



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

Planning • Architecture • Engineering • Interiors • Facility Management

PROJECT: Dixon County LEC – Citizens Committee Meeting #6

LOCATION OF MEETING: Dixon County Courthouse Annex Building, 59140 Hwy. #12, Ponca, NE

PROJECT NO.: 222701 **DATE:** October 20th, 2022 **TIME:** 6:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT:	COMMUNITY/ORGANIZATION:	EMAIL ADDRESS:
Larry Boswell	Allen	boswell@nntc.net
Chuck Chinn	Emerson	chiefchinn@abbnebraska.com
Mathew Michl	Martinsburg	matt67_michl@yahoo.com
Jeanne Blatchford	Maskell	billblatch2002@yahoo.com
John Leader	Ponca	jleader@bop.gov
		leader65@hotmail.com
Kari Lowe	Ponca	kloweplowe7@gmail.com
Dave Armstrong	Rural North	armfarm@nntc.net
Ken Pavlushik	Township	kenp151@icloud.com
Jack Moore	Newcastle	gpajack53@yahoo.com
Cindy Purucker	County Clerk	clerk@dixoncountyne.gov
Lisa Lunz	County Board of Supervisors	supervisordist5@dixoncountyne.gov

MEMBERS ABSENT:	COMMUNITY/ORGANIZATION:	EMAIL ADDRESS:
Ron Mahler	Ponca	debron@gpcom.net
Verlin Hanson	Concord	hansonfarms@nntc.net
Julie Hartung	Dixon	juliehartung@nntc.net
Blake Eisenmann	Rural South	blake_eisenmann@hotmail.com
Tom Decker	County Sheriff	dixonso@dixoncountyne.gov

PROCHASKA & ASSOCIATES:	COMMUNITY/ORGANIZATION:	EMAIL ADDRESS:
Steve Johnson	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	sjohnson@prochaska.us
Curt Field	Prochaska & Associates (P&A)	cfield@prochaska.us

GUESTS PRESENT:	COMMUNITY/ORGANIZATION:	EMAIL ADDRESS:
Don Andersen	County Board of Supervisors	jdandersen@gmail.com
Cindy Geis		cindygeis44@gmail.com
Rich Lamprecht	County Sheriff’s Office	rlamprecht@dixoncountysheriff.gov

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the meeting was to consider options for a new Jail, or new Courthouse/County Offices/Jail, in light of previous information gathered by the Committee. The following points were recorded:

1. A short discussion was held regarding comparisons between the Thurston County and Antelope County Jail facilities. Both were examples of separated Jail and Sheriff’s Offices from the Courts and County Offices, but neither County seemed to complain about the Staff and Inmate transfers back and forth.
2. Curt mentioned the rear utility chase design of Antelope, as well as the “Open” Control station in

the middle of the radiating Inmate Dayrooms, coupled with the use of mirrored glass, to ensure no visual contact between male and female Dayrooms. Other issues mentioned were the differing Vehicular Sallyport sizes, Evidence Storage, and that Antelope had become “revenue-neutral” by housing out-of-County Inmates.

3. Curt showed a slide of Dixon, and the surrounding Counties, to allow consideration of possible Inmates from other Counties which might be housed in a newer Dixon County Jail.
4. The topic of the Structural Assessment for the existing Jail/Courts/County Offices was discussed. The Assessment, as modified by the Structural Engineer’s Supplement had been emailed earlier to the Committee membership, and a few copies were available at the meeting.
5. Clerk Cindy Parucker mentioned that the mold evaluation involved a worker crawling further into the Crawl Space than our earlier efforts, and that moist soil, and deteriorating dry rot, had been observed on the existing interior walls and floor joists in the northeast corner.
 - This is consistent with conclusions drawn by the Preliminary Structural Assessment document, and Curt stated that the joist deterioration had not progressed to the point of causing significant structural concerns.
6. Cindy also provided Prochaska & Associates a copy of the Mold Assessment reporting, and suggested that clean-up of the interior brick efflorescence and mold mitigation would cost the County close to \$16,000, excluding steam-cleaning the carpets. However, the County was told that the mold will return unless the water intrusion sources are sealed.
 - Curt suggested that the worst case—the exposed roof drain piping in the Jail Day Room, could be furred-out and the roof membrane repaired.
7. Several Committee members commented that they did not want to see money spent on restoration of the existing facilities, citing the following reasons:
 - The Courts building had been placed on the Historic Register because of its age, not because it was a significant example of historic architecture.
 - Money spent on restoration of the existing facility would merely push replacement of the facility to the next generation.
 - The degree of ADA non-compliance means that correction would cost more than the previous budget comparisons would suggest.
 - In the end, the 1883 and 1939 buildings will still be an uninsulated multi-wythe brick, which will need costly insulation and interior furring.
 - Curt commented that the Cost Projections done to date *did* contain budgeting for the deficiencies noted by Prochaska & Associates’ engineering staff in the prior Needs Assessment, but *did not* contain
 - i. Budgeting for insulation and furring the exterior walls, and
 - ii. Replacement of the windows, and
 - iii. Supplemental structural supports and damp-proofing in the Crawl Space.
 - The building remains in the 100-year flood zone, and flooding (at least in the fronting streets) was recalled in 1996 and 2019.
8. One Committee Member suggested that only the 1883 Courthouse might be torn down and replaced.

9. Prochaska & Associates showed a slide suggesting the Committee had three Options:
- Remodel of portions of the existing facility, relocation of the existing Treasurer's Office, addition of Elevator(s), and replacement of existing Jail with three-story addition on the existing property.
 - Remodel of portions of the existing facility, relocation of the existing Treasurer's Office, and the addition of Elevator(s). The Jail and Sheriff's Offices (Law Enforcement Center) would be rebuilt on separate property to be determined.
 - Replacement of the Jail, Courthouse, and County Offices on a separate property—a "Justice Center". Some concern was expressed for some disposition of the existing facility other than abandonment.
10. Curt has researched that predicted Construction Inflation for 2022 will likely be more like 14.1%, rather than the 6.8% earlier assumed, so presented several slides of Projected Budgets for either the (a) remodel/addition on-site, or (b) full replacement with a 16-bed modern Jail (please see attached revised sheets)
11. Six Options were presented to the Committee for depiction of either a stand-alone 16-bed Jail, or full Jail/Courts/County Offices, on several locations in Ponca and Martinsburg:
- Ponca: Property south of and adjacent to the County Annex building on State Highway #12. *This option depicted full replacement of the County facilities (Justice Center) on cultivated land south of the Annex Building, likely on raised ground to elevate it to 1-foot above the 100-year flood level.*
 - Ponca: East 3rd Street and North East Street property. *This option depicted both a stand-alone Law Enforcement Center as well as a three-story Justice Center on a full city block, requiring the purchase of land from the local newspaper (Journal Leader), as well as that land used by a larger storage building. Parking would be achieved by narrowing the street paving, as has been tried at nearby locations.*
 - Ponca: West 3rd Street and South Kansas Street property. *This option depicted both a stand-alone Law Enforcement Center as well as a three-story Justice Center on a full city block of vacant and highly-sloped land. Both options were positioned as close as possible to West 3rd Street, and required a minimum 15-foot high reinforced concrete retaining wall.*
 - Ponca: West 4th Street and South Kansas Street property. *This option depicted both a stand-alone Law Enforcement Center as well as a three-story Justice Center on a full city block of vacant land which appeared to front on a City Park (Friendship Memorial Park). When Curt and Steve observed the property prior to the Meeting, it was learned that the park apparently extended into the subject property (a shelter was constructed there), meaning the Park was larger than previously known. A portion of the Park would be needed for the new project, but it appeared to be out of the 100-year flood zone.*
 - Ponca: West 3rd Street and South Iowa Street property. *This was the existing County property, previously presented, depicting a three-story Jail Addition.*
 - Martinsburg: Main Street and State Highway #9. *This was a large (5+ acres) irregular lot on the east edge of the Martinsburg community, which the City Council would donate to the County for a dollar. It is a flat site, and the property has room for a full Justice Center—however, moving the Courthouse and County Offices would require moving the County Seat—a ballot-required item as well. The town also apparently lacks natural gas utility, as well as a nearby gas station. A water treatment center is located immediately to the north, and a water tower is planned for the near future.*

Because there is so much room, Matt Michl asked for Prochaska & Associates to depict the full Justice Center there for the next meeting.

12. The committee discussed the potential for moving the County Seat as part of the process, with several members expressing favor for the idea, but also with others feeling reservations for the potential for passage. It was pointed out that Ponca is located on the north side of the County, and there may be sentiment in the County for a more centralized location for a full Justice Center/County Seat. Further, a good portion of the main part of Ponca is within the 100-year Flood zone.
13. Larry Boswell suggested a property in Allen, also a more centralized location in the County. Prochaska & Associates will attempt to look further into this property potential, and was advised to contact the Allen City Clerk, Gene Rahm (712-212-5061), for further information regarding actual location, development regulations, and available utilities. Larry also offered to help with the investigation, suggesting the land had already been zoned for a possible County Seat facility.
14. Lisa Lunz asked Prochaska & Associates to look further into the actual floor elevation such a facility would need to be located at—meaning how much earth fill would be required to place a facility south of the existing Annex building on Highway 12. She suggested we might receive assistance from the County Surveyor, and that Cindy could give us contact information to allow further investigation.

BY: 
Curtis Field, AIA
Architect - Principal

October 21st, 2022
Date

If any of the parties present take exception to these meeting notes, please notify Prochaska & Associates within five (5) days of issuance for correction or they shall be presumed to stand as written.

PROCHASKA & ASSOCIATES

11317 Chicago Circle • Omaha, Nebraska 68154-2633

Telephone: (402) 334-0755

FAX: (402) 334-0868

Website: www.prochaska.us