, introduction, chapter on each major task, and attachments as appropriate.

II.3.2 Advisory Committee Meeting 5: The consultant will meet with the advisory committee to receive comments for incorporation into the final report.

II.3.3 Final Report: Based on the comments received, the report will be revised as necessary.

[Note: formal presentations may also be required.]

PHASE III PROGRAMMING SERVICES

In order to complete a design program for the new jail, the consultant will carry out the tasks described below. References to the programming committee include county staff assigned to provide input and oversight for the process with the participation of the construction manager.

**Task III.1. MANAGEMENT
& COORDINATION**

III.1.1 Project Initiation Meeting: The programming team will meet with representatives of the Sheriff's Department and the County to introduce the team, review the approach and schedule, and identify major programming issues and constraints.

III.1.2 Review Background Information: The consultant will request and review relevant prior studies that define the scope of the jail.

III.1.3 Project Administration: The consultant will maintain verbal and written communication with the county project manager concerning the progress of, and billing for, the work.

**Task III.2.0 OPERATIONAL
PROGRAMMING**

III.2.1 Operational Program Workshops: The consultant will facilitate two workshops, each two days long, with a programming committee to discuss operational aspects of the facility identified in Task 2.5.

III.2.2 Observe Current Operations: The programming team will spend about one hour observing operations in each area of the existing jails that are relevant to the current project including lobby, arraignment court, booking, various housing units, health services, visiting, kitchen, and programs.

III.2.3 Tour Jail Facilities. The consultant will help organize and participate in tours of other recent jails to orient the participants of programming workshops to the state-of-the-art for this facility type. Facilities to tour will be selected in conjunction with the client and with advice from the state jail authority. Out-of-state facilities will be considered along with those in Washington.

III.2.4 Document Operational Program Information: The programming information collected in the workshops and other tasks will be documented for the following topics and presented for review and comment by the programming committee:

- Philosophy, Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives
- Future Trends
- Psychological and Socio-cultural Factors
- Policies and Procedures
- Facility Occupants and Users
- Activities
- Circulation and Relationships
- Safety and Security (operational aspects)

These will be discussed for each major area of the jail:

- housing units – for each type of inmate/custody level (including the functional needs of cells, dayrooms, dining, interview and program spaces, showers, staff areas, outdoor recreation courtyards, storage, and the like)
- booking/release/transport (including movement to court and the possible inclusion of an arraignment court)
- central control
- administration
- visiting
- program areas
- indoor recreation
- medical and mental health services
- kitchen
- laundry
- receiving/storage/maintenance
- staff support.

Task III.3.0 DESIGN PROGRAMMING

III.3.1 Design Programming Workshops: The consultant will facilitate three, two-day long workshops with the programming committee to discuss physical and architectural aspects of the facility identified in Task 3.4, with an emphasis upon the building as a whole.

III.3.2 Space List: The consultant will further develop the detailed list of spaces initiated during the needs assessment study. The types, sizes, and numbers of spaces will be tested against the operational decisions made during Task 2.0 and modified as appropriate.

III.3.3 Value Engineering Workshop: During this phase of work, the consultant will participate in a one-to-two-day-long workshop organized by the construction manager.

III.3.4 Develop Relationship Diagrams: Spatial relationship diagrams will be developed for each functional area. Spaces will not be to scale, but will be shown in their relative sizes.

III.3.5 Document Design Program Information: The design information collected at the workshops will be documented for the following topics for review and comment by the programming committee:

- Design Objectives
- Facility Image
- Code and Agency Requirements (especially Titles 15 and 24)

- Space Requirements
- Space Relationships
- Flexibility
- Safety and Security
- Equipment and Systems (including for the crime lab)
- Ambient Environment
- Furnishing and Fixture Criteria
- Finish and Material Criteria
- Graphics and Display
- Site Development Criteria (including parking).

These will be discussed for each of the major functional areas as listed in Task 2.4.

III.3.6 Review Meeting: The consultant will attend a meeting to present and review the documented requirements with the programming committee.

Task III.4.0 PROGRAM REPORT

III.4.1 Draft Report: The consultant will prepare a draft report covering the results of all tasks described above. The draft report will include an executive summary, introduction, overall building requirements, specific requirements for each major functional area, and attachments as appropriate. The consultant will e-mail an Adobe Acrobat (PDF) file for distribution.

III.4.2 Review Meeting: The consultant will meet with the programming committee to receive comments for incorporation into the final report.

III.4.3 Final Report: Based on the comments received, the report will be revised as necessary. The consultant will e-mail an Adobe Acrobat (PDF) file for distribution.

PHASE IV. DESIGN ASSISTANCE

[Note: these services are tailored to a design-build process]

Following programming, the consultant will participate in briefing the design-build teams, design workshops, and design review coordinated by the construction manager. It is assumed that meetings will take place in Auburn or Sacramento. Note that all services during the design phase will be limited to comments on functional, operational and programmatic issues; technical and code-related architectural and engineering topics will not be covered by this consultant but will be the sole responsibility of the design-build team and/or construction manager.

IV.5.1 Initial Program Briefing: The consultant will meet with the construction manager and pre-qualified design build teams to present and review the program.

IV.5.2 Design-Build Team Pre-Bid Sessions: The consultant will attend three two-day long workshops – one with each of the pre-qualified design-build teams to answer further questions about programmatic and operational issues.

IV.5.3 Design-Build Submission Review: The consultants will participate in one three-day long review meeting (organized by the construction manager) to help assess the design-build submissions.

IV.5.4 Design Review: The consultants will review two design submissions from their offices and provide written comments to the construction manager via e-mail.

PROGRAMMING SCHEDULE

It is anticipated that programming, once started, will require sixteen-to-twenty weeks, as shown in the figure on the following page. This does not include value engineering and design review, the schedule for which will be controlled by the construction manager.

It is assumed that the County will authorize the consultant to **proceed with programming prior to completion of the master planning phase** of the needs assessment (which would be completed after programming).

Programming Schedule

Task Description	Week															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.0 Management and Coordination																
1.1 Project Initiation Meeting	M															
1.2 Review Background Information																
1.3 Project Administration																
2.0 Functional Programming																
2.1 Functional Program Workshops (2)		M		M												
2.2 Tour/Observe Current Facilities																
2.3 Evaluate Recent Housing Units																
2.4 Tour Other Agency Facilities (Option)																
2.5 Document Functional Program Info																
3.0 Design Programming																
3.1 Design Programming Workshops (2)						M		M								
3.2 Space List																
3.3 Relationships; Diagrams																
3.4 Document Design Program Info																
3.5 Review Meeting										Rev.	M					
4.0 Detailed Program Report																
4.1 Draft Report																
4.2 Review Meeting														Rev.	M	
4.3 Final Report																

Rev. Client Review Time
M Meeting