

**BROWARD COUNTY COURTHOUSE TASK FORCE MEETING**  
**February 27, 2009**

**PRESENT:** Commissioner Ilene Lieberman, Chair  
Margaret Bates, Broward County League of Cities  
Scott Chitoff, Brinkley, Morgan  
Greg Durden, PA  
Howard Finkelstein, Broward County Public Defender  
Howard Forman, Clerk of Courts  
Jose Izquierdo, Izquierdo and Marin  
Chuck Morton, Chief Assistant State Attorney  
Linda O'Neil, Judicial Assistant to Judge Robert Lee  
Eugene Pettis, Haliczzer, Pettis & Schwamm  
Scott Rothstein, Rothstein, Rosenfeld, Adler  
Chief Judge Vic Tobin, 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit  
Circuit Court Judge Peter Weinstein

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Pete Corwin, Assistant to the County Administrator  
Purvi Bhogaita, County Attorney's Office  
Mona Gordon, Facilitator  
Ruth Myles, Facilitator  
Elyse Rosenberg, Facilitator  
Brad Seff, Real-Time Reporter

A Broward County Courthouse Task Force meeting was held at 1:00 p.m. on February 27, 2009, at the Broward County Main Courthouse, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

(A sign in sheet reflecting those present is filed with the supplemental papers to this meeting.)

(The following is a near-verbatim account of the presentation :)

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Good afternoon. We have a lot to accomplish.

We are going to be breaking into two separate sub-groups, twice today. People have been assigned to different sub-groups. We'll go over that in a minute.

The first part of the meeting -- we had two members who weren't with us at our last meeting who have joined us, and I want to give them a minute to say hello and tell

us what their interest is. Before I recognize them, if you haven't already done so, you were provided with a survey, which is a result of our discussions at the last Task Force meeting. We ask that you fill this out and give it to Pete. If you agree with the statement, you check the box. If you have some comments about the statement, even if you agree or disagree, put them in the note section and please make sure you sign your names to this form so that we know whose concerns they are in order to address them. Okay. If you haven't already filled out the form, please do so now.

Scott, we will start with you.

MR. CHITOFF: I'm Scott Chitoff. I'm a partner with Brinkley, Morgan in Fort Lauderdale.

MR. ROTHSTEIN: I'm Scott Rothstein. I'm a CEO of Rothstein, Rosenfeldt, Adler.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: If you have not completed your survey, please do so right away and give it to Pete Corwin.

The first order of business will be the approval of the minutes and also you had some supplemental papers when you came in, so make sure you look at the pile where you are sitting. There are some additional items. Does anyone have any corrections, additions to the minutes? Anybody? Okay. Would someone like to make a motion?

MR. FORMAN: I'll move it.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Motion by Howard Foreman and second by Mr. Chitoff. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Show that the minutes passed unanimously. Okay.

The very first part of our discussion will be a power point presentation by Pete Corwin that covers three different areas. At our first meeting we had two sub-groups

that dealt with facilities and operations and there were a number of issues raised both by the sub-groups and the committee as a whole. In the first part of Pete's presentation he is going to go over the answers to the questions raised by the group.

In the second part of Pete's presentation, he is going to cover parking options and in the third he is going to talk about the size of the courthouse and what he has looked at.

What I would like to do and I hope we have general consensus on, is to let Pete finish each section. If we can let him finish the follow-up questions, I will then ask if there are questions. Then we will let him do his parking presentation and again we will stop and I will ask if anybody has any questions and we will do the reduce the size of the courthouse.

The same general rules from last time are in place, and those rules are that we understand that people who we like and respect may have opinions different than ours. We respect their right to differ from our opinion and not be disagreeable about it, and we don't interrupt other people while they are speaking, we let everybody get their points out. Because I have to Chair the meeting, if I tell you your time is up, please be gracious about it.

With that Pete, it's your time to go over the power point presentation starting with the follow-up questions.

MR. CORWIN: Thank you. I don't want to be redundant.

Hopefully you have had a chance to look at the answers to the follow-up questions that we e-mailed to you, so I will hit the highlights on those, especially those you will be talking about today in the break out groups, starting with technology.

Our consultant provided with you examples in other jurisdictions and I don't know about you, but those that go to other courtrooms, maybe it's not that exciting, but compared to the courtroom I typically come over here with, this is pretty exciting to me. Instead of going in and being lost, you are like in an airline terminal. You have some video screens. These aren't expensive things. Kiosks would be in place. Biometric security, something obviously BSO would want to weigh in on, I doubt we would go to retina scans, but hand scans for employees. Something to get people through the lobby and into the building securely and quickly.

A key thing, obviously, its electronic court rooms. We would never build a courthouse not wired for what we know and what we don't know to the extent, that that's possible. The consultant provided a number of applications for that video testimony, again flat screen TV's, internet connections.

The next two, are efforts that the purpose is working on paperless courts. Imagine a courthouse without paper. E-filing. Imagine a courthouse where attorneys can file from their office, imagine less parking and less people. These are things in our future and it's difficult at this point in time to say if it was implemented in two years, x square feet would go away, but at a minimum it's going to mitigate our need for additional space in the future.

We're doing some video arrangement but there are other applications that could be and need to be planned for in a new court room, again with an effort to supplement what the court is doing, ideally to get some people out of the courthouse if they don't need to be here.

The next one is an interesting discussion. Again, the consultant gave some examples in other jurisdictions, and one of the sub-groups will be talking about this as

well. Last week, last month, there was a period of discussion of night, weekend court, and what we found, if you look at an examples given, typically it's done for convenience of the public although you can get traffic and small claims out to satellites, especially in off hours, you would reduce the demand on a central courthouse.

Jury management, essentially, that could be smoothing out peaks from the beginning of the week, beginning of the day. Throughout the week, it has to go hand-in-hand, obviously with case management, eventually, a master calendar system, but it's obviously a different way of doing business.

There are operational impacts. The group last time identified many of them and you will see in some of the examples the consultant gave us, some jurisdictions moved in that direction and everybody in the case of the county and sheriff's budget, it would be the security budget. They would have to work odd hours, additional hours. On the other hand, if its clerks and other court employees, typically you could work around that with flex schedules.

Master calendaring, lots of different options. At the end of the day, again, there will be discussion groups when you talk about court sets. You can turn away; do court management upside down or ways to still share court rooms. You could schedule court rooms and juries differently. The consultant gave a few examples of those.

Next, this is something that we don't exactly have on the table, but we talked about it last time and there was some follow-up questions regarding the 110 Tower. We tried to give some pros and cons. Again, it's in your background material. If it was gifted to us, if we got a great price for it, obviously that parking would be great. What couldn't we do with 1150 spaces. It's a soft market but it's not for sale. We are in contact with them. We have a relationship with them because the state attorney rents

space there. We just amended the space there and it's not on the market. We hear from brokers once in a while and we talk to the owners, but it's not on the market. The downside, as we see it, it's still a structure designed in the 80's. It doesn't meet today's code. We have to harden it and that's not cheap. It's clearly not suitable without spending a lot of money to make it into courtrooms. If we add another security point, there is an ongoing cost for BSO to provide security. If you provide -- if you treat it as part of your courthouse, it would be a million and a half to \$2 million per year, every year. Taxing jurisdictions wouldn't like losing \$1.4 million per year, especially the city, and the other fit isn't quite right. It's great for offices, great for the state attorney, public defender, maybe even some court admin and maybe even some clerk functions, but we don't need 400,000 square feet of office. This is not the way to go.

The next discussion is well, downtown's prime real estate, downtown courthouse space is limited. What can we get out of downtown that could work, and one idea would be to divide the criminal and civil courts. The Commission wrestled with this over the years and our consultant basically tried to capture, I think in our response, that you can split them. It's doable, but if you don't have to, why do it? There is clearly the convenience for attorneys that go in practice in both courts and if we had space, the next point in the satellite courts, for example, it would be great to move traffic and some things out of here. We mentioned in the follow-up, we are moving to add one Judge soon, at north, and do a remodeling job in south to add one Judge, and west, we will have a courtroom too. It's a little more involved project, but we're going to get another courtroom out there. That was the courthouse we could use 10 more court rooms. It clearly was, but there is no way to expand it west. We looked at north. I don't know if anybody went to the link. If you haven't, I can save you the reading. We looked

at north. There is space there, but because of a lot of different factors, to turn into courtrooms, it's very expensive. We had to take off some of the building to make more room for parking. So at the end of the day, while there is space that is used for storage to convert to courtrooms, would be very expensive.

On the other hand, to the extent that we can move things out of here, we can and should. We are moving our county IT Department to free up space for the Public Defender in the mid-rise and a couple of agencies have already moved their servers out to get into a protected environment.

Looking to the future, and Palm Beach does this, you can have a separate facility as part of your campus for the State Attorney or PD, and the site on the New River is potentially a good site for the future plan. If the state attorney was in the new building now, you design a couple of floors, state attorney could move out and be part of the campus but not in the courthouse proper.

Public/private partnership, the key thing to probably identify right now, at this time it's not viable, but lots of things aren't viable at this time. Generally speaking, our experience with public/private would be we can borrow the money cheaper and often the public/private partnerships often add risk. They either increase your debt payments; homeowners know what that feels like these days, or you borrow for 30 or 50 years and go across the street and see a 50 year old courthouse. I don't think that is something we want to do. There are ways you can do it, but if we thought that in five years we have a lot of money coming in and maybe all we have to do is just get over the hump, but if you read the tax legislation that governs our world, in terms of property tax, reality, it's not coming. Part of the public/private is some retail uses and we definitely would want some of the limited retail uses. So that is it for the follow-up questions.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: This is our natural break to go over the issues in the question paper. Before we do that, I just want to remind those of you who arrived late, to please make sure you turn in your check list of the statements you agree or disagree with, Mona, and make sure you sign names so we have everybody's check list. Okay. Linda.

MS. O'NEIL: I just had a question on the staggering and primarily with small claims because currently we're going to be doing away with our small claims division done by Judge Zack now, and those cases -- as of now, I'm already transferring some of his cases out to other Judges.

Would that also be here for this courthouse, not just satellites?

MR. CORWIN: Right now what we're planning to do in the main courthouse, these are options that might mitigate the need in the future, so I couldn't -- that is a level of detail I couldn't get to.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: Two issues and they kind of ducktail together.

In this hand out, and Pete touched on it, one of the things was going and expanding video usage in the Courthouse. I'm very troubled by what is in this handout, and it's not something I can even get close to agreeing to.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Are you on question two?

MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm on video arraignment, conferencing and depositions, page 3 -- page 4 of 14.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. Just so I may, if you are going to bring up any subject, it would be helpful to the group to site to the page.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm very concerned about this, and I'm very concerned because we're trying it do something that is very important which is to have some sort of

decent courthouse. I think everybody in this room knows whether it's a remodeling or building a new one, something has to be done. I do not want to see us continue to throw good money after bad, to build a facility that is going to be antiquated shortly after it's built, and what I'm starting to see in this section is, cutting out the substance and quality of what my clients get and are entitled to. Video arraignments are a bad, bad idea. I can't tell you in strong enough words. When an individual gets arrested, especially if they are poor and sitting in jail, that means they never see anybody. They are in the jail. Their first appearance at Magistrate is by video. In most cases, the lawyer is in the make shift courtroom here. Now we're going to go forward four weeks and they are going to have an arraignment and the lawyer is not going to be where that individual is. This person doesn't come to court. With all respect to the Judges that are here, while many of them believe they come to the same decision regardless whether or not the person is in front of them or appearing remotely, they are not right about that. When the humanity of the individual is in front of that Judge, when their family, friends and loved ones are there, the emotional impact is real and has an effect on what the sentences are.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Howard has voiced an objection to one of the recommendations -- I can't even say one of the recommendations, one of the discussion items, and from what I understand, the only one you are voicing an objection to is the one on video arraignments and conferencing on page 4.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: No, on video arraignments, video depositions, video misdemeanor sentencing, video bond hearings, video expert witness testimony, scientific evidence presentation.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Isn't that all in that one bullet?

MR. FINKELSTEIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. So we have the Chief Judge, Judge Weinstein, Chuck Morton.

Can we here some input from other members of the court system?

JUDGE TOBIN: I agree. First of all, the new building would house, for the most part, civil courts and county criminal, and delinquency, so I agree with Howard that we shouldn't have first appearances. We shouldn't have arraignments by video. It's not constructive nor do we want to take a plea over a video. All the other stuff that it would apply to the civil cases, which is going to be the bulk of the building, civil and family, lawyers want to stay in their offices and want to use the audio/visual stuff, the video conferencing, so it's not going to apply too much to criminal anyway, but we agree anyway.

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: I absolutely agree with Howard and Judge Tobin. He makes one point that I think is very important. Whatever we do, we never want to get away from basic constitutional rights that everybody enjoys, to be here, be present and heard and by video, in a criminal case, that is not going to happen. In civil, people use it all the time.

MR. MORTON: I don't have any problems with hearings that are non-adversarial. Everything else I agree with Howard, but if they are non-adversarial, I don't think it really makes that big of a deal whether it's live in a courtroom or on a video.

JUDGE TOBIN: When we had the flood and Judges were forced to do it face-to-face, in Room 336, the Judges themselves said it's much better. That is the way they do it in Palm Beach, face-to-face. That is what we ought to be doing. Keep in mind, when the new building is built, three delinquency divisions will be moving out of the old

building, so we will have three more felony courtrooms that we can add, without adding more space in the north wing. We're in agreement. I'm in agreement, certainly, that Magistrates, first appearance hearings, arraignments, anything to do with the criminal defendant, we should be able to have face-to-face contact.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. Let me open to the rest of people sitting around the table. Does anyone feel any differently?

Here is what I am hearing. As far as the civil side of the courthouse, video conferencing is a good thing. Lawyers are asking for it so they don't have it come down to the courthouse and find parking spaces.

As far as the criminal divisions, there are some concerns with constitutional issues, and Chuck, you had mentioned you wouldn't have a problem with non-adversarial proceedings. The other three speakers didn't mention that.

MR. MORTON: They are saying everything. I don't think it makes that much a difference in non-adversarial hearings, but I don't necessarily disagree with having it, but I just don't really see that it makes a significant difference as to what a Judge is going to do. I just don't see that.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: And I disagree.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: So we still have a basic disagreement whether or not -- I think everybody generally agrees that any adversarial criminal proceeding can't be by video. Does anyone disagree with that? Civil hearings and such can be by video. Does anybody disagree with that? So the one remaining issue that I don't think we're going to resolve today, that Mona, we need to put on the list, is this issue about whether non-adversarial criminal is an area to explore further for video or just to leave it alone.

Any other questions about Pete's presentation so far and the responses to the issues raised? Does anybody disagree with any of the items in the report?

MR. FINKELSTEIN: I don't know that I disagree, and I know Pete touched on it and we talked about it last time a little bit, and I'm not advocating this. The split of criminal and civil. I don't know. You guys have looked at it here in the County Commission before. My only concern is, I just don't want to see us be so tight that we have nowhere to go. My clients, who are indigent, in order to come see their lawyer, have to pay \$8 an hour to park. It's absurd. They don't have \$8 an hour to park. I'm worried about whether or not we can do what we need to do, and we need to do something. I don't want to go to Pompano where the jails are. I like coming downtown for the same reasons everyone else does. I just want to make sure we have explored and can really accomplish what we need, and Chief Judge Tobin brought this up last time and I never thought of it because I've never practiced civil. If you have a practitioner that practices both civil and criminal, it does become difficult if you have different cases set in the morning, so I have become recently sensitive to that. I just want to make sure we're not going for a quick fix here downtown and regret it in seven years.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: We're on page 10, question 6.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: Yes. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: On starts on page 10, question 6. Really on page 11, is where you start talking about -- third paragraph, one option was to move the criminal courts.

MR. CORWIN: From a practical dollars and cents prospective, if there isn't existing building or land sitting there to accommodate them quickly, there is really no

savings. It's actually cheaper to make one big one. I think I would agree with your premise. (Inaudible). Do you agree we want to make this courthouse adequate for now with meeting the needs in the near term? I don't think that is debatable. We're not looking for a shortcut to cut and run and it won't be, when you see the price tag, this is not just a band aid. This is bigger than a band aid. There is no land just sitting there or a building sitting there for criminal courts.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: The county doesn't own the land where the Pompano jail is?

MR. CORWIN: Yes, but if we took it for a courthouse, even if it was suitable, where would the next jail go? They are hard to site.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Any other concerns about any of the material covered in the responses to the issues raised last time?

MR. DURDEN: I know the -- we disagree on this whole public/private partnership issue. I guess Commissioner, I don't see how a body should, I don't --

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Hold that thought. One of the subcommittees that -- we will be talking about financing and different ways of paying for a courthouse.

MR. DURDEN: And it seems the only option would be the county to finance itself, and I raise the third option in a public/private partnership. I know that Pete does not agree with that, but if our only option is for the county to spend reserves to build it, I think that option becomes a little more viable.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: I don't mean to cut your discussion off, but we are going to be talking about financing today after the sub-group that is talking about financing options, comes in with recommendations, so I'm simply asking you take a breather and bring the same issue back up when we get to that subcommittee report.

MR. DURDEN: And the ones for office space, not court space but office space, I think understand if attorney's office (inaudible) there is moving out of there. In terms of office space, the clerk's office maybe -- the state attorney's office, I mean it's already designed for that kind of --

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: We're on page 9, question 5.

MR. DURDEN: So I think in terms of, and they are losing space there and I think you can get an attractive offer if we lease it now, so --

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Let's have Pete respond to that. Let's go back to the 110 Tower and whether it's a viable option.

MR. CORWIN: In terms of the optional leasing, we're looking for the long term and want to own it. I think I would agree with you -- when we renegotiated something we did a couple of weeks ago, they were less than flexible then we thought they would be. We didn't get anywhere. One would suspect they would be motivated. They would love to lease us space. What you're trying to address here, should we buy it if it was for sale which I isn't? What would be the up and downside of owning it? And you are absolutely right. For the state attorney, it's perfect. As soon as you get into other applications, what part of the clerk's office would go over there, hardening it, there is significant issues.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: In analyzing whether we would be better off in leasing versus owning, owning is less expensive, and in our recent negotiations with the 110 Tower to extend an existing lease, though logic would tell us all otherwise based on the current state of the economy, they were less than aggressive in seeking to retain us at a reasonable rate.

MR. DURDEN: What I'm hearing in my meetings, is they are in trouble. They are amenable -- that is what I'm hearing in my meetings.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: I started by saying logic would tell us otherwise. The hot off the presses news is Pete's negotiation with them and the lease extension that we just approved, which shows no indications that they are the slightest bit concerned about what they are charging. Is there anyone who thinks and maybe we should deal with this issue right now? Is there anyone who believes its better long term for the county to expand its lease space than to own?

MR. FORMAN: I (inaudible) --

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: A, it's not for sale, and B, it's not a reasonable rate, and C, the cost of renovation could exceed the cost of building a new courthouse, which is what Pete's analysis has shown us. I could don't think anybody disagrees with the if you could buy it at a reasonable rate. It's just not an option at the moment. And one of the options we will be talking being about today, is if we need to relocate the state attorney, because we're demolishing something they are in before we have a new space, or if we have a new space before we have to demolish. That would really drive the issue of leasing.

Any other areas of disagreement? Okay. Pete. On to number 2, parking.

MR. CORWIN: I avoided parking last week because this gets emotional and we have all had stories. I have been in here and watched client or someone else, and despite signs, you find yourself trapped, if you will. We don't like charging eight bucks an hour. We can't wait to not charge eight bucks an hour. It's really simply there is a deterrent so we cannot make money but conserve our spaces. Here's the simple facts in terms of what we have. For employees spaces, we have 1878 in those three spaces,

east garage over here having most of them. In terms of the rest of the east garage, it has 828 spaces and it's divided, if you notice, one side is employees and the other side is the paid or free parking for the jurors. Jurors are priority paid parking and then free parking for witnesses, state employees and non-profits. You can see our best estimate, because obviously these spaces turn over, and at any point in time, you can take a snapshot, but jurors are the biggest user of that space.

One of the issues for the Board to grapple with is who should get free parking. I didn't put Task Force on here, but if you want free parking, I'm sure Howard will accommodate us.

We, as staff, would like to take a hard look at this and either make a little money, maybe get a preferred rate, or better yet, free up some spaces. Those are tough decisions because while it doesn't happen in other jurisdictions, it's been happening here for long, long time.

Let's look to the future. Today our consultants looked and said you need 500 spaces. That is because you are crowded and you're going to lose 240 spaces to the New River hotel. One thing I mentioned earlier, our IT folks are moving out, so we gain some of those back, about 165. The net of all of that would mean if we could move 500 today, we would say that is good.

The next need for parking comes when we build, either on the New River or where the Judges currently park. If we build on the New River, it's only 300. If we build on the judicial garage site, which staff prefers, its 400 spaces. Obviously if you need that before construction starts, so there is a place for those folks who are displaced during construction.

When the courthouse opens, since much of the square footage, even though it's going to be bigger, it's basically going to be the same number of court rooms until state gives you more Judges. It will be bigger, but we estimate 500 will be how many more spaces we need to accommodate the new courthouse. As we get closer that number will become more real.

For planning purposes, if we went to the judicial garage site, we could be looking at about 1400 spaces that we need to replace. This graphic, if you will, and there will be a sub-group talking about parking, gives you some potential places for a parking garage to service the courthouse. Each one has a story. Site A is really two owners. One is for sale. The other half is not. It wouldn't be a bad site for the New River Courthouse. Other than that, Andrews is a pretty formidable barrier to cross.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: It may be helpful if you point to the sites while you are talking.

MR. CORWIN: And I think we have good handout for you, so site A is west of Andrews. Even if it was servicing the new courthouse that might be at the New River site, the best way to get there would be to go under the bridge. Half of it is clearly not for sale.

Site B is, that is potentially a site for – a potential future site for the state attorney, PD. It's suitable to put parking under it. And it's still very viable for the future.

Site C, we go back on the other side of Andrews. This is a site which one owner, if you will, they are in the City of Fort Lauderdale for some site plan approval, they might be interested in some kind of joint partnership arrangement where they build it, but generally speaking, they don't want it sell it.

Site D comes back over to our east garage. We can put two more floors on it and get about 800 spaces, but anyone who parks there knows it's a tough place to get in and out off. Our consultant measures that by levels of service. It pretty much gets an F today. We can bring it up to a C, but if we add two floors, it gets marginal. It a tough sell, although it's an option. One floor might be better than two.

At site E, let's do that one. That is on the corner of 3rd and 6th. The owner of that site is very interested in a -- again some sort of a joint, I guess you call it a build to suit garage. And that site can accommodate about 500 cars and is certainly a very convenient site.

Let's move east. The one there, that is H. That is not for sale per say. That is one owner. The same owner owns the one directly to the west, the Comcast site that is shaped like an L. They too would be interested in a build-to-suit type of arrangement where they would build a parking and that site obviously can hold more.

The other site directly across from the parking garage, great site, two owners. I believe, however, there is one person or firm that has options on the property and they too are very interested in a build-to-suit garage for the county.

So that is what is there and there will be a sub-group to talk about that.

Let me just turn it the next slide we can address. The process to get from here to a garage that we'd like you to consider is the county could seek a developer. Each of those sites has a different story. Some of the land is for sale. Some of it isn't. There are several folks that would be interested in competing for construction in this garage. They bring the land; they design it and build it. Ideally there would be an operator in that too. We recognize other people could do it better than us. Especially with an eye towards maximizing our revenues. If we could create extra capacity, we know that

there's other opportunities to make a little more money. Any kind of procurement would have to look for the future. There are at least three phases of development. How much might it cost? We don't know, but the cost slide basically shows, we guess 20 to \$25,000 per space, plus the land and revenues. If you base it on 1400 spaces, you are \$28 to \$35 million. Our consultant estimates this goes out about five years. If we were charging market rates, not the eight bucks an hour but closer to four, and we had some extra capacity, they are looking at about \$400,000 in year four. We project about \$600,000. Today, we are netting about 400, bringing in about 500, 550, because of the exorbitant rate. This would be a much more reasonable rate, and we think an operator could maximize that and maybe do better. That brings us to the end.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. Before I ask if there are any questions, suggestions about parking, I notice you were drawing your own parking location, Scott.

I just want to remind everybody, if haven't turned the survey in that you were supposed to bring with you and sign, please make sure Mona gets that right away.

MR. CHITOFF: What is next to the proposed courthouse site on the corner of Andrews and 6th? There is a privately owned building. I was saying to Jose, if you moved the whole thing over, expand it over, make a walkway over Andrews and you avoid walking across Andrews and you have -- site C could fit 1200 spots.

MR. CORWIN: I see what you mean. The downside of C, he has made it very clear that he is not a willing seller.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Some of the landowners are more willing than others, and I guess, Greg, this goes towards your public/private partnership, if there was an opportunity for one, it's probably a form of one through the parking garage because

we have had some discussions with owners who would build us a garage if we would allow them to operate the garage.

MR. CHITOFF: I spent a lot of time in Palm Beach recently and there is a walkway to the west of the courthouse, coming across the road. I don't think coming across Andrews is the issue.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: So did we find the right spots? Are there spots we're missing? Are there concerns with respect to a 500 space parking garage?

MR. CORWIN: And there is a breakout group this.

MR. DURDEN: My question is, is that enough?

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Pete, is that enough?

MR. DURDEN: Should there be more than that?

MR. CORWIN: I think the 500 is enough for today. If we were confident the courthouse is a go and I hope we are, we would do at least 500 plus the 200 and the 400 so you could approach 1000 very easily. There would be another debt, but I don't think we want to get out there simply holding on to our money too far in front of this. While there is some revenue potential, we're basically building a juror/employee parking lot. The plan would be -- it would seem logical, but it seems logical to maximize this for the paid uses, move your employees to a site that is hopefully convenient but not in the big garage. If we built a garage down here, that is not going to bring in money.

MR. DURDEN: The idea is to create more eateries and places to go to. I guess my question is, the 500 number, is that sufficient to include the expansion of businesses on the south side of the river?

MR. CORWIN: It probably doesn't take that this to account. One thing I should have mentioned, when we say we need 500 today, the consultant just didn't look at it as we did. (Inaudible).

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: To get to his question, is there room in this discussion for a public public/private partnership, which is given Fort Lauderdale's concern about building a different infrastructure south of the river, could Fort Lauderdale contribute to -- am I hearing what your question is?

MR. DURDEN: We're willing to --

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: -- contribute to a garage that would be oversized for our needs and would address their needs.

MR. CORWIN: Good point. That is an excellent point. It went over my head. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Any other questions? Okay. Then we will move on to reduce the size the courthouse.

MR. CORWIN: We wanted to discuss three ways that we could potentially reduce the size of the program, as we have it now. I have to clarify this when I talk about the 10 foot room addition. We if we make it a part of the bigger courthouse, I believe we can save some money and save some space, but if the decision is to delay the construction of the courthouse, that 10 building addition would still make sense. There is going to be an opportunity that I'll show you in a minute. I have worked with some of the judicial agencies to reduce the square footage. Courtrooms and chambers are still the subject of a breakout group today and we are working with our consultants.

This is a chart we showed you last week. I added -- you can see how the courtroom chambers -- the number of square feet and the projected space needs for 66

court sets, litigation spaces. Sixty-six won't do it, unless you do the 10 courtroom addition. The second number, the 310 adds the useable space. It includes 76 litigation spaces. No small courtrooms. Before we keep going, it includes 76, just being reminded right now that we have 67. That is why 66 won't work. Turning the page and that goes to Howard's concern, let's not build it. Here is the logic of the 10 courtroom addition. There is 70,000 square feet of usable space for the courthouse. If we added the courtrooms to a new courthouse we can cut out a minimum 16,000 square feet of auxiliary space, if you will. Also our project manager here will be love to do this after the old courthouse is torn down and if we go ahead with the big courthouse, the civil family courthouse, we would rather have one project frankly than two.

So the 10 courtroom addition is great when need criminal courts. If we combine sort of beef up the civil family, (inaudible) we will create three courtrooms in the north wing by simply moving over the delinquency courts.

So looking at some judicial agencies and our logic is pretty straight forward, we looked at what is in the space program. We provided for a 10 percent increase in today's staff, and essentially provided the same square foot for employee. (Inaudible). PD, get them out of leased space. They would stay here in the north wing and that is a reduction of the original plan of 67,000 feet. State Attorney, basically if they stay in the east wing, our recommendation is based on a 10 percent increase in employees. Basically the same square feet for employees and reduction of 46,000 square feet.

Then court administration, basically the same, taking a look at them. They are in the east end and north wing and we can reduce that by 27,000 square feet. Again looking for a modest increase in employees.

The Clerk, we really haven't worked with yet. The Clerk under the original plan, we would have remodeled major portions of east wing. The Clerk would have gotten an additional 70,000 square feet. The fact that we're leaving some people in the east, like the State Attorney, we need the bottom line of our recommendations (inaudible), I still haven't had a chance to get with the Clerk. We're going to have it do it between now and the next meeting.

This is kind of a where we are. You can see if you add up those reductions, it comes to around 160,000 square feet. We think we're moving in the right direction.

That brings us to courtrooms and chambers. Just to reminder. 410,000 square feet for the 76. The question becomes, how many do we need? If we apply that same 10 percent factor, and today that looks very ambitious, given the likelihood of funding from the state, but it's a good planning factor, if you take the 102 overall judicial officers and increase it to 112, and then you can see how we would allocate that. We do have an opportunity to add two more in the satellite, so 75 litigation spaces, judicial offices, (inaudible). This is an allocation. You will have a handout -- you should have a handout in that pile of stuff. It started with a correction. I gave you the wrong website for the verbatim minutes, but other than that, it's a chart that should replace the chart in the Q & A. It has these numbers in it but gives you a note and has some color on it. The highlighted yellow part will also tell you the litigation spaces each of this uses. This will be a discussion topic for the court sector.

Now we looked at some spaces and this is very much a work in progress, in terms of how can we save space. One the things that is going on at this point in time is that we're coming at it from different angles. The consultants are working on hypothetical layouts and that gives them an opportunity to see how the pieces fit and

how they can squeeze more into less space. So in an efficient design, it's going to go a long way in terms of reducing the size and cost. We have met with the Chief Judge and he has said this before. Looking at areas outside of the courtrooms that could save space, he brought up the idea last time of changing the approach to prisoner holding. That saves consider space that require holding cells. We're looking at everything from a number of different angles and currently the space program has a one-to-one ratio. If you look at what is in front of you, especially those in the breakout group, you can see many of the judicial officers are working in hearing rooms of 400, 500, 600 square feet. In terms of full size courtrooms I think the number is 40. Sharing is necessary to live with. I'm not going to bore you with this. It's on the handout. That is it.

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: A couple of things. I thought about this from the last meeting. You are making projections, but we really need to project out more then the next 10 years. I think that is critical, without get into the reasons which we all understand.

Second of all, you don't know when the legislature is going to say, you know we really haven't created any Judgeships in a while and they can turn around in four or five years and say now it's time. We could end up like we did just a few years ago, with five Circuit Judges one year and five the next. Second of all, kind keep in mind, we can't plan, especially in Circuit/Civic, for courtroom use. I maybe using chambers for hearings and the next hearing is 27 people who show up. Where am I going to put them? Circuit/Civil you have to have courtrooms available. Sometimes you won't know until 10 or 15 minutes before the hearing. You don't know who is going to show up. It this is just for me personally. I could do all my hearing out of a courtroom, if it was set up appropriately. Some Judges like working out of a hearing room and please keep in

mind it's very difficult sometimes to know in advance what you are going to need and not need.

MR. CORWIN: The only thing and this is needs to be tossed around, the flip side to planning for 20 years out, obviously it has to be bigger than the need when you open. That is the push/pull you're going to have it wrestle with. If we have a major courthouse come in out of the ground and meets today needs, the difference of whatever group is going to address this in eight years, they would have other options that are way less expensive than \$300 million, because you have got the 10 courtroom addition, for example, and now you have got a project and you still have to find \$35 million but that is easier then 300.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: And also one of the thoughts we had early on, is that once the first courthouse project is completed, it frees up the ability to build another twin tower or triplet towers, because that whole middle portion would be available, and so we're thinking it's a good point you make because part of what this groups function will be is to take a look at a long term plan with key dates to when we need to work on the next phase. Okay?

Gene, go ahead followed by Scott and Howard.

MR. PETTIS: Pete, I appreciate the balance we are trying to achieve here, what the reality economically is today versus our greatest vision. I think we have a fiduciary duty, as we go to the public with this plan, that we don't do what we did for example on 595, where the year after 595 was opened, it was overcrowded, and today we're going to expand it at much greater cost than if we looked a little beyond the current population when it was first funded.

It is very important that we build this courthouse with that ability to grow because of everything that has been said.

Secondly if we're going to do it in phases, we need to make sure we educate the public that we're building here, we are leaving spaces and it's not a hodge-podge of what we have currently, and that is pieces that really don't go together. They just got stuck together. We need to do it in a very coordinated fashion. I agree with what Pete was saying as a need to push it out further.

When I look down here at your proposed judicial offices, I just think this is way too tight for a project of this size and it would be an example of once it's complete, it's overcrowded.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. Scott.

MR. ROTHSTEIN: What is the difference of the size of the courtroom facility we need per Judge and current technology as opposed to where we expect to be technology wise when we get to actually build this courthouse?

MR. CORWIN: Good question. We have been wrestling with that with our consultants. Until you -- and I think as Judge Weinstein said, every day might be a little different. Some hearings you're going to have a lot of people show up.

My own simple answer to that, and I really don't have a good answer to it, is the technology will help mitigate some of that growth, as opposed to something I could write down, right now, today.

MR. ROTHSTEIN: But deciding what we're going to do with the Judges, have chambers, courtrooms, don't we really need to understand what they really need to operate from a technology standpoint, especially from Howard's offices and the like.

Pete was is talking about -- and it's not an exaggeration, if we're paperless, that eliminate huge amounts of space. Don't we have to have a real grasp on that?

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: Storage space.

MR. ROTHSTEIN: The amount of additional offices because we don't require file cabinets is astronomical.

MR. FORMAN: The new 10 court building, if we build those, before we build the courthouse where are all the employees going to be? It might be a more global to build a courthouse. (Inaudible).

MR. CORWIN: Well that is a good question. The answer I'm going to give you, there is really isn't a plan. If you do just the 10 courtroom addition, that becomes your growth. You're either in one big building or the addition. The 10 courtroom addition can accommodate those new Judges, if the state would fund them and we could easily put a couple of floors on the top floor for the State Attorney and PD. That's easy. Maybe you could do the same for the Clerk, but again that would have to be planned out. If it wasn't then you had been sitting there with the additional three or four per Judge and no place to go.

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: Some for example even with changes in technology you have a two to three week trial. You have to bring in 40 to 50 jurors to whittle it down to a reasonable number. You don't want to be spending three days working with that group of people by dividing it in half. You really need room for 50 people just in the jury box and the spectator section to go through. In criminal, we do that on a regular basis.

MR. FORMAN: Another question.

You talked about new super satellite courthouse. I don't know if this is in your plans, especially if you are going to get Judges and have more employees. (Inaudible). Are you looking for any space for such?

MR. CORWIN: We're not. It's as somebody mentioned once this is done it's important to have a phased plan. What is next? And that is part of that answer, what is next.

MR. FORMAN: That will be part of the phased plan?

MR. CORWIN: We don't have a site, but it's something you could do you.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: In our third meeting we're going to be discussing what are our next steps and part of that will be the development of consensus as to a phased master plan to determine, after this project, what is the next step, what is the next step, what is the next step, because I don't think there is anybody at this table who doesn't believe that there will be additional growth in all areas and so if you can master plan it, it will make it that much easier even though none of us maybe here to see that next step.

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: We have a number of senior Judges who come back and finding space for them is a huge problem. You talk about how many courtrooms and chambers, things like that. We have no place to put these people and some are willing to come back and work and it's a huge help for the court system, but you have to have something. They have no place to even hang their jacket. That is how bad it is.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay, so one the concerns will be senior Judges. It's not been discussed before, but we need to look at that. Other questions for Pete on courthouse options? Okay. Thank you, Pete.

Next on our agenda, I'm pleased to bring back Mona Gordon and we're also thrilled to have Elyse and Ruth, who we had at our last session as well.

Mona will first go over areas where she thinks we had agreement, the area where we have concerns, and then we will be discussing those issues. I just want to remind everybody there may be some differences of opinion. That is okay. Mona's job is to try to flush out where we agree and those issues will be off the table if we agree, so we can focus on the ones we disagree on.

MS. GORDON: What we're going to do here, so you understand, is we're going to have visuals, so all of you will be able to tell where we are in agreement; where we need discussion, and also identify what those concerns are. We may not necessarily get to the full discussion on each concern today, but it will move to either a sub-group or move to our next meeting because of time. I have to be the task master of time.

The first one that we wanted to let you know where we've quite a bit of agreement is one, there is 14 of you that actually put in your input on how you agree or don't agree. One of you felt out of 14, that a new courthouse may not be critically needed and so I'm going to suggest is that something, is there a reason for that? Is there a concern that maybe we should just stay with the courthouse we have and not make a change?

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Who is that person, so maybe they can share their concerns?

MR. FINKELSTEIN: What I said on mine was I don't know whether or not new or remodeling is the best thing, but we have to do something. I'm okay with either, but I don't have the expertise or knowledge to tell you whether building a new building or – I mean, no matter what I opine, if you listen to me you're an idiot.

MS. GORDON: I appreciate the fact you're willing to admit you don't have that knowledge. Thank you, very much. Can we move that into agreement?

MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm not opposed to it at all. Anybody who says we need a new courthouse, I don't have an objection or even anything to say to them. I just don't know have the knowledge or experience to opine. I'm okay by myself.

MS. GORDON: Obviously my job is to bring us to consensus, and unless you have a reason not to agree, I'm going to assume that because you don't disagree nor agree, we can move it into agreement.

MR. MORTON: Howard abstains.

MS. GORDON: It's very endearing.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Next issue.

MS. GORDON: Renovating the old courthouse is not cost effective. I believe Howard --

MR. FINKELSTEIN: The same thing. I don't know. Pete tells me so. It makes sense to me. I'm just saying you are talking about a public defender who has been a criminal lawyer for over 30 years. I have no idea.

MS. GORDON: But you wouldn't hold up an agreement over the fact that you don't know.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: I'm the Public Defender. Of course I would.

MS. GORDON: The numbers tell us that if we -- it's more expensive to renovate than rebuild.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: That was part of Pete's presentation and he showed you what the costs are.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: I don't disagree. I just don't have an opinion on it.

MS. GORDON: Thank you. Then we will move it to agreement. Given the risk of building system failure our priority is to concentrate on the new courthouse.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: Same thing.

MS. GORDON: Okay.

Postpone other projects in bond issue. Save \$58 million. I believe 13 people are in favor of saving the money. So we have one --

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Who is that, so we can hear the concerns?

MS. GORDON: We want to hear your concerns. This is a way you know -- should we come back to this one?

MS. BATES: I didn't answer that because I didn't know what other projects you had in the bond issue, but you can move that over.

MS. GORDON: Do we need to get some further information for you?

MS. BATES: Yes.

MS. GORDON: Okay. Agencies, we had two people not in agreement on that and we would like to know their concerns.

MR. FORMAN: We have 150 employees and 10 divisions in the east wing. They were not listed.

MS. GORDON: They were not listed there.

MR. FORMAN: And they may as well stay there until we know where everybody is going to go.

MS. GORDON: So that is the concern that you have, your lack of representation on that issue?

MR. FORMAN: I think they should remain there, yes.

MS. GORDON: Okay.

MR. DURDEN: Me too. That concern would have been -- like I said before, utilize the 110 Tower to store agencies there, as well as building a new facility, maybe to house the State Attorney. So that was where I was coming from.

MS. GORDON: How do you want us to capture that in your concerns?

MR. DURDEN: In one or two ways. I think the 110 Tower could be used either for long term or short term and we build another facility to house these agencies someplace else because everybody else does it. I think that it wouldn't hurt. We could walk to the courthouse. They could have more space than they have now. I think it would be a better utilization of additional space for them and that space could be used for more courtrooms, and more functions central to the courthouse itself.

MS. GORDON: So did we get that, Elyse?

MR. DURDEN: And short term could be utilized to -- we could build another facility.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: If needed. In other words, if we can't accommodate all of the agencies in the north and east wing, then plan B would be to look at the 110 Tower.

MS. GORDON: I'm going to leave that in concerns.

JUDGE TOBIN: I did write something. I'm not sure if I'm one of the two, but I misread the bullet points. If I'm one of the two, scratch me. I'm in agreement.

MR. PETTIS: I know I was one of the two. We talked last month regarding Palm Beach's style, where they have it outside of the courthouse proper, but it's adjacent to it, and I didn't know in reading this, whether this agency should remain in the north and east wings, whether or not that was prohibiting that type of option. Last time we

discussed keeping some space in the main courthouse by moving these agencies outside, and I didn't want to sign onto to that, prohibiting those options.

MS. GORDON: Make sure we capture that correctly for you. Anything else? All right.

So the new courthouse should provide, and we have got four, I think people, who have some concerns and 10 who are in agreement with the things that the new courthouse should provide.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: And would those four people share their concerns?

MS. BATES: Mine was an oversight.

MS. GORDON: Okay. So we can get that down to three with 11 on the other side.

MR. DURDEN: That is mine.

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: I think I already did about the needs for the size of the courtroom chambers, retired Judges, etc.

MS. GORDON: What I'm going to suggest on this particular one, that this go to the April agenda. Would that be acceptable? Is there anyone who can't live with that?

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: The other reason I had a concern, which was something raised, was the far term as opposed to the near term.

MS. GORDON: So can anyone live with it going to the April agenda?

MR. PETTIS: Meet the needs of near future, not long term. I think we will be violating our duty here if we're looking to short sight. I think we need to look long term. Not to predict in 50 years how many Judges we're going to have, but not to build a facility of this magnitude under any scenarios that can't house growth in the near future.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: So the issue is how long is near?

MR. PETTIS: How long is near. I think we certainly should be out 10 to 20 years. We can't go to the public with this type of project too often. We need to be able to look beyond.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Any other concerns that anyone feels they want to raise on this particular question?

Okay, Mona, go ahead.

MS. GORDON: Moving on, identify options to meet future space needs once old courthouse is demolished. We have three with concerns, 11 in agreement.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: And the three with concerns are?

MS. GORDON: It had to do with building and/or parking existing courthouse and retrofit north wing for criminal courts. Any concern over those?

MR. PETTIS: Some of these questions, I'm thinking of one option, that is, new courthouse. When I look at this question it has some components in here that I just don't agree with so I don't support it. I don't think we should be looking right now at a 10 courtroom addition. I think we need to look bigger than that.

MS. GORDON: So your thought is we should not be looking at a suggested 10 courthouse addition?

MR. PETTIS: I think these are band aids. If we build this, what about the quality of the air environment and all the issues we know are co-existing in the current facility? It's another band aid. That is why I didn't support it.

MS. GORDON: Okay. Are you capturing that?

MR. CORWIN: To clarify, these options, assume you do the new courthouse, might building it "x" size, which means 10 years, eight years, you need a way out. These are the projects after the courthouse.

MR. PETTIS: Okay. With that explanation --

MS. GORDON: Does that change your agreement?

MR. PETTIS: If we build as best we can, an adequate courthouse and down the road we need additional space, is this a provision? Yes.

MS. GORDON: Then you are in agreement.

MR. PETTIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: And I had written a comment which said, don't forget to master plan.

MR. DURDEN: Gene and I share the same concerns. The parking on the existing courthouse site -- I'm almost not sure what that meant, whether it meant we're going to tear down the building, so I wasn't clear about what that meant.

MS. GORDON: So there's a little confusion about that more than disagreement. Do we want to address that, Pete?

MR. CORWIN: That first point, very quickly, is the vacant land on the river serves as parking and some day could be a home for the State Attorney and the PD.

MR. DURDEN: Okay. Got you. I'm in agreement. Okay.

MS. GORDON: I think we've gone to agreement on that one.

The new courthouse needs to be flexible, which may include shell space, office space that can convert to courtrooms, chambers, multiple purpose rooms, shared spaces, movable walls, co-location of division with similar needs. We really had very good agreement around --

MR. PETTIS: We can agree 100 percent. I meant to check that off, and I remembered when I gave it in I didn't.

MS. GORDON: Okay. So flexibility is not a question anymore.

I think the last one has total agreement on security.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: With one thing added. I happen to agree the Judges need to be secure and everything. We made a mistake when we built this new wing. Our juvenile's do not have a way in and out of these courtrooms. For you who have not seen it, it is one of the biggest disgraces in the county. You have all these young children who are handcuffed with belly chains and feet chains being paraded in the halls, and I just want you to think for one second; your kid, 17, gets bused with a joint. The next thing you know, he is being brought down these hallways. People are looking and pointing. It's so emotionally traumatic. There needs to be some type of entrance where you can get them in and to the courtrooms without parading them down the halls.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Pete is nodding in agreement.

MS. GORDON: Wonderful vision.

MR. CORWIN: I'll add it. You are absolutely right.

MS. GORDON: So these are the things we're in agreement which means we have just moved on and there are other things we need to get agreement around. We will not be coming back to revisit this. Anybody who cannot live with these agreements? I will take silence as consensus.

These are things we have concerns. Some of them will go to the sub-groups. Some of them will go to next meeting's agenda. We will decide that fairly quickly and you will know today if you get it in a sub-group or we will let you know whether it goes to next week.

Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: We're ready to move on. We have two different sets of sub-groups today and we're at 2:20. We will give about 25 minutes for the first set of sub-groups and then for the sub-groups to bring in reports and have discussion, you have about 15 minutes, and then we go to the second set of sub-groups.

The technology sub-group which will be meeting here, on my left, are Carol, Chuck, Howard, Howard Forman, Linda, Jose and Margaret.

The Courthouse Task Force, which is to my right, are Gene, Greg, Scott -- this Scott, Peter Weinstein, Victor, and the other Scott. You guys go there.

(At this time, both sub-groups met individually.)

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: If everybody could go back to the table.

We're going to hear first from the Courthouse subcommittee and Judge Tobin will give his report.

JUDGE TOBIN: What we propose I am not sure -- we're unsure whether it's 600 or 700. We're in 440 thousand square feet right now. So right now we thought we were at 600 but Pete Corwin was saying something else. We don't know what the footprint of that building will be. We're thinking maybe 40,000 square feet. I'm encouraging them to look at other things. The Judges would have no hearing room. You would simply get an office, a secretarial area, a restroom and courtroom for the Judges. We fashioned it similar to the north wing. We're assuming and we should be forcing everyone to go paperless to effective a space savings on all the file cabinets and all of that material that we presently have. So we need to be paperless, and we need to be on board when we

go in this building. The Circuit, the Civil, it would look basically like it is on the ninth and tenth floors. We're all familiar, for those of us who work here, except no chambers and obviously a different floor plan so we have two travel routes. We have delinquency. They need a decent size courtroom. It's not 500 square feet. That shouldn't apply. When we move delinquency out of the north wing, we will open up three criminal courtrooms also for advancement in the future, so there will a savings of three court rooms. Then obviously we need the security on the bottom floors. We have three traffic patterns that- inmates, juveniles, the public and the Judges so it's really four. Juveniles and inmates have to be separate. Other than, that -- family also, same thing. Instead of the chambers they are working out of they would have a courtroom similar in size of what they are working out of, around 5, 600 feet, just elevate the bench, for the psychological security of it, give an access so the Judge and bail if something happens in the courtroom. I said there is such a thing of massive calendaring. I don't know how that works but --

MS. GORDON: But you are open to it.

JUDGE TOBIN: I'm open to everything. Don't dump the research project on me.

MS. GORDON: Very good. Good job. All right. Next.

MR. IZQUIERDO: From the technology side, I'll start with the three things that are somewhat identified as the most important; the first being Wi-Fi the entire building so anyone with a laptop or anything can access the Internet.

Second paperless system which was mentioned on the courthouse side, create a paperless system for filings and what not.

And the third that was outlined was visual presentation of evidence in the courtrooms, such as screens in front of the jurors and the ability for them to put on head phones to listen to audio or see any evidence presented.

Then we also discussed security entrance -- I know it was mentioned during the presentation, the biometrics. I know for Howard, many courts for closed circuit visits with the inmates so his attorneys don't have to trek up to Pompano or what-have-you.

We also discussed a centralized interpretation system which I'm a fan of. I know we have a limited number of interpreters for the courthouse for both Creole and Spanish, and any others where this would allow them to be in centralized location while interpreting for many places. Digitized Court Reporting where appropriate, where it's viable. Expand the kiosks. I know the Clerk of the Courts, Howard mentioned has a kiosk system currently in place. It gets a lot of use. Expand its role and how it can be used. Electronic cuing management for individuals who are visiting the Clerk's office, so it would be more efficient in getting them in and out. Video conferencing for the courtrooms. I know that was also discussed in the presentation and how useful that would be in Civil, and document management and electronic signage. We all discussed it.

At various times, we all find ourselves leading someone through the courthouse to a different area. Electronic signage, sending them to the north wing or to any changes in courtrooms would also help the flow of traffic in the courthouse.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Great. Now we need to have Gene, Howard Forman, Howard Finkelstein, Margaret, both Scott's and Victor, go to the funding table. And we have Carol, Chuck, Greg Jose, Linda and Peter going to the parking.

(At this time, both sub-groups met individually.)

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. Who is reporting on the parking? Okay, everybody.

MR. MORTON: I had a parking questionnaire presented to the group. What to do about parking? We have decided that number one, 500 spaces are just not enough. Simply not enough. We could get 900, get 900. The site if you recall Pete was showing us these different sites, and one site was F, that is too small and we shouldn't even consider that. I will talk about the other sites in the minute. The bottom line is we need to start acquiring and heading towards some kind of solution to our parking problem right now, before we can even start to build a courthouse. We need to come up with a plan. The question we're asking for the Commissioners, whatever they do with the RLI, request for Letters of Intent, all these particular sites we can live with. We can't live with F. We want more than 500 spots. These other sites are here are all suitable for us. We ask the Commissioners to start sending out Request for Letters of Intent, just to find out what is out there. Are people willing to partner with us? Are people willing to sell? Comcast may be up for sale. It may be a good site for us to buy. If we can partner, let's partner, but let's get the request up and get started right now so we can find out as soon as possible what we should do.

Judge Weinstein mentioned also this was not a part of the site here, that we should consider the building just east of the 110 Tower, the courthouse square building we're talking about as a potential site as well we should look into. Should we charge people to try to generate revenue? That is going to depend on the RLI, but if we do

generate revenue and charge for these spaces, who should pay? We have decided that witnesses have to come to the courthouse and we do not believe that employees of the courthouse should have to pay. However, outside agencies, other people who come to this parking lot, they have their own budgets. They can be reimbursed. They should have to pay. That will be a revenue generating source for us in the parking lots.

The question was, how far should the employees have to walk. Naturally that depends on what we get. Sometimes we may not have a choice. All of the sites that we have here that are suitable that was agreeable to us, we saw no problems in getting those sites and they will just have to walk, but the sooner we can get started on that, the sooner we can get the parking situation straight, perhaps we can tear down the judicial garage and maybe start building a courthouse. That is really what we have to do. How much to provide parking during construction, we have a number of options here, basically was it, BSO and --

MS. GORDON: -- we're going to have it look at it.

MR. MORTON: But the main recommendation was, let's get started with some Request for Letters of Intent and see what we can get to improve our parking greater than the 500 limitation.

MS. GORDON: Excellent job.

MS. ROSENBERG: I'm going to report for the group.

What we quickly came to consensus around was that it's incumbent upon this group not to increase the burden on the taxpayers any further, so they decided that going to the voters was just not a viable option up to at least five years, so we watched through a handout from Pete that had some recommendations about project deferrals, and came to consensus around most of those, with some concerns about the amount of

money on a couple of them. Then we looked at some potential funding sources and identified we have a gap between \$150 and \$210 million that we need to fund. We decided to look at Certificates of Participation and other non-voter involved ways of borrowing in order to fill that gap.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Excellent. Mona, we're ready for location.

MS. GORDON: Good. Pete, you are on.

MR. CORWIN: I will be very brief.

You have seen the slides last time and they are in one the tabs. As we have established, the Board probably a year ago, after the bond issue failed, said look around, what are some options, went through many of the discussions you had. What is better? Is there another place to do this and essential they came back and made a policy decision.

Subsequently to that, we had a workshop maybe six or eight months later where our consultants looked at a number of sites around the courthouse and after much discussion and much debate, and I think for very good reason the Board came to the conclusion that the two best options are county owned land. We avoid eminent domain and the cost of acquiring. The New River site, we lose 200 spaces. You have to replace those surface spaces and the judicial garage site we lose 300 spaces. Staff believes that the connectors, an ability to connect to the east wing and the main jail is easier and would work very well. We had a discussion with one the groups earlier about the potential of broadening the base. What you are looking at new surrounded in red is more of a (inaudible) but it would be a very viable site. Our consultants like it because it's visible.

If I go back on the New River some of the downsides would be (inaudible). Also the configuration of it and the access to it. It's not on a major street. If you are on Riverwalk and ask a question even a simple as where is the courthouse, as terms of driving directions, the streets are not designed frankly for that. So let's flip. I think they have properly covered the pros and cons. Both sides are about 1.4 acres. We talked about the front door. Just access for construction. If you want to put a value on the spaces it's about \$500 million and losing 400 spaces the value is about \$10 million. One added complication, the parking group sort of dealt with it by saying we will figure it out and live with it. During construction, you would lose those secure spaces. If we built on the site there would be parking underneath, not as much, but interim we would have to figure out how to provide some level of security. Those are the pros and cons.

MS. GORDON: What we're really looking at is actually talking about these two different sites and what your opinion is and sharing what your concerns are. We want to capture that.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: And if you can figure out which this group thinks is the better of the two sites today, that would be a good thing.

MS. GORDON: We would really move light years ahead if we could come to consensus today.

MR. FORMAN: West garage, where does everybody go who parks in the west garage park?

MR. CORWIN: During construction? The two options we talked about and there could be three by the time we get to construction. The three options would be A, part of the east garage. It's not secure coming over but we could provide at least a segregated area. The second option would be to divert the people parking here to some other spot.

You're not in a real traffic area and there is a secure access into the north access. We could bring people in. The next option and the third one would be if it's timed properly, you still have the garage and likelihood it's not connected but possibly this one would be a -- I forgot the number of it, that might offer -- I don't know about a connector but it's certainly a straight shot. It's a downside.

MS. GORDON: And you're looking at just all -- everybody's parking, but mostly for the most high risk employees.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Is there a possibility to lease spaces for the Judges in the 110 Tower?

MR. CORWIN: It's possible. To date they have not been open to that. We had that discussion earlier. By the time this happens who knows?

MS. GORDON: High risk employees for security.

MS. O'NEIL: If you got parking spaces in the 110 Tower for the Judges, are they going to have to walk all the way around the courthouse to get into the back? They are not going to come into the front entrance in the courthouse where there is mass people. That is what security is at.

MR. CORWIN: Right.

MS. O'NEIL: So if you are across the street, unless you can get into the courthouse without going by everyone else, security is out the window.

MR. CORWIN: To get Judges away from people per se doesn't make them secure. Back here there is not as much activity but it's also not covered.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: The whole parking lot isn't covered but we could do a little canopy as you get close to the building.

MS. O'NEIL: I am not talking about whether the weather is going to be good or bad. How would they get in? Right now they come in through a secured location through the garage.

MS. GORDON: What I hear you saying is, at this point the security issue, you don't really feel is addressed yet well enough.

MS. O'NEIL: With the 110 Tower.

MS. GORDON: So noted.

JUDGE TOBIN: I think that would be corrected by just putting a slide card in a different location where we could enter a different door. I think we need to take a look at while in the construction phase of going back and perhaps getting spaces at the (inaudible) and buses. During the construction phase, we can think start about starting to bus people. I was opposed to it before. During the construction phase, we need to start thinking outside the box here and if people can be, whether jurors or employees or who it is, something else, we could move a lot of cars out there from what I remember of the plan. It was 300 some odd spots.

MR. CORWIN: Yes.

JUDGE TOBIN: Those are out there for --

MR. FINKELSTEIN: How long is the construction period?

JUDGE TOBIN: 18 months, I saw.

MS. GORDON: Anything else in security and parking? What else on the location?

MR. PETTIS: With that issue being addressed, or will be addressed, I don't think there is a comparison to the two spots. I think the side on the left, the perfect square there --

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: That is the judicial parking garage.

MR. PETTIS: I think that is where we select. There was a comment made if we could get consensus today as to the location.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: We have a request for consensus. Is there anyone who feels differently and prefers the New River site to the courthouse site, the judicial parking garage?

JUDGE TOBIN: I second that.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Mona, we have consensus and we're done 20 minutes early. Don't leave.

Our next meeting, it should say on your agenda, I think our next meeting is April 3rd. That is scheduled to be our last meeting. And so at that point we will be looking to have consensus on parking and just like you had a take home test, look for your take home test on parking, technology, financing, Pete, and courthouse issues. Fill it out before you get here. Sign your name on the bottom, make a copy for yourself so you remember what you checked no on and make sure you give it to Mona when you get here. Now, it says on your agenda the meeting starts at 1, Gene. My family has this notice about ILST. That is Ilene Lieberman standard time. They tell me I have a 12:45. We have a lot to accomplish in the time we're sunshined for. Please, it starts at 1:00. Have your lunch, do whatever you have to do, but we need to start promptly at 1:00.

Is there anything we missed in today's meeting, any issue anyone needs to bring up? Anything? Then I want to thank Pete, Elyse, Mona, Ruth, all of the individuals who have been here to help us and all of you for putting time aside. I will see you on April 3<sup>rd</sup>.

(The meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m.)

(A copy of the audio recording of this meeting is available upon request by calling Document Control located in Room 336U, at (954) 357-7297.)