

14. COURTHOUSE SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

In 2008, at the request of the Circuit Court Judge, we contracted with Moseley Architects to prepare a Courthouse Security Improvements Study. Among other things, the study recommended:

- a. An expansion of the main lobby by expanding it outward under the existing covered colonnade in order to accommodate a single security checkpoint for all persons entering the facility. The checkpoint will offer separation of ingress and egress and include a duty station for two (2) security officers, a metal detector, an X-ray machine and standard exit turnstile and wheelchair accessible turnstile;
- b. Installation of a closed circuit television system with both interior and exterior cameras. All cameras will be digital high-resolution color cameras with video stored on a digital video recorder. Monitoring will occur at the existing emergency communications center, located next-door to the Courthouse;
- c. Installation of an intrusion detection system consisting of alarm panels that monitor all exterior doors using door position switches. All first floor exterior windows will use glass break sensors. An annunciator screen will signal all alarms in the emergency communications center; and
- d. A survey and assessment of existing electronic security equipment including the existing Simplex-based card access and alarm monitoring system, card readers on exterior doors, exterior door position monitoring switches, terminal controllers, approximately 20 duress alarms located throughout the facility, remote annunciator in the jail dispatch office, intercom system in the Circuit Courtroom, and portable metal detector in the lobby.

The Court has been patient since 2008 while we've waited to accumulate necessary funding. There are 2 revenue streams available to initiate this project. The first is Courthouse Security Fees - an assessment of \$10.00 on every criminal and traffic case that is collected by the respective Clerk(s) of the District and Circuit Court and remitted to the Treasurer. These funds are restricted and may only be used for the funding of Courthouse security personnel, and, at the request of the Sheriff, for equipment and other personal property utilized for Courthouse security (i.e. cameras, x-ray machine, alarm systems, etc.). Sheriff Stutts has expressed a willingness to utilize a portion of the collected funds for equipment. Your FY 2013 budget includes \$108,100 of these fees budgeted under Courthouse Security for purchase and installation of equipment.

The other revenue stream available to initiate the project is the Building Fund (utility taxes). There is currently \$35,552 available for unspecified capital projects. In addition to the equipment, there is the related cost of the lobby expansion (design and construction) and planning associated with integrating the equipment into the existing facility.

In early July, I issued a Request for Proposals for architectural services and received three proposals in response (Dewberry, Moseley Architects, and PMA Architecture). The proposals were reviewed and evaluated by Judge Delk, Rick Francis, Eric Cooke, Sheriff Stutts, Belinda Jones and me. Interviews of all three firms were conducted on September 12 and the consensus of the committee is that PMA Architecture is best qualified for this project. Their non-binding estimate of cost for design services of the lobby expansion and preparation of the plans and specifications for the equipment is \$46,200.

I am seeking your authority to proceed in contracting with PMA Architecture to develop the plans for the security improvements. I am proposing to utilize up to \$30,800 from the Building Fund to pay for PMA's services and up to \$15,400 from the Courthouse Security Fees to pay their sub-consultant to plan for the integration of the new equipment.

MOTION REQUIRED:

If the Board is so inclined, a motion is required authorizing the contract with PMA Architecture.

Southampton County Courthouse Security Improvements
 Non-Binding Fee Estimate

9/12/2012

Task	Description	PMA			PACE		
		labor hours	rate	subtotal	labor hours	rate	subtotal
0.0	Project organization	4	\$110	\$440	1	\$110	\$110
1.0	Initial Meeting with County Staff	3	\$110	\$330	3	\$110	\$330
2.0	Meet with Court Personnel	12	\$110	\$1,320	8	\$110	\$880
3.0	Prepare Initial Design and Budget						
3.1	Evaluate Existing Systems	12	\$110	\$1,320	2	\$110	\$220
3.2	Design Entrance Lobby Expansion	40	\$110	\$4,400	16	\$110	\$1,760
3.3	Design Closed Circuit TV System	12	\$110	\$1,320	16	\$110	\$1,760
3.4	Design Intrusion Detection System	35	\$110	\$3,850	16	\$110	\$1,760
4.0	Review Design with Court Personnel	8	\$110	\$880	8	\$110	\$880
5.0	Finalize Design	30	\$110	\$3,300	12	\$110	\$1,320
6.0	Prepare Bid Documents	100	\$110	\$11,000	54	\$110	\$5,940
7.0	Bid the Project	16	\$110	\$1,760	4	\$110	\$440
8.0	Award Contract	8	\$110	\$880			
9.0	Construction Administration	hourly					
10.0	Project Closeout	hourly					
				\$30,800			\$15,400
	Total Estimated Fee						\$46,200

§ 53.1-120. Sheriff to provide for courthouse and courtroom security; designation of deputies for such purpose; assessment.

A. Each sheriff shall ensure that the courthouses and courtrooms within his jurisdiction are secure from violence and disruption and shall designate deputies for this purpose. A list of such designations shall be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services.

B. The chief circuit court judge, the chief general district court judge and the chief juvenile and domestic relations district court judge shall be responsible by agreement with the sheriff of the jurisdiction for the designation of courtroom security deputies for their respective courts. If the respective chief judges and sheriff are unable to agree on the number, type and working schedules of courtroom security deputies for the court, the matter shall be referred to the Compensation Board for resolution in accordance with existing budgeted funds and personnel.

C. The sheriff shall have the sole responsibility for the identity of the deputies designated for courtroom security.

D. Any county or city, through its governing body, may assess a sum not in excess of \$10 as part of the costs in each criminal or traffic case in its district or circuit court in which the defendant is convicted of a violation of any statute or ordinance. If a town provides court facilities for a county, the governing body of the county shall return to the town a portion of the assessments collected based on the number of criminal and traffic cases originating and heard in the town. The imposition of such assessment shall be by ordinance of the governing body that may provide for different sums in the circuit courts and district courts. The assessment shall be collected by the clerk of the court in which the case is heard, remitted to the treasurer of the appropriate county or city and held by such treasurer to be appropriated by the governing body to the sheriff's office. The assessment shall be used solely for the funding of courthouse security personnel, and, if requested by the sheriff, equipment and other personal property used in connection with courthouse security.

(Code 1950, § 53-168.1; 1972, c. 135; 1982, c. 636; 1986, c. 568; 1988, c. 119; 1989, c. 571; 2002, cc. [533](#), [756](#); 2003, cc. [26](#), [44](#); 2004, cc. [390](#), [432](#); 2006, c. [495](#); 2007, c. [377](#).)