County Council of Howard County, Maryland

2017 Legislative Session

Legislative Day No.

2

Resolution No. 27 –2017

Introduced by: The Chairperson at the request of the County Executive

A RESOLUTION indicating support by both the County Council and County Executive for a project to finance and construct a new courthouse.

By order Jessica Feldmark, Administrator Read for a second time at a public hearing on <u>heloruary</u>, 2017. By order Jessica Feldmark, Administrator This Resolution was read the third time and was Adopted___, Adopted with amendments V, Failed__, Withdrawn__, by the County Council 2017. on Certified By Feldmark, Administrator Mond 8,2017 Approved by the County Executive

Allan H. Kittleman, County Executive

NOTE: [[text in brackets]] indicates deletions from existing law; TEXT IN SMALL CAPITALS indicates additions to existing law; Strike out indicates material deleted by amendment; <u>Underlining</u> indicates material added by amendment

1	WHEREAS, the building that currently houses the Circuit Court for Howard County (the		
2	"Existing Courthouse") is over 174 years old and is a significant historic structure; and		
3			
4	WH	EREAS, due to the Existing Courthouse's age and spatial limitations related to its	
5	site location, it is impossible to accommodate the renovations and expansion required to meet		
6	current and	future needs; and	
7			
8	WH	EREAS, issues with the Existing Courthouse that need to be addressed include:	
9	1.	The State recently approved a 6 th Circuit Court Judge for Howard County, but no	
10	space is available to accommodate the additional Judge or the Judge's staff;		
11	2.	Prisoners, judges, court staff, the public, and opposing parties in highly	
12	contentious	matters such as child custody, peace orders, and restraining orders are required to	
13	share hallwa	ays and other common areas;	
14	3.	There are severely inadequate spaces to accommodate security needs at the	
15	Existing Courthouse entrances, in hallways, and in courtrooms;		
16	4.	The State requires electronic filing which must be implemented; however, due to	
17	its structural	makeup, the Existing Courthouse cannot accommodate the infrastructure to support	
18	electronic filing;		
19	5.	There is no enclosed secure entrance for prisoners;	
20	6.	Prisoner holding areas are inadequate; and	
21			
22	WHEREAS, likewise, the Existing Courthouse is unable to accommodate the efficient		
23	consolidation of County legal services including land records, the State's Attorney's Office, the		
24	Sherriff's Office and ancillary programs including Juvenile Services and Department of Social		
25	Services; an	d	
26			
27	WHEREAS, the issues identified with the inadequacy of the Existing Courthouse cause		
28	major concerns regarding the delivery of important judicial services to the residents across the		
29	County; and		
30			

1	WHEREAS, the County has conducted studies and engaged consulting services to	
2	investigate the need, analyze different project delivery options and consider preferred solutions	
3	to address problems with the Existing Courthouse and the recommendation is to construct a new	
4	courthouse facility (the "Project"); and	
5		
6	WHEREAS, the recommended project delivery option uses partial public financing and	
7	partial private financing, with a private consortium delivery of design, build, and operation and	
8	maintenance of the Project for a 30-year term; and	
9		
10	WHEREAS, the Project is proposed to be located on the site of the County-owned	
11	Bendix Building; and	
12		
13	WHEREAS, the capital cost for the Project is estimated to be \$138,730,000 and includes	
14	site work, the demolition of the current Bendix Building, and the construction of a new 227,000	
15	gross square feet courthouse building and 600-space garage; and	
16		
17	WHEREAS, the public financing of the Project's capital cost is proposed to be added as	
18	a one-time initiative on top of the typical level of authorized County General Obligation bonds;	
19	and	
20		
21	WHEREAS, recognizing the cost impact of the Project, the County's Spending	
22	Affordability Committee has been briefed and evaluated the need and cost impact of the Project	
23	and the implications of different project delivery options; and	
24		
25	WHEREAS, the Spending Affordability Committee expressed their unanimous support	
26	for the Project on January 18, 2017 and recommended taking a hybrid public private partnership	
27	approach featuring partial public financing and partial private financing with private consortium	
28	delivery of design, build, operation and maintenance due to its anticipated optimum benefit to the	
29	County in the long run among the various options discussed; and	
30		

1 WHEREAS, given the substantial costs likely to be borne by potential responders to the 2 County's Request for Proposals for the Project, while understanding the preliminary nature of the projections and analysis conducted by County staff and consulting services, it is necessary that 3 4 the County's governing body demonstrate support for the Project in order to obtain proposals 5 from qualified contractors and commit necessary resources before officially starting the 6 procurement for the Project; and 7 8 WHEREAS, the County Executive has signed this Resolution, indicating his support for 9 the Project and the proposed issuance of County General Obligation Bonds as part of the resources to fund this one-time initiative. 10 11 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the County Council of Howard County, 12 Maryland, this <u>Le</u> day of <u>March</u>, 2017, that Howard County hereby supports the 13 Project and supports the use of General Obligation Bonds as part of the resources to finance the 14 15 construction of the Project. 16 AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Council requests that any 17 Request for Proposals related to the Project will be submitted to the Council for review and 18 comment at least two weeks before the Request for Proposals is issued. 19 20 AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Council requests that, by signing this Resolution, the County Executive indicate his agreement that any Request for Proposals 21 related to the Project will be submitted to the Council for review and comment at least two 22 23 weeks before the Request for Proposals is issued.

Amendment _____ to Council Resolution No. 27-2017

BY: Jon Weinstein

1 2

3

4

5 6

Legislative Day No. 5Date: 3/6/17

Amendment No. /

(This amendment requests that any Request for Proposals be submitted to the County Council in advance and that the County Executive indicate his agreement.)

On page 3, after line 15, insert:

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Council requests that any Request for Proposals related to the Project will be submitted to the Council for review and comment at least two weeks before the Request for Proposals is issued.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Council requests that, by signing
this Resolution, the County Executive indicate his agreement that any Request for Proposals
related to the Project will be submitted to the Council for review and comment at least two
weeks before the Request for Proposals is issued."

ABOPTED 3/6/17 FAILED Jeanica Judimark STEINITURE Jeanica Judimark