

COURTS COMPLEX NEGOTIATIONS

City's Position	County's Response
<p>1. City contribution 25% of actual costs to implement Frazier Plan after deduction of Historic Tax Credits. City cap of \$12.5 million.</p>	<p>1. To accept Staunton's Frazier Plan, City should fund 50% of costs (after Tax Credits).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of Frazier Plan could exceed the \$44 million to locate in Verona. - City benefits 100% from local Tax Revenues generated due to Courts presence in Staunton. - City's caseload 34% - City's population growing faster than County's (4% vs. 1% since 2010 Census)
<p>2. Debt to be issued and carried by County.</p>	<p>2. Debt should be jointly issued and carried by City-County based on funding split.</p>
<p>3. Suitable accommodation for parking for persons with disability in close proximity to each of the three Courts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eight handicapped spaces could be provided for the new building and 1901 structure in the parking lot on the S.E. corner of Augusta and Johnson Streets. - For the Cochran Judicial Center, there is an on-street handicapped designated space on New Street that ties into an accessible route to the west side of the building via a sidewalk that passes through the garden. 	<p>3. Frazier Plan does not adequately address handicapped needs at three proposed courts locations.</p>

<p>4. Additional Parking</p> <p>A) Judges – secure garage parking in new building. Similar secure arrangement for J&D at Cochran Judicial Center.</p> <p>B) Other Employees – In new garage, as part of Courthouse, plus top level of the City’s Johnson Street parking garage.</p> <p>C) Public Parking – validated parking for 800 existing off-street parking spaces downtown.</p>	<p>4. Additional Parking</p> <p>A) Acceptable</p> <p>B) Acceptable for employees in New Building but not for employees at Cochran Judicial Center.</p> <p>C) County would prefer dedicated on-site parking as envisioned with Moseley Verona Plan.</p>
<p>5. Previously offered items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waiver of fees - Use of Barristers Row and parking lot as staging areas. - Use of Cochran Judicial Center and City Council Chambers as detailed in City’s March 2, 2015 letter. 	<p>5. Acceptable</p>
<p>6. Consolidation of Courts-City will pursue, cooperatively, diligently and in good faith.</p>	<p>6. Understand City is currently leaning more toward “shared use” vs. “consolidation”.</p>
<p>7. Frazier 2015 Conceptual Plan – as proposed</p>	<p>7. County would prefer single Staunton structure (vs. 3 facilities).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Courtroom dimensions not adequate based on Virginia Court Space Standards or Judges’ needs. - Multiple Security check points not as secure as single security check point with Moseley Plan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Three structures not functionally efficient for Bailiffs' oversight regarding courtroom safety and prisoner movement/transportation.- With two structures 100 and 150 years old, current and future fiscal savings with operating efficiencies, i.e., HVAC, roofs, electrical, structural, etc., not as significant as compared to a single new structure.- Frazier Plan for "future expansion" not financially feasible (adding a third floor).- Frazier Plan estimate to purchase Union Bank Property 45% "over" current City assessment.- MRRJ would need to drop off prisoners at three locations vs. a single location as with Moseley Plan.
--	---