TIMNATH POLICE DEPARTMENT
Police Station Design Update
AGENDA

1. Introductions of Team
2. Goals for Work Session
3. Brief History
4. Programming Discussion
5. Site Selection Results
6. Budget and Schedule
TEAM INTRODUCTIONS

• Timnath Chief of Police - Terry Jones
• Contracted Timnath Planner - Brian Williamson
• Owners Representative - Jeff Jensen
• Principle Architect – Shaun Moscrip ALM2S
• Architectural Public Safety Specialist – Gary Campbell, Manns Woodward Studios (via Zoom)
• Project Architect – Kala Bailor, ALM2S
WORK SESSION GOALS

• Provide update to the Council on status of Design Process

• Receive direction from the Council on:
  • Project Site - After review of site selection process
    • Select a preferred site, or
    • Narrow to (3) sites for further due diligence and investigation
    • Determination on existing site – Option for developer buy back to start on 8/1
  • Project Criteria – Basis for Design
    • Design building to last an anticipated number of years prior to expansion
    • Cap project costs at a specific dollar amount
HISTORY

2010: Police Department of 2-3 people

2014: Service calls
Cases: 168
Calls/Incident: 1,126

2018: Service calls:
Cases: 538
Calls/Incidents: 6,778

2018: Resident Survey -
Public Safety as #1 Priority
HISTORY

2019: Better Alignment of Resources with Priority
• Evaluation of best practices
• Budgeting for additional officers to move to 24/7 by 2021
• Planning for new building by 2021
• Updated policies & guidelines to get there

2020: Continue toward full functioning Agency
• Budget for 12 officers, 2 support staff and police facility
• Market Analysis of competitive pay
• Building design progression
• Anticipated construction to begin Q3
CURRENT STATUS

• Department of 9 sworn officers

  **2020 Budget**
  additional officers: 3
  total sworn positions: 12

  Market analysis adjustments necessary to attract new officers

  **2021 Current Preliminary Proposed Budget**
  additional officers: 3
  total sworn positions: 15

• Making immediate improvements towards 24/7
CURRENT STATUS

• Continued contract relationship with Larimer County for dispatch, jailing of suspects & mutual aide

• Gaps of current model
  • No Timnath officers from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.
  • No dedicated specifically to Timnath deputies
  • Larimer County square miles: 2,634
  • Limited staffing (at times only 5 deputies on duty at night)
  • Priority goes to unincorporated Larimer County
  • Negatively impacts response times
CRIME STATISTICS

2014: Service calls
Cases: 168
Calls/Incident: 1,126

2018: Service calls:
Cases: 538
Calls/Incidents: 6,778

The number and complexity of cases/incidents have changed significantly - Timnath is growing
Impact of Regional Commercial Development Area

- Regional Commercial Development 24/7 operation and I-25 location adds to risk

- Positive economic impacts for Timnath
  - Sales tax helps funds improved public safety and other Town of Timnath projects and services

- Evolved over time from shoplifting and misdemeanors to:
  - Complex criminal acts
  - Fraud
  - Nexus to narcotics (meth, fentanyl, opioids)
  - Suspects have previous warrants
  - Aggravated assaults
  - Homicides

CRIME STATISTICS
CURRENT FACILITY - GAPS

• No room for additional officers
• No holding cell
• No interview room
• Not enough evidence space
• No armory (safe place to maintain weapons)
• No vehicle storage

• No sally-port
• No drug storage (unsafe ventilation)
• No forensic evidence capability
• No refrigeration capability
• No emergency management response capabilities
10 Year Town Growth Projections

• 3 scenarios
  • Current projections
    • Based on Historical information
    • Current projects in development process
  • 3% growth increase
    • Increase number of building permits by 3% annually
  • Conservative approach
    • Use 200 and 275 as alternating number of building permits in groups of 5 years
10 Year PD Staffing Projections

• Staffing projections for 2020-2024 based on current budget process
• Projections for 2025-2030 based on adding officer and civilian staff in opposite years
Population Growth Vs Staffing

10 Year Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Conservative Proj</th>
<th>Current Proj</th>
<th>3% Growth Proj</th>
<th>PD Department Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>5933</td>
<td>5933</td>
<td>5933</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>6510</td>
<td>6647</td>
<td>6692</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>7088</td>
<td>7279</td>
<td>7472</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>7665</td>
<td>8220</td>
<td>8275</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>8243</td>
<td>9159</td>
<td>9102</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>8820</td>
<td>9688</td>
<td>9954</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>9240</td>
<td>10293</td>
<td>10832</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>9660</td>
<td>10996</td>
<td>11736</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>10080</td>
<td>11725</td>
<td>12667</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>12327</td>
<td>13626</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programming
Program Overview

• Programming is the first phase of design
• The goal is to get all of the required elements for the building identified
• Determine the adjacencies between these elements
• Determine the preliminary size of each element
Program Phasing

- Determine what the timeline for phasing
- Team determined that a 10 year first phase would be a good place to start
- Put program into phases that match the anticipated needs of the department for the next ten years
PROGRAMMING
Overview
PROGRAMMING
Main Entry (Public)

- Public Spaces
- Public Interaction
- Secure Vestibule
- Community Room
  - Emergency Operations Center
- Training
- Defensive Tactics
PROGRAMMING
Main Entry (Public)

• Emergency Operations Center / Training / Community Room and associated spaces deferred to building expansion
• Combine EOC with Detective War room in 1st Phase
• +/- 2550 GSF deferred
PROGRAMMING
Detainee Access

- Separate Secured Entrance for Officers
- Sallyports
- Detainee Processing
- Short Term Holding Cells
- Juveniles separation
- Evidence Processing
PROGRAMMING
Detainee Access

- 2nd Sallyport to be multi-use space for Vehicle Evidence Bay / Temporary Evidence Storage / Bulk Evidence Storage
- K-9 and ACO Kennel deferred
- 150 SF + savings in Evidence
PROGRAMMING

Evidence

- Evidence Processing
- Pass Through Lockers
- Chain of Custody
- Lab
- Fume Hood
- Evidence Storage
- Ventilation requirements
- Climate Control
PROGRAMMING

Evidence

- Accessory Building
- Transient and grounds storage
- Bulk Evidence
- Operational Vehicle bay
- Traffic Equipment
- Bike storage and maintenance
- 1,150 sf deferred
- 2,775 sf accessory building
PROGRAMMING
Overview
PROGRAMMING
Patrol Area

- Patrol Workroom
- Shared work stations
- Secure connection to Detainee area
- Room for growth
PROGRAMMING
Patrol Area

• Offices and meeting room deferred

• +/- 300 sf
PROGRAMMING
Detectives Area

- Adjacent to Patrol
- Individual workstations
- Interview rooms with secured access to detainee area
- War room
Detective work room and Offices deferred
Use offices in Patrol or Admin
War room to serve multi-purpose as Emergency Operations Center
Interview rooms to be included in 1st Phase
+/- 600 sf deferred
PROGRAMMING
Administration Area

- Offices for Command Staff
- Conference Space
- Internal Affairs and Human Resources
PROGRAMMING
Administration Area

- Offices and Conference Room deferred
- 900 sf deferred
PROGRAMMING
Common Area

- Essential Functions
  - Roll Call
  - Quartermaster
  - Armory
- Staff support areas
  - Locker rooms
  - Fitness
  - Breakroom
- Utility Spaces
PROGRAMMING

Common Area

- Most areas critical for department operation
- Some small areas may be eligible for deferral to building expansion
- Challenging area to expand
Phasing Summary

- Minimum police station build requirements:
  - Public Access Area (Front Lobby)
  - Interview Rooms
    - Hard and Soft
  - Roll Call / Briefing Area
  - Evidence
    - Processing
    - Storage
    - Lab
  - Holding Cells
  - Sally Port
  - Armory
  - Quartermaster

- Office Space
  - Patrol
  - Detectives
  - Sergeants
  - Command Group
  - Admin
- Conference Space
- Locker rooms
- Electronics storage/charging
  - Body Cams
  - Radios
- Breakroom
- Utility / IT spaces
Phasing Summary

• Expansion Challenges
  • Interruption of operations
  • Building security
  • Evidence protection / Chain of Custody
  • Oversize generator and other Utilities and Mechanical Systems

• Specific Areas that are hard to expand
  • Detention Cells and Processing
  • Evidence Storage, Lab and Processing
  • Front Lobby

• Expansion opportunities
  • Offices and Conference space
  • Evidence Storage / Vehicle Bay
  • EOC / Training Room / Community Room
  • Out Building
  • Phased Parking / Site development costs

• Dual purpose spaces in initial build
  • War room / EOC
  • 2nd Sally Port / Evidence Bay
  • Storage areas – Transient storage -> Bulk evidence storage
# Phasing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>10 Year Building</th>
<th>Full Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A COMMON USE</td>
<td>4,638 GSF</td>
<td>7,376 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B OPERATIONS</td>
<td>2,397 GSF</td>
<td>2,397 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>2,036 GSF</td>
<td>3,016 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D PATROL</td>
<td>2,498 GSF</td>
<td>2,980 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E INTERNAL EVIDENCE STORAGE &amp; PROCESSING</td>
<td>2,523 GSF</td>
<td>3,090 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F DETECTIVES</td>
<td>1,052 GSF</td>
<td>1,769 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G UTILITY &amp; SUPPORT SPACES</td>
<td>2,153 GSF</td>
<td>6,564 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F CIRCULATION AND SUPPORT</td>
<td>1,447 GSF</td>
<td>1,603 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUILDING AREA</td>
<td>18,743 GSF</td>
<td>28,794 GSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Programming Excel Sheet
Site Selection Results
Selection Criteria

• The criteria is broken down into two groups.
• The first group, Prerequisite Criteria, will be used to evaluate if a site is valid for consideration in the process. This will be graded on a pass/fail criteria, with all criteria meeting the basic site requirements in order to move to the next phase.
• The second group of criteria, Ideal Criteria, will be grouped and weighted into 3 levels of importance, and then will be graded on a scale of 1 to 5 per criteria.
• The weighting and scoring will allow the more important factors, such as site access and security, to be proportional to less important factors, such as existing easements and water table, that are a factor, but easier to overcome with good site design.
• For example, the pre-requisite criteria is that the site be large enough for a 2 story station, so the existing lot would be allowed into the 2nd phase, but it would score very low on the ability to have a 1 story station (Ideal Criteria).
Selection Criteria

Prerequisite Criteria

Site must pass all categories to move forward

• Developable Site Size (Acreage)
  • 2-Story Station (1.5 Acres)

• Site Access
  • 2 points of access required

• Environmental Challenges
Selection Criteria

Ideal Criteria

Graded 1-5 with category weighting

- Site Sized for 1 story station (weight 4)
  - 2.5-4.5 ac
- Improved Site Access (weight 3)
  - Off site roads
- Site Security (weight 2)
  - Conflicts with existing surroundings (Railroad / high pressure gas line)
  - Stand off distances
- Access to infrastructure (weight 2)
  - Off site utility costs

- Land Acquisition Cost (weight 2)
- Community Presence (weight 2)
  - Visibility to Community
- Zoning (weight 1)
  - Best use for land
- Geographic Location (weight 2)
  - Proximity to existing and future population
- Existing Conditions (weight 2)
  - Topography / ditches / wetlands
SITE LOCATION MAP

A. SE OF HARMONY AND CLUB

B. NE OF HARMONY AND CLUB

C. NW CORNER OF HARMONY AND CLUB

D. NORTH OF WALKER MANUFACTURING

E. MILL BROTHERS

F. FEWELL

G. CURRENT SITE

H. SOUTH OF STONEFLY

I. NORTH OF HARMONY AND SIGNAL TREE

J. 4TH AND TIMNATH PARKWAY

K. POUDRE SCHOOL DISTRICT

L. WEST OF MAIN NORTH OF BUSS GROVE

M. MAIN AND CR42

PROPERTIES FOR REVIEW

PROPERTIES DID NOT MEET MINIMUM CRITERIA
## Site Evaluation Results

### Sorted by Average Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site and Description</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Brian</th>
<th>Shaun/Gary</th>
<th>Kala</th>
<th>Jeff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C - NW corner of Harmony &amp; Club</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site E - Mill Brothers</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site F - Fewell</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site J – 4th and Timnath Parkway - Artisan District</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site H - South of Apartments on Stonefly</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site G - Current Site</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site I - North of Harmony and Signal Tree</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site K - PSD (Main St &amp; CR 40)</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site M - E of Main St, Across from Fisher Subdivision (Corn Maze)</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site D - North of Walker</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site L - West of Main, North of Buss Grove</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A - SE of Harmony and Club (Turner) - Did not meet Pre Req</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B - NE corner of Harmony &amp; Club (Collins) - Did not meet Pre Req</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. HARMONY AND CLUB #3

#### RANK #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE VARIABLE</th>
<th>MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Site Access</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Security</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Infrastructure</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition Cost</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presence</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE -** 84/100

Note: This site is not available for acquisition at this time.
## E. MILL BROTHERS

### RANK #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE VARIABLE</th>
<th>MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>x4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Site Access</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Security</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Infrastructure</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition Cost</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presence</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE -** 82.8/100
# F. FEWELL PROPERTY #6

13.56 ACRES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE VARIABLE</th>
<th>MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>x4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Site Access</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Security</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Infrastructure</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition Cost</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presence</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE** - 82.5/100

**RANK #3**
J. ARTISAN DISTRICT

RANK #4

SITE VARIABLE | MULTIPLIER | SCORE
---|---|---
Site Size | x4 | 15
Improved Site Access | x3 | 9
Site Security | x2 | 7.5
Access to Infrastructure | x2 | 8
Land Acquisition Cost | x2 | 8.5
Community Presence | x2 | 8.5
Zoning | x1 | 4
Geographic Location | x2 | 8.5
Existing Conditions | x2 | 7

AVERAGE SCORE - 76/100
### H. SOUTH OF STONEFLY

RANK #5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Variable</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>x4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Site Access</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Security</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Infrastructure</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition Cost</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presence</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE** - 73.3/100
### G. CURRENT SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE VARIABLE</th>
<th>MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>x4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Site Access</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Security</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Infrastructure</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition Cost</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presence</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE -**

68.3/100
Budget Projections & Schedule
Update on CM / GC Process

• 9 proposals received from:
  • Adolfson & Peterson Construction
  • Brinkman Construction
  • Fransen and Pittman Construction
  • Golden Triangle Construction
  • Haselden Construction
  • Phipps Construction
  • Shaw Construction
  • Sun Construction
  • Taylor Kohrs Construction

• Scoring by team ranked top 3

• Interviews held 7/9
  • Adolfson & Peterson Construction
  • Brinkman Construction
  • Fransen and Pittman Construction

• Score by selection Committee
• Unanimous Recommendation:
  • Fransen and Pittman Construction
  • PD experience, Pre-Construction Services and VE options set them apart.

• Staff to bring Pre Construction Contract back to Town Council on 7/28
Description of 3 Scenarios

• Scenario 1
  • Keep existing site (1.5 ac)
  • Build 2 story building +/- 28,000 sf
  • Have the most detailed information for this Scenario

• Scenario 2
  • New 3.5 - 4 acre site
  • Build 1st Phase in 2021 +/- 19,000 sf
  • Build Addition in +/- 10 years for additional 10,000 sf

• Scenario 3
  • New 3.5 - 4 acre site
  • Build full 28,000 sf footprint
  • Finish +/- 18,000 sf
  • Core and Shell +/- 10,000 sf
  • Finish remaining sf in +/- 10 years
Assumptions

To keep these projections apples to apples the following assumptions were made:

- No site acquisition costs were included
- The following contingencies were included
  - 4% Design / Scope Contingency
  - 5% Construction Contingency
  - 4% Owner Contingency
- Escalators for future design and construction work were estimated at 1.5% per year
  - This is a fairly conservative estimate
Scenario 1- Existing site

- Option #1 – Existing 1.53 acre with Two Story Building
  - 28,000 SF Building
  - Budget Details
    - Soft Costs $1,319,000
    - Hard Cost $10,450,000
    - FF&E $570,000
    - Contingency $1,360,000
  - Total Cost $13,699,000 $490/SF
### Scenario 2 – New Site 2 Construction Phases

- **Option #2 – New Site 4+/- acres with One Story Building built in Phases**
  - **Phase I** 19,000 SF Building
    - Soft Costs: $1,248,000
    - Hard Cost: $8,100,000
    - FF&E: $434,000
    - Contingency: $1,052,000
    - **Total First Cost**: $10,834,000 ($570/SF)
  - **Phase II** 10,000 SF Building 10 Years later
    - Soft Costs: $600,000
    - Hard Cost: $4,717,000
    - FF&E: $142,000
    - Contingency: $614,000
    - **Total Addition Cost**: $6,073,000 ($607/SF)

- **Phase I & Phase II Total**: $16,907,000 ($583/SF)
Scenario 3 – New Site Core and Shell

• Option #3 - New Site 4+/- acres with One Story Building
  • Build 28,000 SF with 18,000 SF Finished (Shell 10,000 SF)
  • Build 10,000 SF Tenant Finish 10 years later
  • Budget Details 18,000 SF Finished
    • Soft Costs $ 1,363,000
    • Hard Cost $ 9,053,000
    • FF&E $ 462,000
    • Contingency $ 1,177,000
  Total First Cost $12,055,000 $430/SF

• Build 10,000 SF $2,250,000 Tenant Finish 10 years later

• Total Cost Option #3 $14,364,000 $513/SF
Conceptual Schedule Options

• If we proceed with the existing site:
  • Move to Design Development and Construction Drawings
  • Break ground in Winter 2021
  • Building complete Winter 2022

• If new site is selected
  • Acquire site if needed
  • Revise Preliminary Drawings then move to Design Development and Construction Drawings
  • Break Ground in Summer 2021
  • Building complete Summer 2022
WORK SESSION GOALS

• Provide update to the Council on status of Design Process
• Receive direction from the Council on:
  • Project Site - After review of site selection process
    • Select a preferred site, or
    • Narrow to (3) sites for further due diligence and investigation
    • Determination on existing site – Option for developer buy back to start on 8/1
  • Project Criteria – Basis for Design
    • Design building to last an anticipated number of years prior to expansion
    • Cap project costs at a specific dollar amount
WORK SESSION GOALS

• Consider assigning 1 or 2 Council Members to act as Liaisons to the Design Team