AOC CONSTRUCTION FILE
COUNTY: HANCOCK
FILE CODE: PDB 1 JM
SUBMITTED BY: JB
DATE: 9.25.08

HANCOCK COUNTY PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BOARD
FRIDAY, MAY 2, 2008
12:00 P.M.

The Hancock County Project Development Board ("PDB") convened at approximately 12:00 p.m. on Friday, May 2, 2008. Board Members present were:

Judge/Executive Jack B. McCaslin
Judge John McCarty
Circuit Clerk Noel Quinn
Magistrate Michael Powers
Ms. Lora McCarty
Ms. Yvonne Taylor
Mr. Harold W. Newton, Local Bar Association

Mr. Thad Scott and Mr. James Bowman of the AOC, Mr. Tim Graviss and Ms. Adrie Hammond of JRA, Richard Mitchell of Codell Construction and Mr. Chris Bowling of C.D. Bowling & Associates were present.

Board members absent: Circuit Judge Ronnie Dortch was unable to attend because of Circuit Court.

The minutes from the April 4, 2008, meeting were presented. Motion to approve was made by Ms. Quinn and a second by Ms. McCarty. Vote was taken by show of hands, unanimous vote, and motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell presented a Notice Of Intent for Storm Water Discharges that must be signed by Judge McCaslin for forwarding to the State. **Exhibit A** attached hereto.

Mr. Mitchell reported that the asbestos abatement was completed last week. Total cost: $6,750.00.

Bids are out for the demolition of the site. Bid opening will be May 19, 2008, at 2:00 p.m. in the Fiscal Court Room. Bids will be reviewed by Mr. Graviss and Mr. Mitchell and a recommendation made to Judge McCaslin. To expedite the process, motion was made by Judge McCarty and a second by Ms. Taylor to authorize Judge McCaslin to award the bid based upon the recommendation of Mr. Graviss and Mr. Mitchell. Vote was taken by show of hands, unanimous vote, and motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell reported that four proposals were received for the Geo Tech RFP. The proposals ranged from $8,030.00 to $10,318.00. Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Graviss have reviewed the proposals, and it was their recommendation to retain the services of Associated Engineers for the sum of $8,030.00. Motion to this effect was made by Magistrate Powers and a second by Ms. Quinn. Vote was taken by show of hands, unanimous vote, and motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell further advised that Phase 2 of this process may not be necessary, and this could reduce the cost to $4,915.00. Drilling should begin in two weeks. A copy of the proposal will be mailed to Ms. Lamar for attachment to the minutes as **Exhibit B**.

Mr. Graviss advised that the floor plans were submitted to the AOC. The AOC has requested that the Family Courtroom be moved back to the Second Floor. Revised floor plans reflecting this request was presented for consideration. See **Exhibit C** attached hereto.

Mr. Bowman advised that the AOC's position is that Family Court is a function of Circuit Court, and thus, it should be located on the Second Floor with the Circuit Courtroom.

Mr. Newton advised that he was not aware of any legal requirements mandating that the Family Courtroom be located on a certain floor, and it was more practical for the Family Courtroom to be located on the First Floor because of traffic.

Ms. Quinn prefers Family Court to be located on the First Floor for several reasons. Family Court meets weekly, it will be more convenient to the Clerk's office and because Circuit Court only meets once a month, having Family Court on the First Floor is more energy efficient. Most importantly, Family Court is more volatile than Circuit or District Courts and should be located as close as possible to Security.

Lengthy discussion by the Board followed regarding this issue. The Board simply believes that locating Family Court on the First Floor best suits this Board's need.

Mr. Bowman further stated that the current floor plan creates an issue regarding security. In particular, keeping the Family Courtroom on the First Floor would result in the Clerk's staff crossing paths with the inmates. Ms. Quinn felt that this could be avoided and details worked out and did not believe that it presented a security threat.

Judge McCarty advised that he could see the pros and cons of locating Family Court on both Floors, and either floor plan would be acceptable.

Mr. Scott reminded the Board that Mr. Garland Vanhook would have the final say, and he does want the Circuit Court and Family Court to be located on the same floor.

Ms. McCarty suggested listing our specific questions and concerns and presenting the Board's reasoning to the AOC. Ms. Lamar will forward this information to Mr. Graviss who will present the information to the AOC. There may be a need for a special called meeting according to Mr. Vanhook's schedule.

For informational purposes only, Mr. Graviss reported that the State has two proposed alignments for the bridge approach. Scheme A is the plan the Board has been working with regarding the location of the Judicial Center. Under this plan, the State would like the entrance of the Judicial Center to be aligned with Wood Street and the Judicial Center moved 150' towards the river. Scheme A would require a large retaining wall and cause problems with fill and regrading.

Scheme B pulls the road further west away from the Judicial Center. Under this scheme, the Judicial Center would be located closer to the road and further away from the hillside and results in more land dedicated to the Judicial Center.

Mr. Graviss presented a 3-D model of the Circuit Courtroom for consideration. This 3-D model showed the relationship of all parties in the Courtroom. No action was taken.

Mr. Bowling addressed the Board and advised that a $2 million dollar line of credit has been established with Hancock Bank & Trust. Once the construction bids have been received and one has been awarded, the Board will start the actual financing.

Discussion followed regarding the need of the Fiscal Court to be reimbursed for its expenses and the sale of the land. Mr. Bowling advised that the Fiscal Court would be reimbursed, and at the appropriate time would need to adopt an Inducement or Reimbursement Resolution.

An invoice from Resolution, Inc., in the amount of $820.00 was presented for approval. Motion to this effect was made by Ms. Quinn and a second by Ms. McCarty. Vote was taken by show of hands, unanimous vote, and motion carried.

Discussion followed on whether it was necessary for the Fiscal Court to approve this invoice and others. Fiscal Court does not have to approve the invoices, but such information should be reported to the Fiscal Court.

Mr. Coleman and Ms. Harold addressed the Board about the possibility of providing office furnishings. Mr. Bowman advised that all furnishings are chosen and purchased by the State. He will provide contact information to Ms. Harold.

Motion was made by Ms. Quinn and a second by Mr. Newton to adjourn. Vote was taken by show of hands. The vote was unanimous and motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Lamar

Stephanie Lamar, Secretary