

**Mayor –**

Public Safety Committee Agenda – August 2008

Secure support from Chamber of Commerce for plan and any tax/service impacts.

Secure support from “vision 2025 Committee” for plan and any tax/service impacts.

Make public presentation of position for spending – lead program with Elected Officials.

*The purpose of this step is to unify the elected officials and taxpaying public towards a long needed solution that is economically responsible and addresses the safety/training needs of the Public and our City employees.*

**City Manager –**

Move Staff to build a chronological listing of our actions – include all public meetings related to the new facility since at least last July 2007 and .....

Build a portfolio that details the following:

- 1) Current state of the City’s spending versus our 2008-2009 budget
  - a) include trend analysis and provide end of 2009 expectations
  - b) include known or anticipated new programs or reductions: e.g.  
alley paving reductions, increased fuel costs, increased salt costs, increased cost of sidewalk program, increased costs for PWSC ventilation changes, all other known increases – staffing etc.
  - c) include anticipated new costs/revenues 2009 – 2010 and onwards  
increased revenue from utility taxes, other expected fees and service charges, increases in water rates and any others -
  - d) property tax plan  
2009-2010 and thereafter -
  - e) staffing plan/impacts

*The purpose of this analysis is to address resident concerns related to controlled spending and maintenance of quality services as we adopt a large capital project.*

- 2) List all potential PD facility sites considered
  - a) location
  - b) last know costs (real and opportunity)
  - c) size of land
  - d) relationship of the same to any documented “comprehensive master plan”

*The purpose of this summary is to re-affirm our and previous Council’s efforts at considering options and our regular public discussion/debate of the numerous alternatives as well as providing an updated archival of all related activities.*

- 3) Assemble additional copies of most recent facility suggestions (January 2008) and the estimated costs presented. Additionally, share the most recent analysis of items considered by Des Plaines and other communities as may be relevant.

The purpose of this summary is again to make available the many documents previously shared in the public arena that speak to the core failures of the more than 30-40 year old current police facilities e.g. lack of reasonable and safe segregated space for processing and moving prisoner/suspects; lack of reasonable female and male officer locker and shower facilities, lack of adequate and safe general public access etc.

The purpose of sharing the Des Plaines facility analysis (and others) is to demonstrate the known opportunity to combine a portion of any new Park Ridge facility construction with a re-modeling option of the existing approximately 9,000 square foot police facilities. Recent documents suggest Des Plaines was considering a re-model approach.

It may be equally beneficial to re-visit a sampling of the previously discussed numerous weaknesses of the existing facilities related to: e.g. segregated locker space (male/female), evidence area ventilation failures, improved safety for the public and officers with a sally port, juvenile versus adult detention areas we lack, safety issues with moving suspects/prisoners and the physical traffic patterns within the facility that expose the public/officers to unacceptable risks, the legal demands for expanded physical storage of evidence and the appropriate adjustments needed for private interview areas, etc.

- 4) Focus the next three Public Safety Committee meetings to include:
  - a) distribution of above analysis /information
  - b) explanation how the same addresses the Citizen survey comments and controls taxes/service delivery for the long term
  - c) and formally place two proposals before Public Safety Committee and General Public for additional opportunity to comment, building a greater understanding of what has been considered and recommendations for a solution the entire City Council may consider.

The two proposals I suggest we immediately consider are as follows:

1) **Busse property** to be purchased **versus using Courtland properties.**

- a) Using the last architect's analysis for a near 50,000 sq foot facility (or smaller if so desired - including underground parking) at a site near the PWSC – last estimated cost of \$17-\$20 million plus additional costs for land at or near Busse/Greenwood.

**VERSUS**

- b) Use of a combination of the existing City Hall/Police and Courtland home property WITH an established and absolute fixed budget of \$16.5 MM including removal of the existing Council Chambers as an alternative.

Many if not every architectural firm we have interviewed and worked with agreed they were willing to undertake this project with a fixed budget in place, delivering a high-quality police facility under such terms.

The advantage of this approach will be many- including a firm hard analysis of the deliverables such as the possibility of eliminating the costs for underground parking (\$3MM Savings), adjusting the project to include utilization of the existing 9,000 square feet of space already allocated to the Police Department (not included in last proposal by SR), a firm commitment to lessen the debt issue burden on the historical budget levels of the taxpayers and City programs, construction of a true “Community” space that would be available to all Committee’s/Commissions the Library Board and other public entities delivering a true multi-community focused meeting space.

As noted above the City has carried an obligation of bond payments since 1998 in an amount of approximately \$1.67MM per year. Under the option of requiring a fixed budget, we could adopt a proposed annual payment of \$1.4MM altering the amortization period to slightly less than 23 years – again this would require the setting and holding to a fixed budget of \$16,500,000 plus initial bond insurance and issuance costs.

Using our Courtland “space”/properties, there would be no need to purchase additional land and subsequently remove the same from the existing property tax roles, the impact to long-term property taxes should be zero if not positive when compared to the last ten years, the impact to current and long-term operating expenses (services) should also be zero if not positive as there will be a lower payment obligation year to year. As time moves forward, with economic prosperity, the payment impacts should further lessen as business development expands.

*Lastly, while Sente Ruble has provided the City with a solid starting point, I believe we should begin interviewing new architectural firms, operating under the premise that we will only consider firms interesting in a fixed budget project. I believe we should consider new firms because we need a “fresh set of eyes” to help us achieve a project with strict economic controls and of equal importance, excellence in construction standards.*

I look forward to discussing this with you at our next Public Safety Committee meeting in August - Frank Wsol