



Connect with us.

Eau Claire County Justice Center Cost Analysis

Final Report

January 13, 2010



Candor. Insight. Results.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
About Baker Tilly	1
Project Scope, Process and Deliverables	1
Project Conclusions.....	2
Limitations and Assumptions	3
Scenario Summary	4
Construction and Development Cost Analysis	5
General Off-Site Considerations	7
Off-Site Justice Center Considerations	7
Off-site Jail Considerations.....	7
Other Considerations.....	7
Market Analysis of Potentially Vacant Space in County Building	8
Operational Cost Analysis	9
Summary of Staff Interviews and Operational Cost Assumptions	9
Cost Summary	12
APPENDIX 1: KBS Construction Cost Review	
APPENDIX 2: KBS Site Matrix	
APPENDIX 3: Market Analysis Supporting Documentation	
APPENDIX 4: Cost Comparison Assumptions	
APPENDIX 5: Eau Claire County Staff Survey Summary	
APPENDIX 6: Estimated City of Eau Claire Police Department Cost Increases	

Executive Summary

Eau Claire County (the “County”) retained the services of Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, LLP (“Baker Tilly”, “we” or “our”) to conduct an analysis of construction and operational costs associated with the location of a new Justice Center facility. A summary of our firm, the analysis, and our conclusions is included in this Executive Summary.

About Baker Tilly

Baker Tilly is an independent member of Baker Tilly International and is the largest U.S. Baker Tilly International member firm. Baker Tilly International is a network of high quality, independent accounting and business services firms and is presently ranked eighth largest in the world in international networks. This membership provides access to resources and talent of hundreds of highly respected, independently owned accounting and consulting firms worldwide.

Baker Tilly has been providing services to counties and other local governments and special districts for more than 75 years. We are one of the Midwest’s oldest, largest, and fastest growing certified public accounting and consulting firms. The firm originated 1931 with a commitment to deliver innovative financial solutions and solid business strategies to our clients and now has more than 1,020 total staff members, including 144 partners and 416 CPAs, serving clients nationwide from offices throughout Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Wisconsin. We were recently ranked as the 17th largest certified public accounting and consulting firm in the United States according to the 2008 *Public Accounting Report’s* “Top 100.”

We are one of the few CPA firms with a dedicated State and Local Government practice, consisting of more than 140 professionals, dedicated entirely to serving governmental clients. Because of this specialized focus, our staff understands the issues governments face and has the experience to find effective solutions. Our public sector group provides services to 33 counties, 229 municipalities, 272 utilities, and 72 school districts throughout the Midwest.

Project Scope, Process and Deliverables

Fundamentally, this project is intended to provide the County with a model with which to evaluate specific scenarios related to jail/courthouse location in terms of operation and construction cost factors. An electronic copy of this model, in Microsoft Excel format, has been provided to the County. The model will allow County staff to change assumptions regarding construction, development, and operational costs for the different development scenarios at any time. The changes in the assumptions will carry through to a simple cost comparison table which will allow the County to compare the scenarios throughout your process. The model has initially been populated with assumptions provided to Baker Tilly by County staff and this report outlines those assumptions and related observations.

The scenarios which Baker Tilly was asked to evaluate as part of the analysis are:

- > **On-site Campus:**
 - A new County jail is built adjacent to the existing downtown County Building
 - Existing departments expand to fill all County Building space
- > **Off-site Justice Center:**
 - A new County jail (including Huber and Juvenile) and courthouse are built at a new location
 - The Ag Center relocates from Altoona to the County Building
 - Existing departments expand within the County Building
 - Remaining space can be rented to other users
- > **Off-site Jail:**
 - A new County jail (including Huber and Juvenile) is built at a new location
 - The courthouse remains in the County Building
 - Existing departments expand to fill all County Building space

The scope of the analysis included:

- > Review and comment on construction cost estimates completed for the On-Site Campus scenario (completed by KBS Construction, Inc. and included in Appendix 1)
- > Identify construction cost differentials associated with moving the Jail and the Justice Center (jail/courthouse) off-site
- > Evaluate operational cost differentials associated with moving the Jail and the Justice Center (jail/courthouse) off-site
- > Evaluate the potential to lease vacant space within the County Building to other tenants

The process of this analysis included:

- > Data collection and review
- > Interviews with County staff
- > Data analysis and model building
- > Presentation of initial findings to County Board of Supervisors
- > Receipt and review of written questions from County Board of Supervisors
- > Final analysis and preparation of final cost model
- > Preparation of final report (includes information requested from the County Board of Supervisors written questions which were relevant to our scope of services)

Project Conclusions

Notable observations from our analysis include:

- > The County's estimated construction costs for the On-site Jail are accurate, based on a square footage cost comparison completed by KBS Construction, Inc. (see Appendix 1).
- > Construction costs are estimated to be the lowest for the On-site Campus largely because this scenario requires the least amount of construction and renovation. Likewise, the Off-Site Justice Center is estimated to be the most expensive as this scenario requires the most construction and renovation.
- > On a per-square foot basis, total development costs are estimated to be higher for the Off-Site scenarios due to additional site work, information infrastructure, and cost to remodel Huber and Juvenile.
- > Annual operating costs are estimated to be the most inexpensive for the On-Site Campus as efficiencies are gained when County services, courts, and the jail are in close proximity. The Off-Site Jail scenario is estimated to require the greatest annual operating budget as separating the courts and the jail requires extra staff, staff time, and travel.
- > Vacant office space within the County building (as may be a possibility in the Off-Site Justice Center scenario) is estimated not to be marketable in the current office market. Should the space become marketable in an improved office market, the rental income from this space may off-set some of the operational costs associated with the Off-Site Justice Center scenario.
- > This analysis does not consider the economic benefits of the alternative uses of the different sites. Once a preferred off-site location is identified, the County may want to consider conducting a highest and best use analysis for the downtown and off-site location in order to understand the opportunity cost in terms of tax base and development opportunities associated with a decision to construct a jail/justice center.

Limitations and Assumptions

The intent of this project is to develop a model and analyze initial data to forecast the operation and construction costs associated with different scenarios for expanding jail space within Eau Claire County. Baker Tilly relied on a variety of sources of data to generate this report, including information provided by County staff. While these data sources are not always verifiable, Baker Tilly has made a significant effort to assure accuracy. Baker Tilly is not responsible for errors or omissions in the data provided by other sources. Specific limitations and assumptions include:

- > Construction costs, space estimates, and staffing estimates were only provided for the On-Site Campus scenario.
- > Estimates used in this analysis for off-site scenarios have been developed with County staff using elements of former studies, projections, departmental assumptions, and industry standards.
- > The research was conducted in November and December 2009, and has not been updated by Baker Tilly since such date.
- > In the event that the client provided building plans, cost estimates, staffing estimates, operational assumptions, etc., the consultant has relied extensively upon such data in the formulation of all analyses.
- > All information contained in the report which others furnished was assumed to be true, correct, and reliable. A reasonable effort was made to verify such information, but the author assumes no responsibility for its accuracy.
- > The evaluation of the market conditions for the office space within the County Building is made as of a certain day. Due to the principles of change and anticipation and market variation, the assessment is only valid as of the date of this analysis.
- > Possession of the report, or a copy thereof, does not carry with it the right of publication, nor may it be reproduced in whole or in part, in any manner, by any person, without the prior written consent of the author. Neither all nor any part of the report, or copy thereof, shall be disseminated to the general public by the use of advertising, public relations, news, sales, or other media for public communication without the prior written consent and approval of the consultant. Nor shall the consultant, firm, or professional organizations of which the consultant is a member be identified without written consent of the consultant.
- > The author of this report is not required to give testimony or attendance in legal or other proceedings relative to this report or to the Subject unless satisfactory additional arrangements are made prior to the need for such services.
- > Acceptance of and/or use of this report constitutes acceptance of all assumptions and the above conditions.

Scenario Summary

County staff provided Baker Tilly with three distinct scenarios to be evaluated as a part of this analysis. These scenarios are as follows:

- > **On-site Campus:** A new County jail is built adjacent to the existing downtown County Building; existing departments expand to fill all County Building space. While plans exist for the potential construction of a new courthouse at the downtown location, this analysis only considered the construction of a new jail and law enforcement garage in this scenario.
- > **Off-site Justice Center:** A new County jail (including Huber and Juvenile) and courthouse are built at a new location; the Ag Center relocates from Altoona to the County Building, existing departments expand within County Building; remaining space can be rented to other users.
- > **Off-site Jail:** A new County jail (including Huber and Juvenile) is built at a new location; the courthouse remains in County Building; existing departments expand to fill all County Building space.

Specific use locations within each scenario are coded in the table below:

Existing Building
New Construction Downtown
New Construction Off-site

	Use Location by Scenario		
	On-site Campus	Off-site Justice Center	Off-site Jail
Eau Claire County Jail			
Circuit Courts			
Clerk of Courts			
Court Holding			
Circuit Court Branch			
Register in Probate			
District Attorney			
Child Support Agency			
Children's Court Services			
TRY Mediation			
Judicial Shared Spaces			
Huber & Juvenile			
Law Enforcement Garage			
City of Eau Claire Police Department			
Eau Claire County Sheriff's Department			
Law Enforcement Shared Services			
City/County Communication Center			
All Other County Departments			

Construction and Development Cost Analysis

In order to review cost differentials associated with construction and renovation costs, Baker Tilly summarized the total square feet to be renovated or constructed in each scenario, as shown in the table below. These space estimates were compiled from previous work completed by Venture Architects and Market and Johnson, in addition to estimates provided by County staff as a part of this analysis. These space estimates are starting points for the evaluation of alternatives and the model provided by Baker Tilly allows for the revision of these figures at any time.

Construction and Renovation Space Estimates Table

	On-site Campus	Off-site Justice Center	Off-site Jail
Total New Construction (square feet)	180,000	360,000	230,000
Total Renovation space in County Building (excluding Huber and Juvenile) (square feet)	60,000*	60,000*	60,000*
Total Huber and Juvenile space renovated to Class B office in County Building (square feet)	0	35,000**	35,000**

*Existing jail space (approximately 60,000 square feet)

** Existing Huber and Juvenile space (approximately 35,000 square feet)

Baker Tilly applied these space assumptions to construction cost estimates that are based on the findings of the KBS Construction, Inc. Construction Cost Review (included in Appendix 1) and assumptions provided by County staff (explained in more detail below and in Appendix 4) to complete the summary of estimated construction and development costs detailed in the table below. All of the assumptions used to develop these cost estimates can easily be changed in the model provided to the County as more information is received on specific construction scenarios.

Development and Construction Cost Estimates and Considerations Table

	On-site Campus	Off-site Justice Center	Off-site Jail
Total New Construction	\$46,800,000	\$93,600,000	\$59,800,000
Total Courthouse Remodel	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000
Total Huber/Juvenile Remodel	\$0	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000
Sale of Ag Building in Altoona	\$0	(\$500,000)	\$0
Total of Quantifiable Construction Expenses Estimates	\$57,600,000	\$108,100,000	\$74,800,000
Other Construction Expenses			
Construction of Holding Cells at County Building	\$0	\$0	TBD
Land costs	\$2,000,000	TBD	TBD
Fiber Infrastructure	Approx. \$200,000/mile from Courthouse	Approx. \$200,000/mile from Courthouse	Approx \$200,000/mile from Courthouse
Fiber Laser Connections	\$3,000	\$8,000-\$15,000 (depends on distance from Courthouse)	\$8,000-\$15,000 (depends on distance from Courthouse)
Other construction considerations (see KBS matrix in Appendix 2)	TBD	TBD	TBD

*See Appendix 4 for detailed assumptions

Given the three scenarios evaluated as part of the Baker Tilly analysis, the following observations related to construction and development costs have been identified.

General Off-Site Considerations

- > Both off-site options require the construction of more space and therefore greater construction expenses.
- > Both off-site options offer the opportunity to renovate the former Huber and Juvenile space in the existing County Building which adds a cost above the On-Site Campus option.
- > Both off-site options require increased costs to lay fiber infrastructure to a new facility. Fiber costs are estimated at \$200,000 per mile from the County Building (according to IS staff). IS staff estimated the cost of switches to be approximately \$3,000 to accommodate fiber to an on-site jail and \$8,000 - \$15,000 (depending on distance) to accommodate fiber to an off-site location.
- > The County will need to consider many other site-specific development costs as outlined in KBS Construction matrix (Appendix 2).

Off-Site Justice Center Considerations

- > With the increased vacant space in the County Building in this alternative, the County may wish to move the Ag Center, currently located in Altoona, to the County Building. This would allow the County to potentially sell the facility in Altoona and off-set construction/renovation costs. County staff estimated that the facility in Altoona could sell for approximately \$500,000. Baker Tilly did not verify this estimate and a professional property appraisal would need to be completed for a more accurate estimate of the building's marketability.

Off-site Jail Considerations

- > In this scenario in which the courts are located in the existing County Building and the jail is located in a new off-site facility, the County will need to construct holding cells at the County Building to secure prisoners awaiting trials and hearings. This will be an additional cost that has not been estimated as a part of this analysis.

Other Considerations

- > This analysis does not consider the economic benefits of the alternative uses of the different sites. Once a preferred off-site location is identified, the County may want to consider conducting a highest and best use analysis for the downtown and off-site location in order to understand the opportunity cost in terms of tax base and development opportunities associated with a decision to construct a jail/justice center.

Market Analysis of Potentially Vacant Space in County Building

Market analysts from Baker Tilly conducted an assessment of the market for office space in downtown Eau Claire in order to evaluate the marketability of potentially vacant space in the County Building (as is a potential in the Off-site Justice Center scenario). As a part of this assessment, Baker Tilly analysts interviewed the Executive Director of the Eau Claire Economic Development Corporation, the President of Commonwealth Development Corporation, and the Director of Property Management for Goldridge Group, LLP. These interviews provided a qualitative assessment of the downtown office market as summarized below:

- > Overall, the downtown office market is very soft right now
- > Downtown is the worst area in Eau Claire with a 13.1% vacancy rate
- > Market rents are substantially lower in today's market than in recent years
- > There is a lot of vacant space in the market that is "hidden" meaning that tenants may occupy more square feet than needed due to the low cost to do so
- > There are no proposed or under construction office projects in the downtown area
- > The developments most comparable to office space within the Eau Claire County Building are Waterford, Hutchinson Technology, and Banbury Place

This information was supported with a review of market rents with data provided by the City of Eau Claire Economic Development Division, Eau Claire Economic Development Corporation, and Loopnet (a summary is included in Appendix 3). Of the twelve properties included in the data, the average Class A net rent equivalent is \$8.54 per square foot and the average Class B&C net rent equivalent is \$6.00 per square foot. Renovated space within the County Building is likely to fall in the Class B&C category. In a stronger market, Class A and Class B&C space rental rates are not this close together. As the market has softened, rent compression has occurred which brings these rates closer together. The effect is generally that prospective renters choose Class A space in order to enjoy additional amenities without a significant cost increase.

Market Conclusions:

- > Due to the availability of affordable office space in the market, the assumption should be made that users not specifically seeking to be close to County services will rent elsewhere in the community.
- > Tenants likely to be attracted to this space include public uses such as schools, municipal uses, or potentially civic and non-profit organizations seeking to be close to County services. Generally, these types of entities are not looking to expand in the current economy due to budget cuts.
- > Short-term operational cost projections should not consider much, if any, rental income unless it is known that other public users have strong interest.

Operational Cost Analysis

In order to examine operational costs associated with each scenario, Baker Tilly interviewed staff from the following County and City departments: Administration, Human Resources, Sheriff's Department, Jail, City of Eau Claire Police Department, and Planning and Development. Participants were asked to consider the three alternatives as described at the beginning of this document. Participants were also asked to assume that the design and size of any off-site jail facility would be the same size as designed for the on-site jail.

The results of the initial operational cost model using the assumptions provided by County staff are summarized in the table on page 11.

Summary of Staff Interviews and Operational Cost Assumptions

A summary of each interview is below. Many of the assumptions that initially populated our model were gathered through these interviews. Those assumptions are provided in Appendix 4 and explained in more detail in each interview summary.

Jail Captain and County Sheriff

The Jail and Sheriff Departments would see virtually no change to their operational costs if the jail were to be located off-site with the courts. Changes to operational costs are all relative to the jail being located in a different location than the courts. Therefore in the Off-site Jail scenario the following cost costs need to be considered:

- > The County Sheriff and Jail Captain estimate that their departments would need to hire two Deputy Sheriffs to oversee the holding cells at the County Building and to transport prisoners from the jail to the court (approximately 22 prisoners are required to attend a court hearing or trial daily which would require an estimate four trip per day in transport). The average annual salary including benefits for Deputy Sheriffs is \$88,000.
- > Two vehicles and equipment for the Deputy Sheriffs would require a one-time start up cost of \$60,000.
- > The holding cells will need to be serviced with meals. It is likely that kitchen staff can float from the jail facility and no new staff will need to be hired. This will result in some lost productivity for the current staff due to transportation time and the logistics of serving prisoners located off-site from the jail facility. County staff estimated that kitchen staff would need to make three daily roundtrips between the jail and the holding cell. The average hourly rate including benefits for kitchen staff is \$28.
- > The holding cells will need to be serviced with occasional medical duties. It is likely that medical staff can float from the jail facility and no new staff will need to be hired. This will result in some lost productivity for the current staff due to transportation time and the logistics of serving prisoners located off-site from the jail facility. County staff estimated that medical staff would need to make one daily roundtrip between the jail and the holding cell. The average hourly rate including benefits for medical staff is \$35.
- > Deputy Sheriffs from the County Jail currently provide back-up services for court bailiffs as there are currently not enough bailiffs to staff each court at all times. Furthermore, the number of bailiffs will be reduced in 2010 due to budget cuts and the frequency of jail staff providing back-up bailiff services is likely to increase. If the jail is separated from the courts, this will require jail staff to make separate trips to the courthouse. County staff estimated that Deputy Sheriffs would make three trips per week, on average, to serve as back-up bailiffs. The average hourly rate including benefits for Deputy Sheriffs is \$28.

Information Services

The Director of Information Services indicated that his department would be affected by either an Off-site Jail or an Off-site Justice Center in terms of staff travel time to support the off-site facilities. IS staff indicated that P.C. Technicians and Program Analysts would need to make trips to a new facility to assist with computer and network problems, maintenance, and upgrades. An estimated 3 trips daily would need to be made to an off-site justice center and 2 trips daily to an off-site jail. The blended hourly rate including benefits for this staff is \$35.

Other Departments

County staff provided Baker Tilly with an estimate of the number of daily roundtrips required to be made between the County Building and the new facility for both off-site locations for all other County staff (not including those discussed individually above). The County's estimates were based on a survey conducted in December 2009 (a summary is included in Appendix 5). In total, staff estimated that 15 daily roundtrips would need to be made to the Off-site Jail and 30 daily roundtrips to the Off-site Justice Center. Baker Tilly used an average hourly wage including benefits for all County employees to quantify staff time spent traveling. The County Human Resources Department provided this rate of \$35.

Operation Cost Comparison Observations

Given the three scenarios evaluated as part of the Baker Tilly analysis, the following observations related to operational costs have been identified.

- > Annual operating costs are estimated to be the most inexpensive for the On-Site Campus as efficiencies are gained when County services, courts, and the jail are in close proximity. The Off-Site Jail scenario is estimated to require the greatest annual operating budget as separating the courts and the jail requires extra staff, staff time, and travel.
- > Vacant office space within the County building (as may be a possibility in the Off-Site Justice Center scenario) is estimated not to be marketable in the current office market. Should the space become marketable in an improved office market, the rental income from this space may off-set some of the operational costs associated with the Off-Site Justice Center scenario.
- > While not a County operational cost, the County may want to consider the impact on City of Eau Claire taxpayers due to increased/decreased costs to the City Police Department. The main impact to the City Police Department will be transporting individuals arrested for jailable offenses to the County Jail. The majority of their jailable arrests are currently made in and around the downtown area, so a jail located on the periphery of the City would require longer trips to transport these individuals. The Police Department provided estimates for additional costs associated with the off-site locations currently being proposed. This information is provided in Appendix 6.

Operational Cost Estimates and Considerations Table

	Increase (decrease) over On-site Campus Scenario					
	Off-site Justice Center (miles from County Building)			Off-site Jail (miles from County Building)		
	2	4	6	2	4	6
County Sheriff/Jail						
Additional Staffing Costs: Deputy Sheriffs for Transportation and Holding Cell	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$174,720	\$174,720	\$174,720
Additional Transportation Costs: Deputy Sheriffs Mileage for Prisoner Transport	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,226	\$4,453	\$6,679
Lost Staff Productivity: Deputy Sheriffs for Back-up Bailiff duties	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,276	\$3,822	\$4,368
Additional Transportation Costs: Deputy Sheriffs Mileage for Back-up Bailiff duties	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$343	\$686	\$1,030
Lost Staff Productivity: Kitchen Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,084	\$8,265	\$9,445
Additional Transportation Costs: Kitchen Staff Mileage	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,113	\$2,226	\$3,340
Lost Staff Productivity: Medical Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,428	\$5,165	\$5,903
Additional Transportation Costs: Medical Staff Mileage	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$557	\$1,113	\$1,670
County Information Services Department						
Lost Staff Productivity: IS Staff	\$13,283	\$15,496	\$17,710	\$8,855	\$10,331	\$11,807
Additional Transportation Costs: IS Staff Mileage	\$1,670	\$3,340	\$5,009	\$1,113	\$2,226	\$3,340
Other County Departments						
Lost Staff Productivity: Various Departments Staff	\$113,850	\$132,825	\$151,800	\$56,925	\$66,413	\$75,900
Additional Transportation Costs: Various Departments Staff Mileage	\$16,698	\$33,396	\$50,094	\$8,349	\$16,698	\$25,047
Total of Quantifiable Annual Operating Expenses Greater than On-Site Campus Option	\$145,500	\$185,057	\$224,613	\$268,989	\$296,119	\$323,248
Other Operational Costs/Revenue						
Potential Rental Income in County Building	(\$162,000)	(\$162,000)	(\$162,000)	\$0**	\$0**	\$0**

*See Appendix 4 for detailed assumptions

** In the Off-site Jail scenario, existing County departments expand to fill all of the space within the County Building.

Cost Summary

The table below outlines the observations of our analysis utilizing data and information provided by County staff. Notable observations include:

- > Construction costs are estimated to be the lowest for the On-site Campus largely because this scenario requires the least amount of construction and renovation. Likewise, the Off-Site Justice Center is estimated to be the most expensive as this scenario requires the most construction and renovation.
- > On a per-square foot basis, total development costs are estimated to be higher for the Off-Site scenarios due to additional site work, information infrastructure, and cost to remodel Huber and Juvenile.
- > Annual operating costs are estimated to be the most inexpensive for the On-Site Campus as efficiencies are gained when County services, courts, and the jail are in close proximity. The Off-Site Jail scenario is estimated to require the greatest annual operating budget as separating the courts and the jail requires extra staff, staff time, and travel.
- > Vacant office space within the County building (as may be a possibility in the Off-Site Justice Center scenario) is estimated not to be marketable in the current office market. Should the space become marketable in an improved office market, the rental income from this space may off-set operational costs such that the Off-Site Justice Center could operate as cost-effectively as the On-Site Campus.

	Total Construction Cost	Total Development Cost (per SF)	Operational Cost* (short-term w/o rental income)	Operational Cost * (long-term potential with rental income)
On-Site Campus	Lowest	Estimated Lowest	Lowest	Lowest
Off-Site Justice Center	Highest	Estimated Middle-Highest	Middle	Middle (long-term potential to off-set some cost increases and operate close to the lowest cost option)
Off-Site Jail	Middle	Estimated Middle-Highest	Highest	Highest

*Does not include utilities and maintenance

Appendix 1: KBS Construction Cost Review



Eau Claire County Justice Center
Construction Cost Review

KBS Construction, Inc has performed a thorough review of the construction costs associated with the Eau Claire County Justice Center project. Our review included reviewing the available documentation, reading executive reports and researching applicable comparables. We did not perform a formal take-off and are relying on the space needs area summaries that were provided. We concentrated our review on the documents prepared by Market and Johnson dated 4/8/2009 and 6/20/2008.

Our research involved using industry data sources from all over the United States. These sources have been factored for location (Eau Claire, WI) and time (December 2009). Some resources provided information in a condensed format or as a single total number. We concentrated on the total building costs for our review.

In this past year the construction industry has seen the greatest fluctuation in pricing for the past 25 years. Currently the market is extremely competitive and prices are low. There are some indicators that certain commodities will start to creep as the market can endure these low prices only so long. For example, we have received a notice that steel pricing will increase after the first of the year potentially by 15%. These times are not predictable but forecasters do support small increases to start first quarter along with wage increases mid-year. A good escalation factor should be in the 2% range for 2010 work provided there are no catastrophic global events.

GARAGE ADDITION

The project most developed is the Garage Facility Addition. Cost comparables that we had on file in our historical database included 2 pre-engineered municipal garages.

14,427 sf	\$ 91.99/sf bldg cost
74,119 sf	\$ 58.72/sf bldg cost

Another comparable resource provided the data for a pre-engineered Collision Center Garage of:

15,331 sf	\$ 94.02/sf bldg cost
-----------	-----------------------

The AVERAGE cost of these comparables is \$81.58/sf for building costs and \$105.37 for building and site costs.



Eau Claire County Justice Center
Construction Cost Review

Market and Johnson estimate dated 6/03/09 is at \$96.17/sf building and 105.37/sf building and site costs including construction manage fees, overhead and profit.

It is our opinion that this is indicative of a good unit price for this work. The comparable unit prices we used need to be adjusted to a concrete and masonry structure in lieu of pre-engineered and to simplify the finishes and mechanicals to just a garage application and not a garage service application. With these factors in mind, the Market and Johnson estimate is a good representation of the costs for the garage addition. (ref Exhibit A)

NEW JAIL and BRIDGE

The new Jail and Bridge facility is probably the easiest project to use industry standard cost comparables as it is a stand alone building. Four projects of similar character were used to develop our opinion regarding the accuracy of the current budget provided by Market and Johnson as follows:

136,604 sf	252 bed	\$192.03 /sf bldg cost
81,200 sf	260 bed	\$277.64 /sf bldg cost
144,000 sf	228 bed	\$177.30 /sf bldg cost
137,000 sf	? Bed	\$176.06 /sf bldg cost
<u>AVERAGE:</u>		\$205.76 /sf bldg cost, \$216.88 bldg and site

Market and Johnson estimate dated 6/20/08 is at \$213.85 for building costs and \$222.36 with the sitework costs included (these unit prices include the construction management fees). It must be taken into consideration that a portion of the Eau Claire Jail will be shell space only. Roughly 23% of the 1st and 2nd floor will be shell space (approximately 25,000 sf). If the space only costs 75% of the finished space, this yields an adjusted comparable unit price of \$198.59 for building costs and \$210.41 for building and site costs. With this in mind, we feel that the Market and Johnson estimated costs are adequate for the Jail building. (ref Exhibit B)

COURTHOUSE REMODELING

Remodeling work is a much more difficult type of work to find comparables for. We approached determining the validity of the current estimate by researching NEW facilities. We found the following:



Eau Claire County Justice Center
Construction Cost Review

170,340 sf	\$166.05 /sf bldg cost
195,713 sf	\$208.00 /sf bldg cost
70,000 sf	\$267.40 /sf bldg cost
70,540 sf	\$193.77 /sf bldg cost
119,779 sf	\$240.37 /sf bldg cost
<u>78,360 sf</u>	<u>\$207.28 /sf bldg cost</u>
AVERAGE:	\$213.81 /sf bldg cost, \$229.52 Bldg and site cost

Essentially, the difference between a remodel project and a new project can be quantified as a remodeled building will not have site costs, structural costs or exterior skin costs. We are assuming only minor modifications of the structure, the windows, and the exteriors will be needed. Elevators will be upgraded but not replaced. With this in mind, we see that the new construction cost comparables should be decreased by \$79.97 for building costs and \$85.97 for building and site costs.

The ADJUSTED AVERAGE comparables would then be \$138.60 for building costs and \$148.32 for building and demolition(site) costs.

Market and Johnson estimate dated 6/20/08 is at \$115.04 for building costs and \$124.09 with the site(building demolition) costs included. (These unit prices include the construction management fees.) (ref Exhibit C)

This is a variable of 20%. This estimate should be looked at more clearly to discern if the project factors warrant this difference. Such factors include: design standards, gross sf of courtroom space to actual, re-using partitions, bathrooms, or mechanical systems. These factors should be reviewed and adjustments should be made.

The project could be remodeled for this amount but it may not be to the standard that the comparables were built to. The comparables all incorporate long term building use (100 years), state of the art technology and code interpretation, room for growth and providing a civic icon for the community.

NEW JUSTICE CENTER

During our research we obtained the data for several projects that were mixed use with the Jail, Justice, and Law Enforcement in one project or the Justice and Law Enforcement in one building. We are aware of the discussion with regards



Eau Claire County Justice Center
Construction Cost Review

to new buildings off site. We took it further to study other Justice Centers to establish the trend in pricing and found that the costs for Justice Centers is similar to Jails and would be good comparables. We found the following:

Jail, Justice and Law Enforcement:

182,940 sf	144 bed facility	\$174.83 /sf bldg cost
116,750 sf	264 bed facility	<u>\$282.11 /sf bldg cost</u>
AVERAGE:		\$228.47

Justice and Law Enforcement:

32,100 sf	\$188.64
47,450 sf	\$295.64
80,000 sf	<u>\$236.23</u>
AVERAGE:	\$240.17

Mixed use comparisons can vary greatly by the ratio of the types of space. These unit prices only indicate what range a mixed use facility should fall. Further space ratio analysis and determining whether the uses will be in a combined or stand alone building development would need to be done to refine the applicable unit pricing. (ref Exhibit D and E)



Eau Claire County Justice Center
Construction Cost Review
References

DCD:

Design Cost Data, *The Cost Estimating Magazine for Design & Construction*.
DC&C Technologies, Inc., 8602 N. 40th Street, Tampa, FL 33604. dcd.com

MEANS:

RSMEANS, *Square Foot Costs 2010 31st annual edition*. Division of Reed
Construction Data Construction Publishers and Consultants 63 Smiths Lane Kingston,
MA 02364-3008 rsmeans.com

ASPE:

Standard Estimating Practice: 5th Edition October 1998, American Society of
Professional Estimators 2525 Perimeter Place Drive - Suite 103 Nashville, TN 37214
aspenational.org

KBS:

Internal Historical Cost Data KBS Construction, Inc. 841 Kipp St. Madison, WI
53718 kbsconstuction.com



Exhibit B

12/14/2009

Jail Comparables December 2009 Projected Eau Claire, WI	Cass County Jail Fargo, ND		Richland County Jail Mansfield, OH		LaCrosse County Jail LaCrosse, WI		Monroe County Jail Sparta, WI		Market & Johnson 6/20/08 Budget		Uniformat	MEANS
	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:	GSF: Beds: SF / Bed:		
0 Bidding Requirements	136,604 252 542,080	136,604 252 542,080	81,200 260 312,310	144,000 228 632	144,000 228 632	137,000 228 632	137,000 228 632	179,521 345 520,350	179,521 345 520,350	179,521 345 520,350		
1 General Requirements	0.98%	\$255,905	\$0.00	\$1,559,331	\$10.36	\$1,418,660	\$10.36	\$2,117,531	11.80	2,117,531	General Requirements	52.31
2 Concrete	2.66%	\$697,965	\$28.32	\$2,299,976	9.95%	\$2,541,524	\$23.76	172,000	0.96	172,000	Substructure	3.24
3 Masonry	10.39%	\$19,960	\$41.56	\$3,374,310	82.46%	\$21,052,543	\$16.97	6,260,000	34.87	6,260,000	Superstructure	24.96
4 Metals	16.04%	\$30,810	\$37.09	\$3,011,701	2.51%	\$604,330	\$4.41	997,000	28.10	5,044,000	Exterior Enclosure	23.09
5 Wood & Plastics	3.87%	\$7,742	\$7.27	\$560,293	14.96%	\$3,609,220	\$26.34	417,000	5.55	997,000	Roofing	2.00
6 Thermal & Moisture Protection	1.04%	\$1,990	\$1.48	\$120,468	2.44%	\$588,000	\$4.29	1,065,000	2.32	417,000	Interiors	12.58
7 Doors & Windows	5.10%	\$9,790	\$8.53	\$692,691	6.61%	\$1,593,296	\$11.63	3,723,000	5.93	1,065,000	Equipment Furnishings	56.6
8 Finishes	1.80%	\$3,460	\$2.15	\$174,679	1.48%	\$378,000	\$2.63	0	0.00	0	in above	
9 Specialties	5.47%	\$10,500	\$13.28	\$1,078,189	0.00%	\$0	\$0.00	0	0.00	0	Conveying	3.94
10 Equipment	1.18%	\$2,270	\$2.06	\$2,197,337	1.97%	\$443,322	\$5.46	400,000	2.23	400,000	Fire Suppression	3.26
11 Furnishings	2.77%	\$5,532	\$20.47	\$1,662,459	9.75%	\$263,825	\$2.77	646,000	3.60	646,000	Plumbing	49.65
12 Special Construction	0.00%	\$0	\$0.74	\$60,234	11.79%	\$2,668,730	\$23.54	5,800,000	14.00	2,513,000	HVAC	14.44
13 Mechanical	7.50%	\$14,390	\$1.45	\$118,059	10.37%	\$2,337,080	\$20.33	3,321,000	18.50	3,321,000	Electrical	15.47
14 Conveying Systems	0.26%	\$68,824	\$5.46	\$443,322	0.52%	\$118,059	\$1.45	539,000	3.00	539,000		
15 Mechanical	22.21%	\$42,650	\$42.65	\$5,825,615	6.03%	\$1,358,880	\$16.73	1,795,000	10.00	1,795,000		
16 Electrical	18.74%	\$35,990	\$28.76	\$2,337,080	100.00%	\$2,337,080	\$22.76	103,000	2.23	103,000		
Total Building Costs	100.00%	\$192,030	\$277.64	\$22,544,631	100.00%	\$25,531,398	\$176.06	\$24,120,110	213.85	\$38,390,531	Cost/sf	261.54
Non-Building Costs		\$762,300	\$F	\$F		\$F	\$F		Reported completed projects			
2 Site Work		\$1,384,591	\$30,358	\$1,025,995		\$1,025,995	\$F		Range: \$176.35 to \$468.35			
Total Non-Building Costs	1.82	\$10,140	\$1,066,142	\$1,300,000	4.08%	\$7,490	\$1,025,995					
Total Project Costs		\$202,170	\$277.64	\$22,544,631		\$25,531,398	\$186.33	\$25,146,105	222.36	\$39,917,531	65,532 1st floor	
		\$202,170	\$277.64	\$22,544,631		\$25,531,398	\$186.33	\$25,146,105	7.94	1,527,000	41,292 2nd Floor	
		\$202,170	\$277.64	\$22,544,631		\$25,531,398	\$186.33	\$25,146,105	222.36	39,917,531	106,824	23%
		\$202,170	\$277.64	\$22,544,631		\$25,531,398	\$186.33	\$25,146,105	24,570	Shell Space		
		\$202,170	\$277.64	\$22,544,631		\$25,531,398	\$186.33	\$25,146,105	Shell at 75% bldg cost =			
		\$202,170	\$277.64	\$22,544,631		\$25,531,398	\$186.33	\$25,146,105	\$35,651,832.56	Waste \$	198.59	
		\$202,170	\$277.64	\$22,544,631		\$25,531,398	\$186.33	\$25,146,105		Waste \$	210.41	

Appendix 2: KBS Site Matrix



SITE IMPACTS TABLE

12/10/2009

Decision Analysis Review (DAR)
 Rating Scale: 0 = low impact 10 = high impact

Category	Description	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8	Details
Site	Land Costs									
	Annexation Process									
	Zoning									
	Acquisition difficulties / condemnation									
	Safe Access Location									site lines, turning radius, grade
	Distance from emergency services									fire department, ambulance, police
	Road Extension									
	Load Restrictions									
	Location of Bedrock									
	Soil Bearing Capacity									
	Water Table									
	Site Clearing									
	Demolition Required									extensively trees rough terrain - flat farm field
	Environmental Factors									
	previous use / hazardous materials									gas tanks, spills, chemicals
	previous use / obstructions									buried old foundations
	Distance to Resources									
	hauling distance for fill									
	hauling distance for export									
	Grade Changes on site									
Earth retention needed										
Utilities	Water									
	Well									
	Hook up and use fees									
	Adequate size and pressure									
	Distribution / Extension									
	Sewer Extension									
	Stormwater Management									distance to tie-in, develop on site detention
	Well drained site									
	Gas Supply									new service costs, size available, pressure
	Hook up and use fees									new service costs, size available
Other	Electrical									
	Existing overhead lines restrictions									
	Voltages available									
	Hook up and use fees									
	DNR -waterway permits / adjacency									
	Tax base impact									
	Distance to Resources									
	Transportation within system									
	Adjacent Amenities for employees									
Contributing LEED certification factors										
Future Expansion										
Related Use adjacencies / Consolidation										
Public Transportation Options										
Neighborhood issues										
TOTAL										

Decision Review:
 SUGGEST: Scores >65 should be disregarded

Appendix 3: Market Analysis Supporting Documentation

Appendix 4: Cost Comparison Assumptions

STAFF UTILIZATION ASSUMPTIONS

	On-site Campus	Off-site Justice Center	Off-site Jail
Additional Deputy Sheriffs for Transport/Holding Cell (full time staff)		0	2
Trips made by Deputy Sheriffs for Prisoner Transport (trips/day)		0	4
Trips made by Deputy Sheriffs to serve Back-up Bailiff Duty (trips/week)		0	3
Trips made by Floating Jail Kitchen staff to serve Holding Cells (trips/day)		0	2
Trips made by Floating Jail Medical staff to serve Holding Cells (trips/day)		0	1
Trips made by Floating IS staff to serve Jail and Courts (trips/day)		3	2
Trips made by Other County Departments staff to serve Jail and Courts (trips/day)		30	15

STAFF COST ASSUMPTIONS

	All Scenarios
Deputy Sheriff for Prisoner Transport, Holding Cells Staffing, and Back-up Bailiff Duties (hourly wage with benefits)	\$42.00
Floating Jail Kitchen Staff to serve Holding Cells (hourly wage with benefits)	\$28.00
Floating Jail Medical Staff to serve Holding Cells (hourly wage with benefits)	\$35.00
IS Staff to serve off-site Jail and Courthouse (hourly wage with benefits)	\$35.00
Other County Departments staff that will make trips to Courthouse and Jail (hourly wage with benefits)	\$30.00

**Eau Claire County Justice Center Cost Analysis
Appendix 4**

CONSTRUCTION/REAL ESTATE ASSUMPTIONS

	On-site Campus	Off-site Justice Center	Off-site Jail
Available space for rent in County Building (square feet)		30,000	0
Vacancy of rental space in County Building (% of total)		10%	0%
Annual rental income in County Building (net rent/square foot)		\$6.00	\$0.00
Total New Construction (square feet)	180,000	360,000	230,000
Total Renovation space in County Building (excluding Huber and Juvenile) (square feet)	60,000	60,000	60,000
Total Huber and Juvenile space renovated to Class B office in County Building	0	35,000	35,000
Sale price of building in Altoona	\$0	\$500,000	\$0
Cost of New Construction (cost/square foot) (includes site work and soft costs)	\$260	\$260	\$260
Cost of County Building Renovation (cost/square foot) (includes demo and soft costs)	\$180	\$180	\$180
Cost to renovate Huber and Juvenile to Class B office (cost/square foot) (includes demo and soft costs)	\$0	\$120	\$120

OTHER ASSUMPTIONS

	All Scenarios
2 miles travel/prep time (minutes roundtrip)	30
4 miles travel/prep time (minutes roundtrip)	35
6 miles travel/prep time (minutes roundtrip)	40
Annual days of operation (days/year)	253
Mileage reimbursement (\$/mile)	\$0.55

Appendix 5: Eau Claire County Staff Survey Summary

**JAIL SURVEY
12/28/09**

Department	How many times per week would your staff visit the jail?	How many times per week would staff visit the justice center?	Other Comments
Administration	Once a week	Twice per week (McCarty once per week (Rasmusson)	
ADRC	Less than 1x month	Less than 1x month	
Airport	None		
Child Support	3.5 times /wk for agency	N/A	Not having the Sheriff's Dept. located at the Justice Center is more ludicrous than building a new jail remote from the courthouse
Children's Courts Services	20 staff @ 4 times a week = 15 trips to the jail weekly	10 staff @ 1 trip per day = 10 trips per week	
Circuit Courts	None		
Clerk of Courts	12 this would be if we did most things the same. We have someone visit the jail 1x or 2x a day to do bonds or amendments	N/A We would most likely be a part of the justice center	The COC office deals with the same clients that others do. Having the courts removed from the other departments will make it more difficult for the public. Some trips are unexpected such as someone in jail needing to post a bond. Not enough staff to drop everything and drive to the jail to do the bond.
Corp Counsel	None	38	
County Clerk	4-5 times a year	None	
DA	15	?	
Extension	None	None	
Finance	No reply		
Health Department	Nursing - less than once every 1-2 months Environmental - twice a year to inspect food service.	Less than once per month	
Human Resources	This is a difficult one to answer. There are times I am up in jail 2 or 3 times per day or week and there are times I am not there at all. It depends on the HR matter being discussed and whether it makes sense for us to go to the Jail/Sheriff's Department or for them to come here. I am going to assume that Dan has included trips to HR in his analysis and leave it at that as they tend to come to HR more than we go there. (used 1/wk)		
Human Services	16 times a week	72 times a week	
IS	addressed directly with BT		
Maintenance	Average of 10 per week	Average of 20 per week	In both scenarios, I think it would be more efficient to have 1 maintenance worker stationed at new building, but would have space needs for a shop. In the case of the new justice center, I think it would be more efficient to station 1 maintenance worker and 2 custodians at new building. There would be FTE needs for my dept. with the addition of that many square feet of building.

**JAIL SURVEY
12/28/09**

Department	How many times per week would your staff visit the jail?	How many times per week would staff visit the justice center?	Other Comments
Planning and Development	Staff from P&D would rarely, if ever visit the jail. Perhaps 1 or 2 staff, twice a year at the most.		
Parks and Forest	None	N/A	
Probate	None	None	
Purchasing	3.5 visits/week (incl. prints hop, purch and safety)	11.5 visits/week	If the justice center was built off-site there would be many employees running back and forth all day long. A courier would be more efficient.
Register of Deeds	None	I would depend on if there was a courier. The COC sends paper to record and we send them back also the Register in Probate does once in a while. The DA comes down if they need a death certificate for court. Once in awhile we work with Corp Counsel.	
Sheriff	Captain Bresina said he talked personally with Kate Crowley about this, so he thinks we're covered.		
Treasurer	No reply	used 5/wk	
Veterans	No reply		
TOTAL	77/ week divided by 5 (days/wk) = 15 trips/day	154.5/wk divided by 5 = 30 trips per day	

Appendix 6: Estimated City of Eau Claire Police Department Cost Increases

Baker Tilly interviewed the City of Eau Claire Police Department to understand the impact of the justice center scenarios on their operations. The main impact on the City of Eau Claire Police Department will be transporting individuals arrested for jailable offenses to the County Jail. The majority of their jailable arrests are currently made in and around the downtown area, so a jail located on the periphery of the City would require longer trips to transport these individuals. The Police Department provided estimates for additional costs associated with the off-site locations currently being proposed. This information is provided in the table on the next page.

