

THE WORKING GROUP PROCESS

- Identify External Understandings
- Identify Underlying Limitations
- Place City and County operations into functional teams
- Identify a series of alternative space configurations (these became the four scenarios)
- Review each scenario from three critical perspectives
 - Do the potential scenarios make sense from a citizens perspective?
 - Do the potential scenarios make sense from an internal management perspective for the City and the County respectively?
 - Do the potential scenarios make sense from a financial perspective for each the City and the County respectively?
- Report out the results of the tri-perspective review along with some basic pros and cons for each of the potential scenarios

**DONALD F. SCHENKEL
10646 MAPLE SPRINGS COVE
FORT WAYNE, IN 46845**

January 22, 2010

Dear Members of the City-County Space Utilization Task Force:

As members of the greater Fort Wayne business community, we have been closely following the discussions between the City of Fort Wayne and Allen County as a mutual solution to the space needs of local government is pursued. While we applaud the leadership of the City and County on this issue, it is time for our voices to be heard.

We are business owners, employers, investors, executives, volunteers, family members and above all else, citizens of this community. We care deeply about its success, and we regard our civic responsibility as seriously as you do. Therefore, we urge the task force to develop a plan that takes full advantage of the City-County Building and 200 East Berry Street.

Our reasons:

- We believe that we are one community.
- We believe that the City-County Building and 200 East Berry Street are the foundation for an equitable solution that can bring nearly all local government together.
- We believe our community's top priority must be the creation and retention of jobs, and a joint answer to local government's building and space needs will send an important signal to the world that our community is unified in purpose and equipped to compete.
- We believe that few of our citizens differentiate between the various levels of local government and that we must do everything possible to make all local government easier to use, more cost effective and more responsive to their needs. Those objectives are even more important to the business community as we work with our elected officials to build a vibrant local economy.
- We believe that local government collaboration and cooperation are good for our community and good for business and that co-location is an investment that will promote those values.
- We believe that best practices combined with common functionality and smart space planning can yield significant efficiencies for local government operations.
- We believe those efficiencies can be translated into cost savings while still ensuring the delivery of high-quality services to all citizens.
- We believe that co-located local government will save tax dollars and better serve the public.
- We believe that this is a decision that is right for our community and that the time is right to make it happen.

Given the many benefits outlined, we strongly support the co-location of local government in the City-County Building and 200 East Berry Street. We also support the use of the City-County Building for both police departments. Do not allow this moment to pass. Act swiftly to make this a reality. This letter has also been endorsed by the individuals listed on the attached schedule.

Thank you for your hard work on behalf of our community.

Sincerely yours,



Donald F. Schenkel

**Individuals Also Endorsing the Letter to
City-County Space Utilization Task Force
dated January 22, 2010**

Keith E. Busse, President
Steel Dynamics

James E. Cook, President
Chase Bank

Scott Glaze, President
Fort Wayne Metals Research Products Corp.

Dave Haist, Executive Vice President/COO
Do-It-Best Corp.

Joni Howell, Manager, Government & Community Affairs
Chamber of Commerce

James Marcuccilli, President/CEO
Star Bank

Tom Marcuccilli, President
Star Financial Group

Michael Packnett, President/CEO
Parkview Health Systems

Michael Schatzlein, CEO
Dupont Hospital and Lutheran Health Network

Pat Sullivan, Executive Vice President
Hylant Group

Chuck Surack, CEO
Sweetwater Sound

Jim Vann, Chairman of the Board
Rea Magnet Wire Company, Inc.



January 26, 2010

Dear City-County Space Utilization Task Force:

As a membership organization representing the Greater Fort Wayne business community, we have been observing the discussions between the City of Fort Wayne and Allen County in pursuit of a solution to the space needs of the two local government organizations. We commend the leadership of the City and County for working on this issue, but feel it is time for us to step forward and express our opinion.

Our Chamber members provide the foundation for this community through their entrepreneurial efforts as business owners, employers, investors, and executives, and they also make substantial contributions as volunteers, family members and taxpayers. As such, we are deeply invested in the success of our community and believe it is our civic responsibility to make our opinions known, namely our belief with regard to this issue that whatever plan is adopted should contribute to the efficiency of both organizations and take full advantage of both the City-County Building and the building located at 200 East Berry Street.

The Chamber is aware that a group of local businessmen recently sent you a letter expressing a similar point of view regarding space allocation in the two buildings. We agree with the reasons they listed in their letter, which appeared on the opinion page of *The Journal-Gazette* last Saturday, but don't believe it is necessary to re-list them point by point in order to get our message across. Suffice it to say that the Chamber is on the same page with those business leaders in regard to this issue.

In addressing the space needs of the City and the County, and the space that is available in the City-County Building and the Berry Street building, The Chamber asks that you keep in mind what is best for our community. We ask that you remember your bosses, the local taxpayers, and make the most efficient use of the available space so that our local government operations will conserve tax dollars that can be used for other priorities.

As business leaders, our Chamber members believe that job creation and retention should be the top priority of this community, because these form the framework of all future economic success. In order to accomplish these goals, we need to work together as a unified community so that Fort Wayne and Allen County remain an attractive place in which to live and do business. What better way to illustrate this unity than by our two units of local government – the City and the County – working together toward common goals and for the best solutions to their space needs?

We believe that the City and the County can and should co-locate at both the City-County Building and at the Berry Street building. Our only recommendation in regard to specific space allocation is that we believe it is in the community's best interest to locate both the Fort Wayne Police Department and the Allen County Sheriff's Department in the City-County Building. It makes sense to house two organizations with similar missions in the same building in order to keep our community safe and secure in the most efficient manner.

We ask that you give serious consideration to the opinions of the Chamber expressed herein, and that you take swift action in finding the best solutions to the issue at hand. Time is of the essence to get this done, and we thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Landram, President and CEO,
on Behalf of the Board of Directors of
The Greater Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce

From working group Document.

PUBLIC SAFETY NOT CO-LOCATED

	BERRY ST.																		
	Square ft.	County	City	City/County Bldg.	Square ft.	County	City												
San Wayne Police Department	80,000		90,000		22,000		22,000												
Fire Department	11,000		11,000		5,000		5,000												
City Utilities <i>Custom S&C Admin</i>	29,825		29,825		1,500		1,500												
Storage	11,000		11,000		11,000		11,000												
Management Team	21,275	7,450	13,825		1,000		1,000												
Internal Service Team	19,450	6,825	12,625		11,800		11,800												
Other	3,300		3,300		52,950		19700												
HR Training Room	950		950		34,150		34,150												
Commissioners/Council Chambers	5,000	1,300	3,700		24,900		24,900												
					Customer Services Team		8,500		8,500										
					Courthouse Annex		20,100		20,100										
					City Traffic		400		400										
					911 Communications		6,000		3,400										
					Omni Room		1,750		1,750										
					<i>City Utility development funding + 12,000</i>														
Total Square ft. allocated	181,800	15,575	166,225		201,050		164,800		36,250										
Total Square ft. available	215,011				214,495				18%										
Excess (Short)	33,211	9%	91%		13,445		82%												
					<i>45,211 *</i>		<i>1,446 *</i>												
Total Space Allocated	392,850	190,375	202,475																

Less C.U. Development Teams.

* Based on Working Group assumptions of SF.

CITY OF FORT WAYNE/ALLEN COUNTY CO-LOCATION				City/County Building			
County Councilman Moss Scenario							
Public Safety Not Co-Located							
200 E. Berry Street							
	Square Ft.	County	City		Square Ft.	County	City
	Required				Required		
Public Safety Team				Public Safety Team			
Fort Wayne Police Department	80,000		80,000	Sheriff	22,000	22,000	
Fire Department	11,000		11,000	Lock up	5,000	5,000	
Total	91,000		91,000	Coroner	1,500	1,500	
City Utilities				City/County Communications 911	6,000	3,400	2,600
Customer Relations	4,200		4,200	Total	34,500	31,900	2,600
Data Control	1,500		1,500	Misc. Team			
Financial Services	2,800		2,800	CCB Storage	11,000	11,000	
Administration	2,100		2,100	Total	11,000	11,000	
Additional Space Requirements	7,225		7,225	Public Spaces			
Total	17,825		17,825	Building Training Room	1,000	1,000	
Misc. Team				Omni Room	1,750	1,750	
Storage	11,000		11,000	Total	2,750	2,750	
Total	11,000		11,000	Development Team			
Management Team				Building Department	6,000	6,000	
Commissioners Office	6,600	6,600		Land Use Planning	1,200	1,200	
County Council Office/Conference Room	850	850		Surveyors	4,600	4,600	
City PIO and Legislative Liaison	650		650	Total	11,800	11,800	
City Law	2,200		2,200	Expanded Development Team			
Mayor/Deputy Mayor	3,050		3,050	County Highway	9,600	9,600	
311	450		450	GIS - County	1,200	1,200	
Neighborhood Advocates	1,800		1,800	County Plan	5,900	5,900	
City Council Resource Office	625		625	NIRRC	3,000	3,000	
City Clerk	1,600		1,600	Board of Works Administration	1,100		1,100
Controllers Office	3,450		3,450	Barrett Law	225		225
Total	21,275	7,450	13,825	Solid Waste	550		550
Internal Service Team				City Traffic	400		400
County HR	1,200	1,200		Traffic Engineering	3,875		3,875
County Purchasing	1,200	1,200		Transportation Engineering	4,475		4,475
IT Admin - County (3)	925	925		Right of Way	1,575		1,575
County Printing	2,500	2,500		Flood Control	950		950
State Board of Accounts	1,000	1,000		Greenway Department	300		300
City HR	4,600		4,600	Public Works Conference Room	625		625
City Purchasing	3,625		3,625	Transportation Administration	1,475		1,475
City Property Management	375		375	City Community Development	11,500		11,500
IT Admin - City (2)	375		375	Neighborhood Code Enforcement	6,600		6,600
Payroll	1,700		1,700	Total	53,350	19,700	33,650
City Risk Management	1,200		1,200	Other			
Internal Audit	750		750	Public Defender	3,800	3,800	
Total	19,450	6,825	12,625	Board of Health Admin	15,000	15,000	
Other				County Solid Waste	4,000	4,000	
Metro Human Relations	3,000		3,000	D&M	1,000	1,000	
Victims Assistance	150		150	Joe	150	150	
Hispanic Liaison	150		150	ATOS	8,000	8,000	
Total	3,300		3,300	County Clinic	1,500	1,500	
Public Spaces				Veterans	700	700	
Commissioners Court	1,300	1,300		Total	34,150	34,150	
HR Training Room	950		950	Tax Team			
City Council Chambers	3,700		3,700	County Auditor	7,000	7,000	
Total	5,950	1,300	4,650	County/Wayne Assessors	11,000	11,000	
TOTAL 200 E. Berry Street	169,800	15,575	154,225	County Treasurer	3,000	3,000	
		9%	91%	County Recorder	3,900	3,900	
				Total	24,900	24,900	
Total Square Ft. Allocated	169,800	15,575	154,225	Customer Service Team			
Total Square Ft. Available	215,011			Voters Registration	4,500	4,500	
Excess	45,211			Election Board	4,000	4,000	
				Total	8,500	8,500	
				Courthouse Annex			
				Court house Annex Small Claims (Clerk)	17,000	17,000	
				Courthouse Annex 4-D Program (Circuit Ct)	3,100	3,100	
				Total	20,100	20,100	
				City Utilities			
				Engineering Support Services	2,100		2,100
				City GIS	1,600		1,600
				Planning and Design Services	4,350		4,350
				Water Permits/Development Services	3,175		3,175
				Additional Space Requirements	775		775
				Total	12,000		12,000
				TOTAL City/County Building	213,050	164,800	48,250
						77%	23%
				Total Square Ft. Allocated	213,050	164,800	48,250
				Total Square Ft. Available	214,495		
				Excess	1,445		

Under one of the scenarios being studied, employees who interacted directly with the public would be housed separately from those employees in the department who have little direct contact with the public. Could your department operate if the public-facing staff were housed separately from the "back-office" staff? Explain.

Building Department	This would cripple the Department's efficiency. Our back-office and field staff interact routinely with front office staff on projects. Both groups share the same files and resources. Public/Customer Service would be disrupted. Management staff supervises front office and back office staff, separating them would make supervision less effective and possibly require an additional staff person.
County Highway	<p>We do receive a number of permit requests (by phone and at the counter). These are mostly handled by our receptionist/secretary, who also handles secretarial duties for the Department.</p> <p>The predominant and major public interaction takes place/involves our management and engineering staff in "sit-down meeting" formats or in going over plan and drawings from the plan files.</p>
Board of Public Works/Barrett Law	No. All of our staff is cross trained. Each individual's job has elements of public contact.
Transportation Engineering – City Engineer	No; City Engineering works closely with TES and TED Project Coordinators and Administrative Support staff.
Traffic Engineering	We do not differentiate between "public facing" staff and "back-office" staff. Interaction between all staff is necessary and all staff needs to be housed at one location.
Transportation Engineering Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, all staff should remain together. Our department is comprised of project teams. Every 3 project coordinators are assigned one draftsman. The project coordinator's proximity to the draftsman is critical to project efficiency and cohesiveness. We will also bring 3 additional field staff to assist with drafting. It's imperative that all staff remain in one location. - His duties are integral to our operation and easily and readily accessible. - Not possible with this group as they are assigned field specific duties.
Transportation Administration	No – the public facing staff rely on back office staff to help public face-to-face. This includes Right of Way, Land Acquisition, Inspection, Permits, Finance Director and Assistant.
Department of Planning Services	<p>No, this office could not operate if the public-facing staff were housed separately from the "back office" staff. Mainly because this office does not have a "back office" staff. I'm assuming you defining a "back office person" as a staff person who could review plans and do not interact with the public. This office does not have enough staff to operate a public facing and a back office staff.</p> <p>This office goes as far as having an "on call" schedule where staff are available to back up front office intake when there is a question or situation that merits additional expertise. Because of the number and several types of current, open projects, all staff work with the public.</p>

Energy and Environmental Services	No we cannot operate separately. Customers often walk in needing answers to general questions. If the front line Customer Reps cannot answer or satisfy the customer, the manager needs to be available.
City Utilities – Policy and Planning	Yes, this is somewhat the way we function today. However, we have one position, Energy & Environmental Services that deals more with public/outside visitors.
City Utilities – Engineering	Not applicable.
City Utilities – Development Services (DVS)	Marginally possible. DVS public/customer base is narrow/focused to item described above – we do not serve the general public. While we utilize (and need) a common area/counter to serve our public/customer walkins it is specific to certain audience and types of projects (new development, new customer connections); with that said, all DVS staff will have an occasion to meet with our customers at the front counter on a daily basis – some staff more than others. We share project files and often have to go to the file cabinets or sometimes offices to access a project file to serve customer at the counter. Current “front office staff” process/handle 60% to 70% of the public/customers that come to our office – the remaining are handled by the (semi) back office staff.
Department of Health	It would not work very well for our department for the following reasons: (1) The public facing staff interact with the back-office staff on an ongoing basis throughout the day for consultation and plan review for example – and the back-office staff routinely become public-facing staff as they respond to the front office inquiries all day long. IN SHORT, most of our staff are public-facing staff throughout the day and “un-weaving” them would be difficult and most likely cause a dysfunctional environment; (2) The public-facing staff often discuss sensitive information (such as medical information or disease outbreak information for example, that is best done in a “department of health” setting vs. any sort of “general” public setting; (3) The records and materials referenced by both the public-facing and the back office staff must be easily accessible to both at all times and easy to sit down together to review. Separating the people would require separating the records/files in some fashion again most likely causing a less efficient work environment; (4) Managing staff is already difficult. If you combine various staff from various departments who function under various policies and procedures (and rightfully so), you will cause a competitive/fragmented environment. Further, supervision is difficult as it is in a large department especially because we have three campuses of operation already. If you separate our staff any further – you will significantly fragment our ability to supervise in a minimal way that we need to; (5) Lastly, the public-facing staff are often shared among divisions as needed due to significant short-staffing issues. If they are located separately from other staff and a need arises, the geographical separation will make staff-sharing less possible and therefore create the need for more staff to make “coverage of duties” possible. Please seriously consider the impact to the departmental functionality on this issue. Thank you in advance!

March 9, 2010

Honorable Mayor Tom Henry
City of Fort Wayne
And
Commissioners Brown, Bloom, and Peters
Allen County Indiana
One Main Street
Fort Wayne, IN 46802

RE: City-County Co-Location Task Force Study

Mayor Henry and the Commissioners:

As part of the current co-location study and cost estimates being performed by SCHENKELSHULTZ and Design Collaborative, we were tasked to provide results for three tasks. We have completed the first, and the second and third items are underway....however, based on the information gathered and observations made to date, we feel we need to offer preliminary findings and inquire on further direction:

As a recap, the three tasks are as follows:

- Due Diligence: SSA and DC have toured all potentially affected departments in several buildings. Additionally, each department has provided a response to a survey that Pat Roller, Chris Cloud, John Stafford, and our firms compiled that inquired on current space usage, needs, and operational items.
- Study and Cost the Co-Location Option where Public Safety is Co-Located in the City-County Building. Study to have more refined parameters, and more defined cost estimates.
- Study and Cost Partial Co-Location Option where Public Safety is not Co-Located, and where Development and Expanded Development departments are each housed as separate "front-office" and "back-office" functions, in separate buildings. This portion of the study is to have equally refined parameters, and more defined cost estimates as the Co-Location Study.

Based on our findings and efforts to date, and our professional experiences, we believe the third task defined above is very questionable as a functionally viable second co-location option. This is based on efficiency, the departmental surveys and our experience as architects and engineers utilizing these City and County services. As such, we respectfully ask for your direction on whether to proceed in efforts for the second option.

As back up to our inquiry, we offer the following information for your consideration.

- The survey to departments requested, among other items, a response to the question regarding efficiencies and possibilities of separating departments into "front office" and "back office" functions – with the possibility of locating the front and back-office functions in different buildings. The question directly addressed, to the operational department heads, the implications of Task # 3 above. You will see in the attached summary the responses from these departments. Additionally, our professional experiences with most of these departments support the responses that there are, in many instances, no "front office" persons, but that many persons are involved in the discussions and workings of the review and development processes.

- The second co-location option is in conflict with two of the "guiding principles" developed in 2005, specifically "maximizing efficiencies and space utilization" and "placing a high priority on co-locating...departments which provide service the general public".
- While not studied completely, we assert that developing a "front office" service counter area for the development, expanded development and utilities teams would lead to greater inefficiencies and frustrations for the public by not providing access to entire departments in singular locations.

To be clear: while we are prepared and intend on completing the tasks you have engaged us to perform, we feel it necessary, in our professional roles, to make you aware of our observations regarding this option. We do not believe it will result in a beneficial community asset that could be achieved by a full co-location of these departments.

Respectfully submitted,

Design Collaborative



Ronald K. Dick, AIA

SCHENKELSHULTZ



Cory D. Miller, AIA