

# Facility Options Analysis

## How Should Scott County Address Its Facility Needs?

The foundation for this analysis is based on:

- The Phase One Needs Assessment, completed in 2001.
- The Evaluation of Alternative Programs completed in 2002.

Scott County has been successful in changing the practices which led to a projected need for more than 500 beds in 1998. Current projects suggest that the County will need approximately 375 beds in 2017 if the recommended alternatives are all initiated. However, in spite of these efforts, the County continues to experience problems associated with jail capacity.

- The Jail is an aging, inefficient facility. It does not meet the requirements of today's codes and standards. It does not provide adequate space in which to provide even the most basic functions which must be carried out in jails. Additional space will be required to keep pace with the increases in inmate population. Although the County continues to make a commitment to maintaining the facility, portions of the building and its systems are beginning to fail.
- In spite of population management efforts, the County's Jail population continues to exceed the capacity at both the Jail and the Annex. Populations held at the Annex are limited to minimum security prisoners because of the housing type and security level of the facility. As a result, the County must transport inmates to other locations, at considerable expense. Fortunately, to this point, space has been available close to Davenport. At some point, this space will no longer be accessible at a price the County is willing to pay. When that occurs, the County will be at the mercy of the detention bed market - both in terms of price and location.
- The structure of the Jail increases the County's level of risk in two significant ways. Because of the lack of contemporary life safety systems, the facility is more vulnerable to a variety of emergencies than it should be. Because of the inability to actively supervise the inmate population, the County is vulnerable to incidents in which both staff and inmates could be harmed.

# Evaluation Criteria

- ▶ **Operating cost**
- ▶ **Enhanced public safety**
- ▶ **Enhanced inmate accountability**
- ▶ **Capital cost**
- ▶ **Professional correctional practice**
- ▶ **Good community development practice**
- ▶ **Consistent with laws and standards**
- ▶ **Sensitive to community values and standards**
- ▶ **Minimizes liability**

The Planning Team has developed the following criteria to evaluate the options that have been identified. At the Community Summit, held in June 2003, participants ranked the criteria in the following order. The number in parentheses is the percent of responses in this category.

- 1) Operating cost (25%)
- 2) Enhances public safety (16%)
- 3) Enhances inmate accountability for behavior inside and outside the institution (13%)
- 4) Capital cost (12%)
- 5) Consistent with professional correctional practice (10%)
- 6) Consistent with good community development practices (8%)
- 7) Consistent with laws and regulations (7%)
- 8) Sensitive to community values and standards (5%)
- 9) Minimizes County liability (4%)

# What are Our Options?

- ▶ **Option Type 1: Status Quo**
- ▶ **Option Type 2: Third Facility**
- ▶ **Option Type 3: Remodel/Expansion Options**
- ▶ **Option Type 4: Replacement Options**

These options can be placed on a continuum with Option 1 representing the least level of intervention to Option 4, representing the greatest. Each of the options has a number of "sub-options."

## **Option Type 1: Status Quo Options**

- *Option 1a - Transportation* - The County continues to transport inmates to other jurisdictions, with or without a long-term lease.

- *Option 1b - Catastrophic Change* - A catastrophic event (such as the closing or loss of a facility) results in the loss of extensive capacity.

**Option Type 2: Third Facility Options** - The Jail and Annex remain as they are and additional capacity is added in a third facility. There are two potential approaches:

- *Option 2a - New Construction* - The County builds a third new facility.

- *Option 2b - Purchase/Remodel* - The County purchases and remodels a third facility.

**Option Type 3: Remodel and Addition Options** - The County remodels and adds capacity to its existing facilities. The scope of the remodel may vary within these options, but it addresses facility deficiencies identified in the needs assessment and makes the best use of available space. The remodeled areas may be used for a variety of identified space needs including, but not limited to, jail functions.

- *Option 3a - Jail Only* - The County remodels the Jail to correct functional deficiencies and adds capacity at this location, leaving the Annex as is.

- *Option 3b - Annex Only* - The County remodels the Annex and adds capacity at this location, leaving the Jail as is.

- *Option 3c - Jail and Annex* - The County remodels both the Jail and the Annex to correct functional deficiencies and adds capacity at both locations.

**Option Type 4: Replacement Options** - The County abandons the Jail and Annex as detention facilities, maintaining and/or remodeling them for other purposes and constructs a new facility.

- *Option 4a - Courthouse Location* - the County centralizes all its detention services at the current jail location.

- *Option 4b - Annex Location* - the County centralizes all its detention services at the current Annex location.

- *Option 4c - New Location* - the County centralizes all its detention services at a new location.

# Options and Inmates

| Classification | Option 2: Third Facility |       |     | Option 3a: Expand at Jail, Leave Annex Alone |       | Option 3b: Expand Annex, Leave Jail Alone |       | Option 3c(1): Expand Both GP Downtown |       | Option 3c(2): Expand Both GP at Annex |       |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------|-----|--|-------|---|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|
|                | Jail                     | Annex | New | Jail   | Annex | Jail                                      | Annex | Jail                                  | Annex | Jail                                  | Annex |
| Female         |                          |       | 72  | 72   |       |   | 72    | 72                                    |       | 72                                    |       |
| Spec Mgmt      | 48                       |       |     | 48   |       | 48  |       | 48                                    |       | 48                                    |       |
| Intake         | 48                       |       |     | 48   |       | 48  |       | 48                                    |       | 48                                    |       |
| GP             |                          |       | 128 | 128  |       |   | 128   | 128                                   |       |                                       | 128   |
| Minimum        |                          | 84    |     |  | 84    |   | 84    |                                       | 84    |                                       | 84    |
| Total          | 96                       | 84    | 200 | 296  | 84    | 96  | 284   | 296                                   | 84    | 168                                   | 212   |

This table shows the differences between the options in terms of where different classifications of inmates are located.

# Option Type 1: Status Quo

- ▶ Jail and Annex remain as they are.
- ▶ The County continues to transport inmates to other jurisdictions.
- ▶ Issues
  - Board and transportation costs escalate.
  - Beds in the numbers needed will not be available within 5 years within a reasonable travel distance.
  - Deficiencies in existing facilities will remain.
  - Limited alternative programs will increase # of beds ultimately needed.
- ▶ Does not meet facility needs.
- ▶ Dollars are spent out of County with no decrease in costs in County.

These options defer capital costs. However, they place Scott County at the mercy of the “jail bed” market. There are few jurisdictions that have jail beds available in southeastern Iowa. As time passes, the number of beds that the County needs will not be available nearby and at a cost that the County is willing to pay. Scott County would be in the same position as Polk County in having to develop contracts out of state (in Missouri).

Because the County’s ability to implement programs aimed at reducing recidivism is limited by their facility, the number of beds that will be needed will be greater.

## Option Type 2a: New Third Facility

- ▶ **Jail and Annex remain as they are.**
- ▶ **The County builds a third facility.**
- ▶ **Issues:**
  - **Duplication of spaces and services**
  - **Inefficiencies and deficiencies of current facilities remain**
  - **Limited capacity to meet facility needs**
  - **Site selection issues**
  - **Complicates jail operations significantly**

This option has the lowest capital impact, but results in the duplication of spaces, functions and staffing in three facilities. It is likely to result in the most complex operation; all three of the facilities must be able to function on their own in an emergency situation.

Building a third facility would at least allow the County to build the type of housing that it most needs – medium security. The basic assumption is that intake functions remain at the existing Jail, because of its relationship to both the courts and the Davenport Police Department (the largest user agency).

## Option Type 2b: Renovated Third Facility

- ▶ **Jail and Annex remain as they are.**
- ▶ **The County acquires and renovates a third facility.**
- ▶ **Issues:**
  - **Same as Option 2a**
  - **Conversion of a non-secure building to a secure use is difficult and expensive**
  - **Building types in which this could be considered are very limited**
  - **The need is for medium security space**

In addition to the issues associated with having any third facility, this option assumes that the County will be able to find a building that could be suitably modified for a medium security population. This is considerably different from finding a building which could easily be adapted for a minimum security population or a population which could function safely in a non-secure facility. In most cases, if the individual can function safely outside the jail, they currently are outside the jail.

## Option Type 3a: Renovate/Expand the Jail & Leave the Annex Alone

- ▶ Jail deficiencies and inefficiencies are corrected.
- ▶ The Annex is functional, but aging.
- ▶ Can meet all identified program needs.
- ▶ Maintains relationship with the Courts and the County.
- ▶ May address some other county space needs.
- ▶ Issues:
  - No additional internal transport costs; most population is downtown
  - Central Intake option
  - Tight site with constraints
  - More difficult to construct, more disruptive, phased construction
  - Operational compromises
  - Annex staffing remains "as is" while jail efficiency is improved
  - Inmate workforce is separated from location where they work
  - Requires duplication of some spaces and functions

The advantages associated with this option relate to its relationship to the courts. It also allows the county to remedy some of the inefficiencies which exist today in the Main Jail.

Type e options will be more challenging since they involve construction in and around buildings which must stay operational. Expansion at the Courthouse site faces a number of operational compromises and site constraints. These can be managed.

## Option Type 3b: Renovate/Expand the Annex & Leave the Jail Alone

- ▶ **Jail deficiencies and inefficiencies are not corrected.**
- ▶ **Can meet most identified program needs.**
- ▶ **Maintains relationship with the Courts and the County.**
- ▶ **Issues:**
  - **Easier to build at Annex site & less disruptive**
  - **Phased construction**
  - **Increases transportation to court**
  - **Requires duplication of some spaces and functions**
  - **No staffing efficiencies gained at Main Jail**
  - **Aging, hard to maintain structure, is not improved**

This option offers easier construction and a more flexible site. However, it increases the amount of transportation to court and it fails to address the deficiencies and inefficiencies of the existing jail. As a result, it does not achieve some of the staffing efficiencies in other type 3 options.

## Option Type 3c1: Renovate/Expand Both Facilities – GP Males Downtown

- ▶ **Deficiencies at both facilities are addressed.**
- ▶ **Can meet all identified program needs.**
- ▶ **Maintains relationship with the Courts and the County/most inmates are downtown.**
- ▶ **Issues:**
  - **Phased construction**
  - **Continued need to transport workers to work site**
  - **New housing will be constructed, w/reuse of existing space for non-housing (and potentially non-jail) functions**
  - **Can integrate Central Intake concept**
  - **Tight site w/constraints**
  - **Larger facility downtown – w/midrise solution**
  - **Duplication of some spaces and functions**
  - **Jail staffing efficiency is improved; Annex staffing levels remain as is**

Options Type 3c provide the best opportunity to address deficiencies and inefficiencies in both facilities while making use all or part of the facilities. Both involved phased construction and provide a number of options for collaborative projects.

Type 3c1, in which general population male inmates stay downtown, results in a larger facility downtown. Because the Annex remains at its current size, there is no potential increase in staffing efficiency at that location.

## Option Type 3c2: Renovate/Expand Both Facilities – GP Males at Annex

- ▶ Deficiencies at both facilities are addressed.
- ▶ Can meet all identified program needs.
- ▶ Maintains relationship with the Courts and the County.
- ▶ Facilities are balanced in size.
- ▶ Issues:
  - Phased construction
  - Continued need to transport inmates to court
  - New housing will be constructed, w/reuse of existing space for non-housing (and potentially non-jail) functions
  - Can integrate Central Intake concept
  - Tight site w/constraints
  - Smaller facility downtown – w/midrise solution
  - Duplication of some spaces and functions
  - Jail and Annex staffing efficiency are maximized

The only difference between this option and Option 3c(1) is where general population males are located. There is increased transportation to court, but there is less transportation involved with the movement of workers and materials. There are also some additional efficiencies achieved in minimum security areas of the annex.

## Option Type 4a: Replace Everything Adjacent/Connected to Courts

- ▶ Deficiencies at both facilities are addressed.
- ▶ Can meet all identified program needs.
- ▶ Maintains relationship with the Courts and the County
- ▶ Similar to 1998 plan, although facility is smaller.
- ▶ May meet a number of other county space needs.
- ▶ Issues:
  - All of the advantages of Option type 3
  - Additional parking requirements
  - Tight site
  - Public perception
  - Potential to "mothball" the Annex
  - Most difficult from a design and construction perspective
  - Most staff-efficient of the options

This is essentially the option which was suggested in 1998 although it is considerably smaller than the option brought forward at that time. It is the most efficient from a staffing and space perspective although it has the largest capital cost.

Its great value is the relationship it maintains with the courts.

## Option Type 4b: Replace Everything at the Annex

- ▶ Deficiencies at both facilities are addressed.
- ▶ Can meet all identified program needs.
- ▶ Separates the facility from the courts significantly increasing transportation costs.
- ▶ Similar to 1998 plan, although facility is smaller and not downtown.
- ▶ May meet a number of other county space needs.
- ▶ **Issues:**
  - Easier to expand at this location
  - Public perception
  - Potential zoning issues
  - Any staffing gains achieved by the design are negated by the increase in transportation staff

Although this option also offers the potential to address all issues identified in the program, it significantly increases the need to transport inmates. It has the potential to inconvenience a variety of user agencies.

## Option Type 4c: Replace Everything at a "Green Field" Site

- ▶ Deficiencies at both facilities are addressed.
- ▶ Can meet all identified program needs.
- ▶ Separates the facility from the courts significantly increasing transportation costs.
- ▶ Similar to 1998 plan, although facility is smaller.
- ▶ May meet a number of other county space needs.
- ▶ Potential site acquisition costs and issues.
- ▶ Issues:
  - Easier to expand at this location
  - Potential utility issues if rural
  - Potential urban renewal project
  - Public perception
  - Any staffing gains achieved by the design are negated by the increase in transportation staff

This option has all of the disadvantages of replacing everything at the Annex location, while setting in motion the need to locate an appropriate site and all of the related issues that come with relocation of the facility.

A "green field" site could be truly rural; a site of this type is likely to have significant utility issues. This could also be an urban site in an area in which development would be seen as advantageous; some jurisdictions have approached a project of this type as an "urban renewal" project.

# Questions and Discussion

**Other pros and cons?**  
**Stay tuned for more information.**

