### REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

#### Version 6/10/19

Completed by County Counselor's Office: Res/8rd No.: 20588

Sponsor(s): Theresa Cass Galvin Date: December 14, 2020

SUBJECT	Action Requested  Resolution Ordinance  Project/Title: Requesting the transfer of \$162,000 within the County for Architecture and Engineering Design Services for Renovations a Public Works Department to SFS Architecture of Kansas City, Miss Request for Qualifications No. 54-20.	at the Jackson County Cou	rthouse for the					
BUDGET								
INFORMATION	Amount authorized by this legislation this fiscal year:		\$162,000					
To be completed By Requesting	Amount previously authorized this fiscal year:							
Department and	Total amount authorized after this legislative action:		\$162,000					
Finance	Amount budgeted for this item * (including transfers):  Source of funding (name of fund) and account code number:		\$162,000					
	Source of funding (name of fund) and account code number:							
	TRANSFER FROM: 013-5113-56790 County Improvement Fund Other Contractual Services	l, Non-Departmental,	\$162,000					
	TRANSFER TO: 013-1204-56030 County Improvement Fund, Facilities Management  -KC, Architectural and Engineering Services  * If account includes additional funds for other expenses, total budgeted in the account is: \$							
	* If account includes additional funds for other expenses, total budgeted in the account is: \$ OTHER FINANCIAL INFORMATION:							
	No budget impact (no fiscal note required)							
	Term and Supply Contract (funds approved in the annual budget); estimated value and use of contract:							
	Department: Estimated Use:							
	Prior Year Budget (if applicable):							
PRIOR	Prior Year Actual Amount Spent (if applicable): Prior ordinances and (date):		- 2004					
LEGISLATION	Prior resolutions and (date):							
CONTACT	The resolutions and (date).							
INFORMATION	RLA drafted by (name, title, & phone): Barbara Casamento, Purcha	sing Administrator 881-3	1253					
REQUEST		ionig reministrator, our-s	200					
SUMMARY	The Public Works Department requires Architectural and Engineers wing of the first floor of the downtown Jackson County Courthouse	in order to provide a Jury	Room/Multi-					
	Function Area. The Purchasing Department issued Request for Quarequirements.	alifications No. 54-20 in r	esponse to those					
	Thirty-One Notifications were distributed, and seven responses were	e received and evaluated	as follows:					
	Respondent Name and Location	Scores prior to Interview	and Prices					
	BNIM, Kansas City, Missouri	85	- Annual Communication of the					
	Goldberg Group, Kansas City, Missouri	69						
<b>分上在这种区</b> 。	Junk Architects, Kansas City, Missouri	55						
	Piper Wind, Kansas City, Missouri	74	Tatalan Caranta Carant					
	Wellner, Kansas City, Missouri	65						
	TreanorHL, Kansas City, Missouri	91						
	SFS Architecture, Kansas City, Missouri	88						
	After the initial evaluations were completed, the two best qualified second set of scoring was applied. The scores were tabulated as follows:	Respondents were intervilows:	ewed where a					

	Respondent Name and Location	Final Scores						
	TreanorHL, Kansas City, Missouri	69						
	SFS Architecture, Kansas City, Missouri	74						
	After both sets of scores were averaged the final score							
	Respondent Name and Location	Final Scores	7					
	TreanorHL, Kansas City, Missouri	80						
	SFS Architecture, Kansas City, Missouri	81						
	To The intecture, Runsus City, Missouri	Ţ O I						
	The Evaluation Committee has recommended SFS Arreceived.	rchitecture of Kansas City, Missour	i as the best proposal					
	Points were Awarded as follows:							
	Submittal Scoring – Round 1:							
	Responsiveness to Request	10 Points	CANADA TO STANDAY					
	Qualifications and Experience	60 Points						
	References	30 Points						
	Total	100 Points						
		120201110						
	Interview Scoring – Round 2:							
	Clear Approach and Project Understanding	30 Points						
	Involvement in Comparable Work	15 Points						
	Team Dynamics, Strength, Size, Affordability	15 Points						
	Estimated Project Schedule 10 Points							
	Project Command 10 Points							
	Total 80 Points							
	Pursuant to Section 1054.6 of the Jackson County Code, the Public Works Department recommends the award of Architectural and Engineering Design Services to SFS Architecture of Kansas City, Missouri as the best proposal received.  The Director of Finance and Purchasing recommends the transfer of funds as follows:							
	FROM: TO:							
	013-5113-56790 County Improvement Fund, NonDepartmental, Other Contractual Srys \$162,000 013-1204-56030 County Improvement Fund, Facilities Management KC – Architectural							
CLEARANCE	and Engineering Services		\$162,000					
CLEARANCE	☐ Tax Clearance Completed (Purchasing & Department) ☐ Business License Verified (Purchasing & Department) ☐ Chapter 6 Compliance - Affirmative Action/Prevailing Wage (County Auditor's Office)							
COMPLIANCE	Transactive rectional lev	anning wage (County Muditor's Of	1100)					
COM LIANCE	☐ MBE Goals Goals of 9.5% for MBE; 11 ☐ WBE Goals The recommended Responded VBE Goals been amended to 1%	.7% WBE and 9.5% VBE were set dent will meet MBE and WBE and	for this project the VBE has					
ATTACHMENTS	Bid Abstract, Evaluation Recommendation Memoran Scoring Sheets and the pertinent pages of SFS Archit	ndum from Mr. Brian Gaddie, Dire tecture's proposal.	ctor of Public Works, the					
REVIEW			Date:					
	Department Director:		12-08-2020					
	Finance (Budget Approval):  If applicable	APPROVED  By Mark Lang at 4:00 pm, Dec 09, 2020	Date:					
	Division Manager:		Date: 10 Zeza					

dannerannannannannannannannannannannannannann	County Counselor's Offi	Blyan Con	inte	Date: 12/10/20			
Fiscal	Information (to be verified by B	udget Office in Finance Depart					
	This expenditure was included in the	annual budget.					
	Funds for this were encumbered from	the	Fund in				
	There is a balance otherwise unencumbered to the credit of the appropriation to which the expenditure is chargeable and there is a cash balance otherwise unencumbered in the treasury to the credit of the fund from which payment is to be made each sufficient to provide for the obligation herein authorized.						
	Funds sufficient for this expenditure	will be/were appropriated by Ordinan	ce #				
	Funds sufficient for this appropriation	are available from the source indica	ted below.				
	Account Number:	Account Title:	Amount Not to Exceed:				
	This award is made on a need basis ar funds for specific purchases will, of n	nd does not obligate Jackson County eccessity, be determined as each using	to pay any specific amour gagency places its order.	nt. The availability of			
	This legislative action does not impact	t the County financially and does not	require Finance/Budget a	approval.			

### **Fiscal Note:**

Funds sufficient for this transfer are available from the sources indicated below.

	PC#						
Date:	December 9, 2020				RES#_	205	88
Depart	ment / Division	Charac	ter/Description	Fro	m	То	
013	County Improvement Fund						
5113	Non-Departmental - Cnty Imprvmnt	56790	Other Contractual Services	\$	162,000	\$	
1204	Fac. Mgmt Kansas City	56030	Architectural & Engin. Services				162,000
	ROVED rk Lang at 4:01 pm, Dec 09, 2020			\$	162,000	\$	162,000

**Budget Office** 

Request for Qualifications 54-20 Jury Room		Piper-Wind Architects	SFS Architecture	TreanorHL	BNMI	Wellner
Opens: 2:00 PM, CDT on 11/3/2020		KCMO	KCMO			KCMO
NO   DESCRIPTION	UNIT QTY	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
		Didosa	see bid		see bid see bid	Deepid
		encember of self-resource of capabilities of self-resource of self-resourc				
						hadyan ayaanda addiina marayaan ayaan ayaa ayaa ayaa
AND						
		de de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la c				
		manifest and statement of the data.				
Street St						
CERTIFICATION OF BID OPENING		Commission of the party of the temperature of the temperature of the party of the temperature of the tempera				
BIDS WERE PUBLICLY OPENED AND RECORDED						
ON: November 3 2020 BY						
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE		man (ingrimos (Bancais), seem insidipendibuk		detection in a definite constitution and the second		
The state of		Andreas and the state of the st				
PURCHASING	Name of the state	The management formation and account process the second				The second secon

ABSTRACT \_\_\_ OF \_\_\_

	AMOON	Constitution of the second control of the se								money (s. demandration) (SDM) terremone control (SDM) (the experience of the state	A recent in contraction of the c		
Line of the second seco	AMOUNI												de administrativa de la companio del la companio de la companio del la companio de la companio del la companio de la companio della companio de la companio della companio della companio della companio
	AMOUNI							e a constant de la co					
Goldberg Group Architects KCMO	AMOUNT	Dee hid					The second secon					display, the contract of the c	
Junk Architects KCMO	AMOUNT	Deepick		The state of the s				and the second s		son it indeminately on "Algebra, philateoremic persons in the property of the persons of the per	distribution of the state of th	c. Chronisten companies — the destrict operations are supported to the destrict of the destric	
	UNIT QTY												
Request for Qualifications 54-20 Jury Room Opens: 2:00 PM, CDT on 11/3/2020	DESCRIPTION		The second section of the second section of the second section of the second section s	experience of the contract of		many or the state of the state			CERTIFICATION OF BID OPENING	OPENED AND RECORDED	ON: Alevenher 3, 2020 BY	CLECK COTTUE LEGISLATIBE	PURCHASING
1	ON			 4									*****

ABSTRACT \_\_\_ OF



# JACKSON COUNTY Public Works Department

Jackson County Technical Center 303 West Walnut Street Independence, Missouri 64050 jacksongov.org

(816) 881-4530 Fax: (816) 881-4448

#### Memorandum

To:

Barbara Casamento, Purchasing Administrator

From:

Brian Gaddie, PE, Director of Public Works

Date:

November 25th, 2020

RE:

RFQ 54-20 Recommendation - SFS Architecture, Inc.

#### Barbara,

As a result of the competitively bid RFQ 54-20 to provide Architectural and Engineering Design Services for renovations at the Jackson County, Missouri Courthouse, I would like to present to you the recommendation of the selection committee. SFS Architecture, Inc submitted a package that illustrated their expertise and experience with project specific criteria. SFS Architecture was shortlisted and interviewed in order to vet their team structure and approach to the work. The selection committee agrees that the team assembled by SFS Architecture is capable of completing the work and best illustrated their qualifications and therefore should be recommended as the selected vendor for RFQ 54-20.

At this time, we will begin negotiations until a contract value and terms have been determined and are prepared for the County Executive's signature. A Request for Legislative Action will be prepared and introduced forthcoming.

Thank you for your consideration with the above recommendation.

Professionally,

Brian Gaddie, P.E.

Director of Public Works

FIRD 54.20 - COMPOSITE PROPOSAL SCARE SHEET   111772020	RF	-0 54.20 - C	DIPOCITED	S IVSUGUE	THE CHEET			The state of the s
11/17/2020   AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL RANKING FOR EACH FIRM   Member 1   Member 2   Member 3   Member 4   Member 5   Avg of Scores	manage of the contract of the	2-1-1-1	T I I I I I I	שלה שלה היי	JONE SHIELL			
Member 1   Member 2   Member 3   Member 4   Member 5   Avg of Scores	Geologica produce de Geologica de Constantina de Co		11/17/	/2020				
BNIIM         85         80         86         89         85           Goldberg Group         65         68         70         86         89         85           Goldberg Group         65         68         70         54         86         69         85           Out Wind Architectus         65         63         48         56         64         76         74         74           SFS Architecture         80         87         89         96         96         88         91         88           Wellner Architecture         80         87         89         96         96         86         88           Wellner Architecture         80         78         55         64         66         65         91           Member 1         Member 2         Member 3         Member 4         Member 5         Avg of Scores         74         88           SFS Architecture         76         73         77         78         74         74			AVERAG	SE INDIVIDUA	L RANKING F	OR EACH FIR	EM.	
BNIM         85         80         86         86         85           Goldberg Group         65         68         70         54         86         69           Junk Architects         65         68         76         74         55           SFS Architecture         80         87         89         90         96         88           FS Architecture         80         85         90         96         96         85           Wellner Architecture         78         55         64         65         91           Member 1         Member 2         71/24/2020         Member 3         Member 4         Member 5         Avg of Scores           Treanor HL         60         62         76         Avg of Scores           FSS Architecture         76         69         77         78         74    *SFS Architecture  **Scores adjusted out of 80 max points due to potential confusion with rating the pricing schedulers were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that trealistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that trealistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that trealistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that trealistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that trealistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that trealistic and appropriate fees were		Member 1	Member 2	Member 3	Member 4	Member 5	Avg of Scores	Ranking of Firms
Goldberg Group         65         68         70         54         69         69         69         69         69         69         69         69         69         69         65         65         64         65         74	BNIM	85	80	98	98	88	85	က
Junk Architects         65         60         48         56         46         56         46         55           SFS Architecture         80         87         89         90         96         88         88           Wellner Architecture         80         85         90         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         97         91         91         91         91         91         91         91         91         91         91         91         92         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         97         97         97         97         85         97         97         97         97         97         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         96         97         97         97         97         97         74         97         74         98         97         74         98         98         97         74         98	Goldberg Group	65	89	20	75	98	69	ഹ
SFS Architecture         75         73         83         64         76         74           SFS Architecture         80         87         89         90         96         88         88           Wellner Architects         80         85         90         96         96         91           Wellner Architects         80         78         55         64         66         65           Treanor HL         Rember 1         Member 2         Member 3         Member 4         Member 5         Avg of Scores           Treanor HL         66         73         77         78         74         74           SFS Architecture         76         69         77         78         74         74           RFQ process. Pricing schedules were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested and appropriate fees were requested and ap	Junk Architects	65	00	48	56	46		2
SFS Architecture         80         89         90         96         88         88         89         90         96         88         89         90         96         91	Piper Wind Architects	75	73	83	64	9/	74	4
Wellner Architects         85         90         96         96         91           Wellner Architects         60         78         55         64         65         65           RFQ 54-20 - COMPOSITE INTERVIEW SCORE SHEET           11/24/2020           AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL RANKING FOR EACH FIRM           AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL RANKING FOR EACH FIRM           Average Individual Ranking Formating the pricing schedual SFS Architecture         69         77         78         74           SFS Architecture         76         69         77         78         74         74           RFQ process. Pricing schedules were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that the feet were requested to ensure the feet were requested to ensure that the feet were requested to ensure that the feet were requested to ensur	SFS Architecture	80	87	68	06	96	88	2
Wellner Architects	TreanorHL	06	85	06	96	96	9.1	7
RFQ 54-20 - COMPOSITE INTERVIEW SCORE SHEET  11/24/2020  AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL RANKING FOR EACH FIRM  AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL RANKING FOR EACH FIRM  Member 1 Member 2 Member 3 Member 5 Avg of Scores  Treanor HL  SFS Architecture  * Scores adjusted out of 80 max points due to potential confusion with rating the pricing schedu  RFQ process. Pricing schedules were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees w	Wellner Architects	60	78	55	64	99	65	9
AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL RANKING FOR EACH FIRM  Member 1 Member 2 Member 3 Member 4 Member 5 Avg of Scores  Treanor HL  SFS Architecture  * Scores adjusted out of 80 max points due to potential confusion with rating the pricing schedu  RFQ process. Pricing schedules were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees w	STATE AND A STATE OF THE STATE	-Q 54-20 - C	OMPOSITE IN	TERVIEW SC 2020	ORE SHEET			
Member 1       Member 2       Member 3       Member 4       Member 5       Avg of Scores         Treanor HL       69       73       77       78       74         SFS Architecture       76       69       77       78       74         * Scores adjusted out of 80 max points due to potential confusion with rating the pricing schedules were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees were requested to ensure that the feet were requested to t			AVERAG	E INDIVIDUAL	RANKING F	OR EACH FIRE	E	
		Member 1	Member 2	Member 3	Member 4	Member 5	Avg of Scores	Ranking of Firms
	Treanor HL	60	29	7.3	75	17	69	2
* Scores adjusted out of 80 max points due to potential confusion with rating the pricing schedule as part of the RFQ process. Pricing schedules were requested to ensure that realistic and appropriate fees would be utilized.	SFS Architecture	9/	69	7.0	77	78	7.4	-
	* S*	Scores adjus FQ process.	sted out of 80 r Pricing sched	max points due ules were requ	to potential constead to ensu	onfusion with r	ating the pricing sche	edule as part of the s would be utilized.

RFQ 54-20 - COMPOSITE AGGREGATE SCORE SHEET 11/25/2020

				The second secon	The second secon		
		AVERAG	AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL RANKING FOR EACH FIRM	RANKING FO	OR EACH FIRE	5	
FIRM NAME	Member 1	Member 2	Member 2 Member 3 Member 5	Member 4	Member 5	Avg of Scores	Ranking of Firms
Treanor HL	75	73.5	8115	85.5	86.5	80.4	2 1 2 1
SFS Architecture	78	78	79.5	83.5	87	81.2	

<sup>\*</sup> Per aggregate scoring from both composites, the selection committee has chosen SFS Architecture as the preferred vendor

Member 5	Greg
Member 4	Crissy
Member 3	Brian
Member 2	Rick
Member 1	Howard

sfsarchitecture

drivenbyconnections

November 3, 2020

Office of Jackson County Purchasing Department Room G-1, Ground Floor Jackson County Courthouse 415 East 12th Street Kansas City, Missouri 64106

RE:

Statement for Qualifications - RFQ No. 54-20 A/E/ Services for Jury Room Renovations

Dear Selection Committee Members:

SFS Architecture is pleased to submit our qualifications to design renovations to the first floor/south wing of the Jackson County Courthouse to accommodate new jury room space for the 16th Circuit Court. As you review our qualifications, please keep in mind the following key strengths of our team:

+ Experienced Local Leadership. SFS is a leading Kansas City architectural design firm with extensive experience in all areas relevant to this effort, including programming, planning and design of large, complex renovation projects; preservation and modernization of historic PWA/WPA era courthouses; and the specialized design of courthouses, courtrooms and court support spaces, including jury assembly areas.

We are familiar with the stringent design standards of courtroom and court support spaces, including: separate circulation patterns for public, prisoner and judiciary members; acoustic and lighting levels; ceiling height; millwork and furnishings; seating; noise sensitivity; pressurized raised floors; specialized finishes and security features; among others.

- + Capable, Multidisciplined Team. The SFS team is further strengthened by local MBE/WBE/VBE engineers and consultants specializing in areas such as mechanical, electrical and plumbing engineering; telecommunications; security; fire protection engineering and codes/life safety; audiovisual and acoustical design; and construction cost estimating. We will leverage the expertise of these professionals throughout the project. Their participation will enable us to address all aspects of this project, while providing meaningful roles for their firms.
- + Understanding + Insights. As outlined in more detail on the following page, we understand the unique requirements that must be considered when designing jury assembly rooms and associated support spaces. If awarded the contract for the Courthouse Assessment, we believe there are synergies between the proposed project and the assessment effort benefiting the Courts and County that could be realized by our team.
- + Collaboration + Communication. SFS utilizes a collaborative, interactive and participatory process aimed at building consensus among project stakeholders. Key to our process is listening to project stakeholders, translating what we hear into options for review and then guiding you in the development of a final option that best meets your space needs. Consensus building will be critical to the success of this project.
- + Budget Control. We recognize as stewards of the public's tax dollars you have an obligation to spend wisely. We will scrutinize each budget item to ensure the County is receiving the highest value with the best opportunities to save energy, reduce maintenance requirements and improve the quality of the courthouse environment all within budget parameters. We will work collaboratively with you to prioritize strategies and explore options to maximize the value of the work.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to the opportunity to share our approach to collaborating with you on this important initiative.

Sincerely,

Marsha K. Hoffman, AIA, LEED AP BD+C

Principal 816-541-2299

mhoffman@sfsarch.com

Dana Gould, AIA, LEED AP

Associate 816-541-2646

dgould@sfsarch.com



# **Project Understanding**

SFS Architecture has a keen understanding of Jackson County's goals for the renovation of the first floor/south wing for jury assembly and jury support spaces following a thorough review of the County's RFQ and experience working with other clients on similar renovation projects. Our experience with similar projects provides our team with the insights and expertise to anticipate and pro-actively address key goals, opportunities and challenges, such as the following:

- Create a vibrant environment with modern amenities that facilitates jury room needs while being sensitive to the historic typology of the building.
- Design that responds to the Jackson County's vision for the highly utilized public space for the Courts and projects an appropriate image for the County.
- Optimize available space to accommodate new juror selection and potential jury trial space.
- When not in use for the Courts, the County's desire to utilize this area as a multipurpose space for large scale townhalls and legislative meetings, exhibitions, press conferences, formal speaking addresses and other engagements.
- Provide enhanced technology and adequate infrastructure to accommodate Courts, County and public technology needs.
- Address acoustical concerns to accommodate A/V requirements for juror orientation, jury trials and multi-use assembly needs.
- Upgrade and/or replace HVAC, plumbing and electrical systems as required.
- Upgrade to more efficient lighting.
- A sequenced approach to construction to maintain Courthouse and other operations during construction.
- Collaborate with Building Committee and Stakeholders to meet the needs of 16th Circuit Court and the County

The existing department located in the first floor/south wing of the first floor will be relocated to the 3rd floor as a part of this project. Conceptual planning provided as a part of the RFQ will be used as a basis by which to advance to final design. Further considerations and design alternatives will be developed with the stakeholders to develop the final best design.

# Key Design Considerations

The design of the Juror Assembly Room renovation is influenced by many complex programmatic requirements, some of which are highlighted below. Members of the SFS Team understand these complexities and have successfully worked within numerous courthouses to create functionally-driven environments that respond to these unique requirements and best support the County's mission to serve.

- Juror Assembly Room should be easily accessed by jurors and close to the Courthouse entry. Directional signage should be provided as needed.
- Juror check-in is best located close to the entry to the Jury Assembly Room. Check-in can be located directly outside
  or within the room, but should be located directly adjacent to staff offices. Glass can be provided between the clerks
  and jurors for safety of staff.
- Suror Assembly Room may consist of an orientation area with lecture seating arrangement and an area with tables and chairs.
- Toilets should be provided directly adjacent to the Jury Assembly Room.
- Circulation for public, staff and judges should be considered for safety.
- Since jurors may be waiting for a long period of time, the room should provide adequate heating, cooling and ventilation for juror comfort, as well as lighting, power and WiFi to accommodate passive activities such as reading, remote work, television and refreshments.
- Vending area should be adjacent to the Juror Assembly Room.
- Seating for jurors should be comfortable.
- Video display and sound system for orientation should be provided throughout the room.
- Judge's bench appropriately designed to facilitate Juror selection process and trials.
- For occasional use as a jury trial courtroom, requirements for jury, witnesses and clerk must be considered. These
  could be mobile and stored to provide maximum space for potential jurors.
- Space should be comfortable for citizens performing their civic duty.

We understand it is the County's desire to utilize this space when it is not being used by the courts for large-scale townhalls and legislative meetings, exhibitions, press conferences, formal speaking addresses and other engagement. Each of these uses will be programmed to facilitate the multi-use requirements for the space.

