

BROWARD COUNTY COURTHOUSE TASK FORCE MEETING
January 23, 2009

PRESENT: Commissioner Ilene Lieberman, Chair
Margaret Bates, Broward County League of Cities
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, 17th 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 January 23, 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: I want to thank each and every one of you for putting time aside from your very busy schedule to help us solve what is a pressing need in our community, and that is usable courthouse space.

I think we're all here today with a common interest, and that is to develop consensus and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners on what a new courthouse should look like in order to meet the operational needs of our court

system, all of the components of the court system, by recognizing the fiscal constraints and realities that face Broward County today in terms of paying for infrastructure.

We may need to think outside the box. We will definitely have to think outside the box. This is a time to be innovative and creative and to think of solutions that really meet those needs. And to do that, we may want to think about how do we maximize space; how do we reduce dependency on lease expenses, because those are outside expenses for us which drive our budget. How do we achieve operational efficiencies?

All of you are here because we respect your opinions and we think each and every one of you can help us as we work through these issues which are facing us, and I wanted to start by going around the table and asking everybody to, even though your name is in front of you, you say your name and tell us if you were appointed by a group; what group you represent, and tell us what your goal is, what you hope to achieve by participating in the task force.

(At this time, all Board members introduced themselves.)

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: The Mayor appointed everybody sitting around the table. If you are at the table, you have been appointed by Mayor Ritter. Please do not send substitutes because I am not allowed to seat a substitute at the table. The only people who can sit at the table are those who are in the resolution approved by the Commission naming each and every one of you.

Before we continue with the meeting, I thought I would go over a couple of quick ground rules. I hope that we will be able to work together as a group, and I recognize that there are a lot of people, passionate people at this table, who nonetheless have

different views. That is okay. I'm going to ask that when you address each other that you use the dragnet approach. Just the facts, ma'am, nothing but the facts. Name calling, adjectives, interrupting people, are off limits for this Task Force. If you have a cell phone, please put it on silent or vibrate. You have a name tag attached to your place card. Please wear it. When you are called upon to speak, please start by saying your name. The reason is, this Task Force, because it has been appointed by the Board, is subject to the Sunshine Laws and we will be going over that in a couple of minutes. Some of you are very familiar with it and some are not. For the purpose of records, if you start by saying your name, they are sure to attribute the right comments to the right people, even understandable by newspaper reporters. This is going to be very difficult, because I know a lot of you sitting around the table have a legal background. Be brief, concise and to the point, with a goal of reaching consensus in all your comments. If someone has said something that you believe is also true, there's nothing wrong with saying, "I agree" and nothing more. No side bars. Some of you are sitting next to people you know really well. Some of you aren't. We're going to mix up the seating at every meeting so everybody gets to know each other and respect each other, but please, no side bars. That's because this is a Sunshine meeting and so minutes has to capture everything.

I'm going to ask, with all due respect to everybody at the table, I think we are all familiar with the shape the courthouse is in, and the purpose of this group is to not beat a dead courthouse, but look at innovative, creative solutions and not rehash problems, but look forward to how do we get to where we need to go and be really aware of realistic solutions.

Number one rule, Howard, you can disagree with everybody at this table. Chuck, you can disagree with Howard and everybody at this table, but we ask when you disagree, you do so without being disagreeable. We live in America. Everyone is entitled to their own opinion even when they are wrong or even when they disagree with me. No interruptions of speakers. Sometimes, and this happens in a group like this, we get very informal and you want to jump in. Please don't. Give everybody the same courtesy. Let them finish. I'm going to try and recognize people, although there will be some formats that will be very informal, just because of records. Strict time frames.

Carolyn, Margaret -- I didn't see when you came in, Linda, so I apologize if I didn't include you in the group. Carolyn and Margaret were here by 1:00. This is Sunshined to start at 1:00. I'd like the meetings to start at the time they are Sunshined. Please work that out. If you need to have a cigarette or lunch or drink, please make sure you work it out so you are here by 1:00. We are Sunshining these meetings. Today's is 1-3. We're ending exactly at 3:00. That is the only time it's Sunshined for. To make that time frame productive, please arrive on time so we can end on time and leave.

I anticipate there will be three meetings, and I want to give you a general idea what these will cover. Meeting one, that is today. Today you have -- there are a lot of people around the room and I'm going to have them tell you who they are, although some I'm going to introduce. The first meeting is to sort of get a handle on the current status, the needs assessment, what does it mean, the bond issue, how do we go forward, just sort of get a handle on where the issues are and to ID those issues that staff needs to look at and research which will impact the ability to have a courthouse.

Meeting two, and that date has already been set and I think it's in your book, it's February 20, and the purpose of that meeting is to look at options and analysis. One of the various options this group has come up with, what are the pros and cons, what should we keep, throw out, what do we need to modify.

Meeting number three, consensus. Consensus is different than winning and losing. Consensus is, "I don't love it but I can live with it, and it works. It's in the best interest of everybody." The goal of this committee is not for anybody to win or lose, but to reach consensus with a realistic solution that will allow us to address this need in our community.

Does anybody have any questions?

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: One point because I already looked at the schedule and I know I will be out of town on that date. Could we check to see the availability of other people?

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Great idea, and I appreciate that, Judge.

Pete, could you please contact everybody's office, get their availabilities for Friday's, and maximize so that we have full participation from the committee? We may re-advertise the meeting on the 20th. Judge, to accommodate you, we need to see everyone's availability. If we need a fourth meeting we will have a fourth meeting, and I know it's an aggressive time schedule. It's like being on motion and calendar and going in and saying, "Oh my gosh, your trial number is up." That is where we're at, so I hope we can achieve what we're here for and I have confidence we will.

We will review all of the options that have been reviewed by the various consultants and we will also hope to look at some new techniques and innovations and design so we can construct a courthouse that will work for the users of the courthouse.

Now, for the first part of our meeting, Purvi will very briefly -- I know for those of us elected, we heard about the Sunshine Law, but for some of you who haven't had any familiarity with it, we thought it would be a good to have her give a very brief overview of do's and don'ts, before we begin our work. Purvi.

MS. BHOGAITA: Sure. The Sunshine Law basically means these meetings are open to the public, with reasonable notice given of the meetings. Minutes need to be prepared and filed. That is why it's very important we don't have a lot of sidebar conversations. Communication outside is not permitted between members of the meeting on any matter that is foreseeable, that may be discussed here, which includes no telephone, no informal gathering and no use of a third party to relay messages.

I think that is as brief as I can do it.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. Any questions for Purvi? All right.

We're now at the point in our meeting where the first presenter is going to be Pete Corwin. Pete is going to walk us through a powerpoint presentation. I just want to let everybody know that we had your notebooks delivered to you so you will have them in time to review them for today's meeting. Some of the documents that Pete is going to reference are enormous and are available to you on the Broward County website at www.broward.org. There is a special page for the Courthouse Task Force, and these documents, the large voluminous documents are listed for you, and you can download them and read them at your leisure.

Before Pete starts, I just want to let you know we also brought here for the Task Force, the consultants and others who have worked on these reports, so that they can, when we go into breakout sessions, be available for questions.

Why don't you start very quickly by telling everyone who you are and what your goal was.

(At this time, all audience members introduced themselves.)

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Pete has been in charge of facilities for a long time, assistant to the County Administrator. Pete is the unfortunate person who gets a phone call at 8:30 in the morning when I go to motion calendar and two of the four elevators are out and everybody is standing around and complaining. He shares our common goal of fixing the courthouse.

I would ask when Pete speaks, do not interrupt him in his powerpoint. Make notes and then we will go around and have a discussion with him. That way he can get through it. While he's talking, however, we can multi-task and I ask that you sign in.

MR. CORWIN: Thank you and good afternoon.

I'm going to try to flow through your notebook. Some of the slides will look better in the notebook than they do up here because we cannot dim the lights.

Let's go to the purpose. Commissioner Lieberman has covered this so the next slide is simply to orient those that are not as familiar with all the facilities that are here. This is in your notebook, tab one. Basically we're in the north wing. There are criminal courts here and the Public Defender. The East Wing, probably where you entered, has the jury room, Clerk of the Courts, Court Administration and the State Attorney with 120 employees including administration. The area to note, the west/central wing of the courthouse, whatever you want to call it, consists of 400,000 square feet. Judges do business in their chambers but also a hearing room and courtroom. There are about 38

courtrooms but 67 Judges or Magistrates that are working in there. That is a fluid number. The point is a lot of courts. Most of the state attorneys are in there. Clerk, both county and circuit, which are two agencies that draw a lot of people, a lot of public traffic. But that is the basics of the 400,000 square feet. You can see where we have leased space, public defenders, state attorney and Guardian ad Litem. We can also can show you the garage, 400 spaces and the east garage which is has about 2200 spaces. Everybody parks there, jurors, employees, witnesses, paid parking, the works, and not to forget the midrise, 60,000 square foot, four story building. It currently houses some BSO operations and our ETPS key operations, soon to move to another building which might be an opportunity for locating probably the PD.

Second tab in your notebook is simply to support what you already reached consensus on. This is an old courthouse. It was built in the 1950's. There have been remodeling projects going on and naturally repair projects that Scott is in charge of on a daily basis. So it's old and difficult to maintain. To described the condition of the courthouse, and we look at it from a building systems point of view, and the way we describe it, every building system has passed its useful life whether it's the electric, plumbing or the exterior shell that is needed to protect against a strong hurricane. Naturally since it was built a long time ago, it was not built to building standards of today, and it's clear for those of you who practice and visit other courthouses, our layout is not conducive to best practices.

As a result, we're now in tab 3 of your notebook. We asked our consultants to do a master plan. They completed the plan in 06. They looked at what you need until the year 2020. At that point in time when they did that, we were getting Judges left and right. We were growing. Things have changed a bit since then. Looking ahead, it's an

excellent blue print to move forward. We just can't afford it. It included the kinds of projects you see here. There's a list in your notebooks. The \$450 million bond issue did not include the ones in italics. The next slide gives you the dollars associated with them. The ten courtroom addition is on the north wing, and needed criminal courts will be there. It's a good project that will happen someday. The remodeling of the north wing, the logic there was to create more courtrooms. Actually where we're standing and where the Public Defender is, someday that might be courtrooms which is a good idea, but that remodeling project is expensive and as the PD moves out of the building, you need to build more space. As you will see later on, staying put makes most sense. Same thing with the east wing. Someday the east wing could be a consolidated wing to the Clerk of the Courts. Ten Courtroom addition on the north wing adds needed criminal courts that will be needed there someday. It's very creative and a good project. The remodeling of the north wing was to create more courtrooms. Where we are standing and up on the third floor where the Public Defender is located (inaudible) and some today that maybe a good idea, obviously that remodeling project to renovate the east wing is expensive and you have to have a little more space. But again, \$19 million. To do this by moving people out you need to add space to the tower and people that would move would be the Court Administration, and State Attorney.

Now the next slide and this is in your notebook, this is a good picture of what we would like to do had the bond issue passed and able to acquire the land. You can see an alignment that runs north and south and that blue tower will be the new Civil Family Court and the 10 court room addition. It's hard to imagine where that is 10 room court is going to be. That is basically all I can say about that. The browns are alternative

places to park which is something that we would get into at our next meeting. That is a discussion in and of itself.

We can't afford this so what options do we have and some of the options that staff has looked at, and I will just -- this is our opinion, our judgment, but we're here for you to challenge that and look into it more closely, but here are three options that we don't think is the right way to go. Remodeling the existing courthouse and put courtrooms in there; remodel existing courthouse without courtrooms or remodel an existing office building. And we will take them one at a time.

The first one would be -- we have 400,000 square feet. What would it take to simply remodel and as I said earlier we look at that building as a user. We look at it primarily as all those building systems that need to be replaced. Simply put, as when I look at the building, the only thing that has long term value that would be around if we remodeled would be the roof and floor structures in between, probably. But the outside of the building, we need to fix it for hurricanes. AC, elevators need to be replaced. Our experience has been you don't save money when you remodel. You get surprises. Always, whether it's your house or a county project, and so let's say it's equal to the cost of construction, for us to move out to do the project, means we have to lease space while we're building the project which is probably a three year proposition. If we could move out, there are not too many courtrooms for rent for circuit civil operations. It wouldn't be hard to find a place for Chuck and the State Attorney, but everything else that goes on in that courthouse, you would have to build it out to those specs.

The next idea, and this might be a little convoluted. This was an idea we liked a couple of months ago. Is there a way to save the old courthouse, move out, just the court rooms and harden it quickly and then come back over time when we have money

and remodel, space for PD, State Attorney and Clerk. The problem is the systems that we investigated to try to harden while in place if you will, harden the exterior while people continue to work, so we got a little excited about it. It was affordable, made sense until we brought in some experts and they told us there are other places that use this and their opinion was it doesn't last and there is some concerns about fire hazards, so again at the end of the day, the other point to be made, we think we could build office space in a new building at the same price to renovate an existing office.

The third option that we considered numerous times, why not just look remodel an existing office building. Now there is only one existing office building in town near the courthouse, looking at the 110 Tower-AutoNation. First of all, it's not for sale. We have talked numerous times. They'd love us to lease more space, but you run into the renovation problems and costs and unknowns. It's a beautiful building, especially if you go from the old courthouse, but remember, whether you look at that building as our construction guys do they see a building built in the 80's. It needs to be hardened. As soon as you touch a building in a big way, if you will, you have to bring everything up to code and that again is an unknown. We haven't done the assessment.

The other thing is, you don't have the floor/ceiling height requirements. If you want to build a Circuit Court to need to take two floors to make one courtroom. Everything is doable, but it's not going to be any cheaper, we don't think, than new construction. So what can we do?

Some options we think are very viable and would recommend you look at. Three of them. One, there is some opportunities to scale back the bond issue projects that we went through. We could postpone the 10 courtroom addition, if a new courthouse is built. I want to pause here and qualify it. If we are building a new courthouse. If we are

not building a new courthouse, we need that 10 courtroom addition to meet the needs of new Judges that some day will come. If we were going to build a new courthouse, we think we could do it cheaper by adding a few courtrooms. Whatever the new number is and do it cheaper.

The other thing and this is a challenge, but this is a real big challenge, we think the size of that courthouse as projected now could be shrunk a little bit and still meet, not our 2020 or 2030 goal, but today's need a little bit. Again scale back bond issue projects. We don't remodel. PD stays in the north wing. State Attorney remains in the east wing, and Court Administration remains in the north/east wing. At the end of the day that is \$69 million that was in the bond issue. If a new courthouse is not built this project is essential. Courtrooms could be added to civil/family tower.

I think I'm on tab 4. Now let's see what is the impact of reducing the space and I will qualify this number in your book. The 600,000 is not a magic number. It's simply to illustrate that you are currently using 440,000 square feet with the whole courthouse and leased space. The program as it stands right now, if -- you can't do court in a modern court with 440,000 square feet. That is not going to work. It's got to be bigger just to have separation. There is no doubt about that. What if it could be done for 600,000 square feet? If you apply our rough estimate, this is a project cost estimate that includes contractor's cost, site work, everything that goes into a project. That is the difference, a \$75 million difference. Now you could do the math anyway you want. You take off a square foot, you save \$400. How do we do that? This is again under space needs and tab 4. This is worked through a little bit, but this simply breaks down and compares the current square feet with the projected space.

Let's start with court admin. Again if court admin stayed where they were, we could meet their needs much closer to 28,000 square feet than 45,000 square feet. That is 250 employees. I know they are not going up and that is the story for another day. The State Attorney similar. 120 people could stay in the east wing. I believe the consultant projected -- I think there are around 540 employees. If we look at where we need, I think we could certainly, obviously bring that number down by keeping the State Attorney in the east wing. The Clerk, there is a difference, a swing of about 60 people between staff they have now and staff in the projected space needed. The Clerk is a little more complicated and needs a closer look. The Public Defender, if they stay in the north wing, our objective would be replace the 20,000 square feet with a little growth factor. So potentially in terms of a new courthouse, that 67,000 projected space would be zero. There is still a cost to replace 20,000 square feet but it's probably 50 percent square foot less to remodel a new building. A good alternative building is the mid rise. It's a building that works, compared to new construction at \$400 a square foot. Guardian ad Litem, I'm sure we can reduce, but we're not going to balance any budget on that. Obviously the space and the money is in the courtrooms and you can't -- I would encourage you, you can't just talk about them and you can't say generically, let's talk about them all. They all have unique needs. There are 12 General Magistrates. Family Court Judges have different size courtrooms or hearing rooms for each set of Judges. I think there are some opportunities and this comes from conversations with the Chief Judge, there are probably some opportunities and way more public space and shared space than you have now. That could be an opportunity to scale that back, but this is a place to sharpen a pencil. One qualifier here is these square feet do not include a building gross factor; interior hallways, but not exterior.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. Why don't we take a breather before we do money, and let me introduce Mona Gordon who is a Project Manager in Human Resources, and Mona is going to handle the questioning and answers and I thought before we go into money, I wanted to separate what we need from how we pay for it to give everybody a chance before we finish the presentation.

Have we missed something? Is there something else we need to look at?

MS. GORDON: So, at this point I guess what we want to do is hear from each of you, if you want to try to talk about what you have heard so far.

MR. FORMAN: It seems that originally we were looking for 800,000 (Inaudible) square feet and if we're going to build less than that by doing the math, 600,000 square feet. We have over 400 now, it would cost about \$240 million. If we don't have a bond issue, we have to find the money elsewhere. If we build a new courthouse without a bond issue, is there some --

MS. GORDON: I think that is what you are all here to figure out. I think that is a good statement to try to capsulate. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Could we just ask when people speak, they speak towards the room so everyone can hear the comments?

MR. PETTIS: I know you were getting some space needs over the last few years and there have been some shifts on how much space we need, how many people are coming to Broward County, the growth factors that may be considered.

Is there a significant difference from what you looked at to come up with these numbers, to what we think we really need going forward?

MS. GORDON: And I think that answer can be handled by Pete at this point.

MR. CORWIN: Simple answer is, yes. If you change the mission from build to the future, year 2030 to meet the immediate needs with -- I don't know how to define it, a little elbow room, one huge advantage of whatever we might have to do in the future, if you could imagine that old courthouse demolished, we wouldn't debate where to put the next building.

MR. PETTIS: My question is a little different.

I think it would be foolhardy for us to say let's get what we need today, because we know tomorrow we may need more. If we're going to the public, use public dollars to build a new courthouse, we need to have some foresight, however, given that foresight, the needs of growth in our areas, have they been trending downward, that may be the space we thought we needed a few years ago. Today's assessments, out of the University of Florida (inaudible) or where you're going to go may not be as large.

MS. GORDON: Would you mind if Ilene answers that question?

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: That is part of what we will be doing today.

The reason we have asked all of the consultants to be here is because there have been some shifts, you're correct, in business operations and demographics and in new cutting edge type facilities, so when you breakdown into your groups, in the Facilities and Operations group, you will be having discussions about some of those issues and how they plan to -- what we actually need in size in the courthouse.

MS. GORDON: But thank you for your statement.

MS. O'NEIL: I just have a question with regard to court sets and reading this yesterday. I was like -- I wasn't quite sure what court set was, but I was under the assumption of having more hearing rooms and courtrooms. Being a county court, we're not assigned a courtroom every day, so we share with county Judges, but we do use

our hearing rooms all the time for hearings. The only times we would use a courtroom is for trials. Are they looking at giving every Judge a court set?

MS. GORDON: I think we are looking at everything. I think everything is on the table. I think we need to get creative and that is what you are all here for.

Does that answer your question?

MS. O'NEIL: Yes.

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: Two things. First of all in the Civil Division of Circuit Court, you never know whether you need your hearing room or a courtroom. It changes all the time. For example, yesterday we did all motion calendars in the morning, and in the afternoon I had an injunction hearing. There were about 20 some odd people who came into this big hearing, so we have got to have facilities available, so I think at least at a certain level the Circuit Judges in Civil are going to need access to the courtroom all the time because we do it on a per issue basis. There are trial dates where you absolutely have to have a courtroom.

MS. GORDON: I think we will discuss more about that in small groups.

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: Okay.

The other thing is, keep in mind, even though we don't know exactly what Florida's demographics will be or the population of Broward will be, the population of the Judges, which has been suppressed because of the lack of funding in the legislature. We used to get new Judges every year because of workload. It's nothing to do with population. Workload.

MS. GORDON: Can we save this for small groups?

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: Sure we can save it, but I want to keep people thinking about the fact it's not just the growth of the county or lack of growth of the county, but

it's the growth of judiciary, where the legislature might look and say, "You know what, we haven't done right, we're going to change things."

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: If I can sum up, I think we're ready to move on to money.

Are there any options that Pete said the county has rejected that anybody in the group says we have to put back on the table?

MR. FORMAN: I think we have to take a real strong look at the tower. I know it's going to take a lot in order to make courtrooms. You have to knock a few floors out. Times aren't that great. Maybe they will want to sell for a decent price. I would look at it until you really totally convinced it's not worth it.

MS. GORDON: Okay and let's capture that in small groups. I think that is a really valid idea.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Any other items that Pete said were off the table that anybody thinks should be on?

MR. FINKELSTEIN: I don't know if it's off the table or not, but listening to the points raised, my concern is, are we going to build something, throw good money after bad and then find and do whatever, we come to a consensus, and then three years afterwards, the State Attorney is going to look to rent places out there and I'm going to be looking.

My question is, and I don't have the business background or building background, should we be considering taking the criminal courts out of here and moving them up to Pompano where the jails are, where there is plenty of land? I know it will have an effect on the business communities down here, but it may also help the business communities in the poorer section of the county.

MS. GORDON: Can we actually look at this in the small groups?

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Are there any other options that people think, how come they didn't think about this one?

Are we ready to move to show me the money, Pete?

MR. CORWIN: I don't want to -- you have a tab in there, I think its number 5 and -- let's just briefly, we have \$60 million for courthouse related projects. The Board has not appropriated specific amounts of money for each project. This is staff's estimate of what could be done with \$60 million. \$34 million is an estimate of 10 courtroom additions. \$18 million is an estimate for the downtown garage and \$8 million for a north garage. Now where could you find money? Whatever your target is, part of that cash could be redirected. If we redirected it from the north courthouse garage, we will continue to have a problem there but we have a problem today and we need to have a temporary solution anyway. The \$18 million will go into downtown parking. A more important number is the \$34 million. It would be our recommendation, if you're building, to make one project and build the extra courtrooms, and put that \$34 million into extra courtrooms. You'd have to grow above 788,000 square feet. If the legislature gave us approval to increase the courthouse facilities fee, it's \$60 million. It would be a huge down payment on whatever comes out of this committee. We could use funds in other capital projects.

The only one is a new jail, \$60 million. One reason it's on this list is that as we look forward, there will be a day when we need a new jail. Quite frankly with the state funding constraints, we can't afford to operate. We don't have \$34 million to staff and operate a new jail. Other options to fund it, \$15 million could come from getting people out of leased space. It's been our experience, it's cheaper to own then lease. We

spend over a million dollars on leases. You have that in one of your tabs. You can see the details. That million dollars could easily replace the 50,000 square feet or more that we currently lease. We're looking for creative options. We need to work with our friends in BSO security. There could be options such as retail opportunities on the first floor. Ultimately it's going to come down to borrowing. I would prefer not to use your precious time to go through a discussion in your notebook prepared by our outside financial advisor. They came to the conclusion that the best options would be a general obligation bond issue, which requires voter approval and repaid with property tax or COPS. COPS does not require voter approval, but would require essentially, we'd have to collect more property taxes to pay off that debt and that comes back to the County Commission needing, probably an extra ordinary vote given the new fiscal constraints the state placed upon us.

This chart shows over the next few years our debt will decrease.. Libraries and parks (inaudible) a lot where we are going to peek in FY 10 and each year after the amount, we have to pay for our facilities. Our debt service will drop by about \$36 million. This is an opportunity to either A, you could go to homeowners associations if our Board elects to, to put this on the ballot and say this won't cost you anymore. Or another way could be if we go request COPS. The other way to do it would be we will increase your taxes in this one part of the budget and decrease your taxes in another part of the budget, so the net effect is no tax increase. That is it in it a nutshell. I would encourage you get into that, call me or e-mail me and we will give you anything you want on the finances.

Very briefly, the Board has looked and discussed alternative courthouse locations. This effort was supported by a consultant who reviewed a number of different

sites. It is narrowed it down to two county owned sites. As you can see in the report, county staff and the consultant prefer the judicial garage site for a couple of reasons. In the New River site, access would be very difficult for a structure this big. The other thing is at the judicial garage you would have a better connector. The downside of the judicial garage is a loss of 400 parking spaces. For about a year and a half where we would have a challenge to provide secure parking under less than ideal conditions. (Inaudible.)

THE CHAIR: Okay. Any questions of Pete?

MR. FORMAN: If the county would ever sell that piece near the river, could you take that money and put into the courthouse.

MR. CORWIN: We have looked at this and even a couple of years ago the market was not that strong. One the advantages of that, you are all going to say we don't want to think too short term. The highest and best use for that piece of property is probably office/garage to service the courts, (inaudible) that could be the State Attorney or PD. The bottom line is we don't think we would get much money for it.

MS. BATES: You said you were not in favor of public/private partnership. Why wouldn't you be?

MR. CORWIN: It's in your book. I expected our Finance Director to be here. They don't think there are enough commercial opportunities in a building like this unless we add several floors and make it, lease it out to attorneys or something. We can end -- we can always borrow money cheaper. The COPS, Certificate Of Participation, would be cheaper money than public/private partnerships.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: All right.

We're now ready to move in our facilitated discussion. Mona will be assisting us. We have two other facilitators with us today. We have Elyse Rosenberg, a manager in Aviation with eight years of facilitation experience and we have Ruth Myles, who is a trainer to Human Resources, with four years of facilitation experience. We have 45 minutes in our facilitation sessions, right Mona, which means I have five minutes to two, so at 20 minutes to three, you will break your facilitation. Please when you go to facilitation, elect a spokesperson and a scribe for your group session and your spokesperson will give a report to the group. That will leave us five minutes for each group report and 10 minutes for discussion and we will be adjourning at 3:00. Everybody got it? Who has the list?

MS. GORDON: Actually the list is already made. Parking lots are off the table until next time we meet. If you want to talk about parking lots or you have any ideas you can get it up here on this parking lot. We will bring it back at the second meeting. Today we want to focus on the two areas. We have Facilities and Operations. Also, we're going to cut you off if you go too long. It's nothing personal. We need to let everybody talk. If you can, let's disagree nicely. On the back of each one of your name tags you have a dot. If you have a green dot, go to Facilities. If you have a blue dot, go to this table. We have experts you can go to. They are not participating. They are only here to answer questions.

Any questions? All right. Let's break. Green. Blue.

(At this time, both groups met for a discussion.)

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Fascinating discussions in both our groups.
Jose, would you like to go first?

MR. IZQUIERDO: Sure, why not?

I'm going to start down here. This is the first issue we began with.

One of the things we discussed was the use of courtrooms, particularly, one of the discussions was revolving around how best to use the space that each Judge would be given, particularly in county, civil, where the Judges would be given, instead of having a hearing room and a courtroom, having one or the other, or a courtroom that would facilitate all their hearings, everything they do including trials. It would be one smaller courtroom for each county/civil.

Another discussion was to have multi-purpose rooms that possibly had movable walls that could be used for either work space or hearing space.

We also discussed the possibility of -- if we have courtrooms for Judges that are smaller than having one larger litigation space that can be used for trials that require having more people in the area. We then moved here to what we have under number 2 here. I think there was a lot of talk about focusing, about having a new courthouse as opposed to try to renovate what we currently have. I think the discussion regarding the funding made a whole lot of sense, focus on the near future -- in other words, the needs that are now, because of the funding issues, pair down the office sections in the courtrooms which we discussed over here and what was required in the space because the space was -- what we're currently using is 440,000 square feet, and we're now discussing the ability to build a building that has 600,000 square feet. What would be required in that space? We would move 56 Judges and everything encompassed within those Judges, their judicial assistants, their work space, the State Attorney's office and

a major section of the Clerk of the Court, moving that which is currently housed in 440,000 square feet and putting it in 600,000 square feet. Logically speaking, that would increase work space for everybody. The shell would allow us to expand later in the future, focus on flexibility. Things that were frowned on that were sent over by staff, including moving the Clerk's office out. Keep the courts downtown. One stop shop for everything. In other words, keep everything in the courthouse. We move over here. The last thing was prisoner movement. There was some talk about how that works and we wanted to follow some the ideas that currently are in the north wing, but no jail cell behind every courtroom because that is a loss of space and lastly, move the juvenile divisions into the courthouse so we would gain three courtrooms that allow jury trials in the north wing.

MS. GORDON: You have got three minutes for questions and discussions and no more than three.

JUDGE WEINSTEIN: You talked about one stop shop. What do you mean by that?

MR. IZQUIERDO: At first the idea was there was some questions brought to the table about what we could have in the courthouse as far as questions regarding renewing of drivers license and registrations, and you'll see here that talks about traffic flow. One the problems with that, I believe my understanding was that we were currently moving a lot of the stuff out of the courthouses because it causes a traffic flow problem with parking and with the public. There was a lot of talk about just leaving courthouse operations in one spot and if everything moves, for instance, to the suburb areas like that, things would work better.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: You concluded the courts all would stay downtown.

MR. IZQUIERDO: No, the main courthouse should stay downtown.

MR. FINKELSTEIN: That is my question.

Why did you come to that conclusion? I'm not saying it's good or bad. It just seems someone should study the availability of what is going on in Pompano and investing up there in that community. It seems to me that is something that should be considered before it's taken off the table.

JUDGE TOBIN: One of the reasons, just to start it at one spot, you have civil as well as criminal stuff. (Inaudible) I know they are not happy in Dade County, so we didn't voice that, but that is part of what I said.

MS. GORDON: Anybody else?

Thank you, Jose. Good job.

All right, Gene

MR. PETTIS: We had Operations, and I'll take these in the order of discussion.

Relocation of non-essentials in the courthouse, ideas, marriage, finance, mediation, depo rooms and human resources, see if they can be placed off site and save space in the main building. Electronic filing and scanning. That is a system that may or may not be studied now, but it will save space. Right now we're just realizing the last couple of months, our hard copies of files are so vulnerable and outdated, if that information is electronic, we don't need as much space to house them and they can be accessible. Secondly, it will cut down with the filing on the traffic in the courthouse because people will file documents as we do every day in Federal Court system from your office.

We discussed centralizing the master calendar. That is an idea that is being utilized in the Orlando/Orange County area and this really ties into determining an

assessment of how many courtrooms are needed to meet the Judges needs, both in civil as well as criminal. Many times courthouses are sitting there open and not needed. If we had a study, maybe we didn't need as many courtrooms to start with. Once they are available we can coordinate them through a centralized master calendar reservation system.

We also discussed integrating technologies. A lot of what we talked about stems around technology, better use of technology, which saves space and time. Technology, coordinating courtrooms and efficiency studies, that is just what I tied into.

Next we discussed the staggering of trials and events, times and dates. Every trial doesn't need to start at 9:00 Monday. Maybe the building could stagger them over time. The issue of night court came up. Seven day operations, looking to see if we could utilize the same smaller facility but get more use out of it through more days of availability. Somebody said family courts and some circuits on done on weekends because that is when it's more convenient for families, again tying into the staggering, so looking at the scheduling and use of courtrooms. Next video conferencing and legal proceedings. More so on the civil side, a lot of lawyers are lining up saying we don't need to be here. We can deal with this in our offices. Save space. The Judges Chambers don't need to be as large. The courtrooms don't need to be in use for these hearings. They can be done by video conferencing. Elimination of building, traffic, et cetera.

Lastly we discussed analysis of what needs to be in the building versus off site. I know Palm Beach, Orange County, the Public Defender's office and the City Attorney's office are not in the main tower but next door. Quick access, but not in the same building, and that is something we need to look at. Again that can save space in the

main courthouse building. Those are the ones we bubble up to the top as being most essential in impacting our operational use of the Courthouse.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Gene.

Questions, comments.

MR. FORMAN: Yes. Good report. To bring you up-to-date a little bit, we have electronic filing in our probate division today. We just got permission from the Supreme Court that we don't need to keep the paper copy, and in our civil division. (Inaudible.) We're in the process of writing that letter. The joint calendar is something that we're going to work, our office will work with the judiciary on. I think it will save a lot of time, hopefully save a lot of money, that may save some space but those are just to bring you up-to-date.

MR. PETTIS: Good. We're moving in the direction.

MR. FORMAN: Sharing technology. I think that is a good idea as long as we keep our money separate, as long as you all voluntarily do it together.

MS. GORDON: Thank you, Howard.

JUDGE TOBIN: You cannot have seven day operations, because you're going to run into all kinds of --

MR. PETTIS: We talked about a study of that.

JUDGE TOBIN: Night court increases the costs. (Inaudible.)

MS. GORDON: So in other words, we need to do an analysis to see if that is something we can or cannot do. We have that on the list.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: And on the research list, are there flexible work schedules that will offset those costs? Night court is an additional cost, if you don't change somebody's work schedule.

MS. GORDON: Yes. So, can somebody capture that for me? All of these things can be studied. Let's look at them before we decide.

What else? Anything else?

JUDGE TOBIN: Traffic tickets can be -- (inaudible.)

MS. GORDON: Thank you, Victor. What else? We're out of time.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Okay. To wrap up from today --

MS. GORDON: And good job by the way.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Nothing is off the table. The two groups did a sensational job.

Between now and our next meeting, staff will do the research asked for and before our next meeting, you will be provided with additional papers to put in your notebook that analyze the items brought up today. We will also ask that we transcribe the group reports from each of the two groups so you will know what the groups talked about and where the analysis needed, pros and cons analysis will be done.

Our next meeting will be -- we will find out everybody's schedule. Pete will give you some dates. Please make sure when that comes in you respond to it quickly. The next meeting will start promptly at 1:00 o'clock.

I want to thank everybody for participating. I ask you to join me in thanking our facilitators who I think did an outstanding job, and all of the brain power at the table to come up with so many wonderful and creative ideas to help us meet the demands of the future.

Is there anything anybody would like to add, talk about operations, scheduling for this Task Force that we should be aware going forward?

MR. FORMAN: If we have any individual questions, we copy Corwin?

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Yes, because he is not a member of the committee. You can call Pete.

SPEAKER: Pete, I know a lot of businesses, like CVS for example, does not really own the building. Is there a thought given to a concept where there is like a land lease and you have to build (inaudible). Has that been considered at all Pete?

MR. CORWIN: It probably comes under the heading in your book of public/private partnerships. Historically, we've come to the conclusion that we can get the money cheaper, but we can take a closer look at it.

COMMISSIONER LIEBERMAN: Are there any other things anybody would like to bring up? Anything about Operations? Okay.

Then we stand adjourned about five minutes early and I thank everybody for their participation.

(The meeting adjourned at 2:55 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.)