

MISSOURI STATE PENITENTIARY REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Open Session – June 23, 2010

Call to Order: Call to order by Dan Carr at 1:06 p.m.

Roll Call: The following Commission members were present: Michael Berry, Gene, Bushmann, Dan Carr, Bob Meyer, Kathy Peerson, Darrell Roegner and John Sheehan. Quorum met. (Six members must be present to constitute a quorum, 2 vacancies.)

The following Commission members were absent: Frank Burkhead.

Present: John Kuebler (Attorney) and Mark Schreiber

The following Facilities Management, Design and Construction staff members were present: Deputy Director John Hequembourg, Deputy Director Cathy Brown, Charlie Brzuchalski, Cindy Layton, Larry Weber, and Lois Bennett.

-
- 1) Approval of May Meeting Minutes
 - a) Michael Berry motions to approve, John Sheehan seconds. All in favor. Motion passed.
 - b) Dan proposes passing April's meeting minutes at the July meeting, after everyone has had a chance to view them.
 - 2) Public Comments
 - a) Dan opens the floor to the public.
 - b) None
 - 3) MSPRC Sub-Committee Reports
 - a) City / Neighborhood Sub-Committee – No report.
 - b) MSP Development Sub-Committee – Presented by John Sheehan
 - i) Mike Berry, Cindy Layton, Charlie Brzuchalski, and John Sheehan toured prison to interested developers. Gained, from interested parties, how existing buildings could be readapted and reused. How courthouse could accelerate development and parkway could be reconfigured to allow for more private development. Gaining more information with hopes to continue towards the development between the State and this Commission of an RFP that would seek a public project partnership. Dan asked if interested developers were positive about the site, John S. says yes and they are really interested in readaptation of existing buildings. Charlie wants multiple proposals before locking in. Dan asks for RFP timeline, John S. says no. Says Jeff and State will be leaders in that. Hope to provide update at next meeting. Michael says the site open to any interested party to tour.
 - 4) Status update on MSP Caretaking / Interim Uses Management – Presented by Charlie Brzuchalski
 - a) Law Enforcement Training & MU Fire School – Successfully completed school. They were more pleased this year because they were able to add new programs. Offender clean-up crews have already gone through and cleaned up. It is law enforcement training

season right now, doing 3 or 4 a week. All going very well.

- b) Building Weatherization & Clean-up – H.U. 1, 3, & 4 - Probable leak in edge of roof of H.U. 4, investigating it now. Still working on H.U. 3 roof repair. Trying to get definitive cost estimates for H.U. 1. Sustained more damage in last storm, lost more shingles and roof tears and lost insulation. Lack of funding is an issue. Almost need to say emergency catastrophic problems with the historic buildings. Trying to address how to make some repairs and some replacements, just not sure what the extent of that is going to be financially. Dan asks if the weeds and lawn care at the site are being taken care of. Charlie said it's not a problem. Clean up is going great. Have an excellent offender crew. Almost finished with H.U. 3 and will move on to H.U. 1 to clean cell block at the top.
 - c) Michael asks about environment assessment. Charlie says ground water and soil sampling site work has been done. Initial report says there is great deal of coal and cinders in the lower yard area. Rock at varying depths. Very low if any groundwater. Not getting high level impressions of solvents, hydrocarbons, petroleum and things like that. Expect probably second week of July asbestos, lead, mold teams will be here to start going through the buildings. Still pushing to have data in hands in August. So they can assemble demolition packages. Frank asks about potential hazardous materials in the buildings immediately slated for demolition. Charlie says we will be getting data in July and August that lets us quantify suspected materials that lets us put it in the demolition package for bidding for contractors to do the work. Charlie says all buildings will be tested.
- 5) Review and Update on MSP Redevelopment Project Status
- a) Federal Courthouse Project
 - i) Will have another opportunity to tour again in the fall.
 - b) Whitton Expressway Study
 - i) Draft Environmental Impact Statement – MODOT has asked to endorse their Environmental Impact Statement. Information contained in packet is important to the committee. Michael asks about sequence of events. Charlie says CAMPO has resolution that says they do not endorse any sequence of construction and MODOT has not planned sequence at this time. This is just a draft and is more about the environmental impact of the potential project.
 - ii) Frank motioned to approve the resolution. Michael seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.
 - c) Lafayette St. / Lafayette St. Extension / State St. Reconstruction
 - i) Capitol Avenue completed. State Street is being worked on now. 6 more weeks for finished pavement. 4 weeks out will start on Lafayette. Work is going well. Cooperation between subcontractors is great.
 - d) MSP Greenway Trail Project
 - i) Project Planning - Hope to have a photo and archeological work done soon. Depends on PA, then can start on design this summer and fall.
 - e) Environmental Assessments (Phase 1 & Phase 2)
 - i) Already discussed.

- ii) A little behind with the EPA contractor. Getting it for free so can't complain.

- f) Programmatic Agreement Review
 - i) Worked hard to make sure all parties are equally represented. All parties are ready to sign. Several already have. Want MSPRC to sign today. Cindy says county and state have already signed. City is has it on their agenda. Charlie gives a brief description – States who is involved and what we are doing, and who is responsible for carrying on what project; if another agency comes in they may utilize the agreement for their work; identifies other activities that are exempt from further review; has a section on new construction; they must be in conformance of design style; info on public participation; technical assistance; document has a duration of 5 years but may be extended; has a section on unexpected discoveries; dispute resolutions; provisions for termination of agreement should that be desired. John K. asks why it is required. Charlie says it is **required by the ? in the National Historic Preservation Act** of 1968. Dan asks if it requires all signatures because they are stakeholders, Charlie says yes. Frank asks if it is between the State and the City. State, MSPRC, City and County and Historic Preservation Society. Frank doesn't think its final until the city signs. Wants to wait til city signs. Charlie says the mayor has already seen and is advising the city to sign and MSPRC should sign simultaneously with city. Dan says if city doesn't sign its null and void anyway. John S. asks if National Parks has the compliance to secure store tax credits and has the same standards as MSPRC for restoring historic buildings. Charlie says National Parks Service has developed a set of historic standards for historic buildings to be done under. MSPRC has guidelines that contain things that are historically important to them. National Historic Preservation is gatekeeper. Michael asks if end product will be a report that identifies buildings that can't be messed with or demolished. Charlie says the master plan contains buildings for retention, demolition, restoration, etc. Michael doesn't know what buildings are going or staying. Charlie says buildings identified in master plan as historic and worthy of saving should be included. Michel doesn't want to sign something that defines some other course. Charlie says if developer wants to retain more buildings than what is in the master plan – its ok, but if you want to destroy any that are in it – it must be reviewed. Kathy makes the motion to sign. John S. seconds. All in favor. Motion passed. Will sign.

 - g) Shows slide of buildings to be demolished in Phase A. John S. says interested parties are interested in shoe factory. Dan points out that the wall behind it will come down. Charlie says even though it was built in 1898 it has had so much structural damage it's exterior is not the same as it was, and has structural issues. Dan asks about Phase 2 and what takes place amid private development. Charlie says it will contain all info on the buildings and ground. Phase 1 environmental has shelf life. Will need to be reevaluated every 6 months. Private developer would have to have to do an update. Dan wants it in hand when they go out with RFP so people know what they are getting in to. Charlie says it should be available in mid-August. Frank asks about archaeology issues with the 3 buildings on the corner or Capitol and Lafayette. Charlie says that area has had a lot of old buildings on it. Will probably find damaged or old foundations. Mark s asks about fencing to secure the area when part of wall comes down. Charlie says 8 foot tall chain-link fence with wire on top. Will reuse original fence and gate from along State Street - will be erected along plaza.

- 6) HU1 awarded plaque for historic building. Will go on soon.

MSP Redevelopment Commission Meeting

May 27, 2009

Page 2

With no further business, the motion was made by Dan to adjourn. John S. seconds. All in favor, motion passed. Adjournment 2:03 p.m.

Next Meeting:

July 28, 2010
Truman State Office Building
Room 850
Jefferson City, Missouri