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Current Perceptions

– City has bought 200 E. Berry.
  • City wants to build equity rather than pay rent.
  • County will lose city’s rent.
  • Other building alternatives have been explored.
– Co-ownership has never been addressed.
– County has questions about City numbers.
  • Is $7M sufficient to renovate 200 E. Berry. Other architectural estimates suggest $12M.
  • City appears unwilling to lease space at 200 E. Berry for $4.50 sq. ft. ($5.90 sq. ft. including capital) it presented to City Council.
  • Have all costs been figured (moving, parking, furniture, etc...)?
Current Perceptions

– Some opponents have questioned the value of 200 E. Berry.
  • Building will be 43 years old (Since 1987 renovation) by the time bond is paid off in 2030.
  • $7M (purchase price) will depreciate over the next 20 years.
  • Estimated final cost will be about $25M before city can inhabit building (doesn’t include parking estimates).
  • 252,000 sq. ft. building being purchased when police only need 80,000 sq. ft.

– Opponents do not want to see government grow
  • Other alternatives available like Public Safety Academy, Kroger and Home Depot Buildings.
  • Will leave 20,000 available sq. ft. in each building under any plan
Current Perceptions

– County wants to cap costs
  • $3M approved for re-location of County Police Department.
    – Not interested in spending more than an amount necessary to re-locate County Police.
  • Additional $3M+ could be recouped from sale of county buildings housing those who could be re-located.

– City and County are already co-located.
  • Proponents argue that current co-location could be made to be more efficient.
    – Co-location of police, development teams.

– Miscellaneous issues
  • Not enough time has been accorded county to do proper due-diligence
    – Need better cost estimates involving; moving, furnishings and contingencies.
    – Will bid numbers come in under estimated numbers?
Solution

1. City to renovate and own 200 E. Berry. To be used primarily for Development Team and administrative offices.

2. County to renovate and own City-County Building. Will house City and County Police Departments.

3. Each entity will trade (approximately) 100,000 sq. ft. for respective functions at $0 rent.

4. Costs to modify space after initial renovation will be borne by the entity requesting the change.
How Solutions Address Current Perception

- City has purchased 200 E. Berry for $7M; City will likely spend budgeted amount to renovate regardless of what County does. Taxpayer cost to separate is same as cost to co-locate.

- Co-ownership; City will own their own building, County will own theirs. Sharing space in each building for $0 rent creates de facto co-ownership.

- County has questions about City numbers – This should not be a concern to the county if they are only responsible for numbers related to City–County Building.
How Solutions Address Current Perception

- **200 E. Berry is not a good value.** – City’s concern; they have bought and will be renovating it.
- **Don’t want to see government grow** – Issue will have to be addressed by City and County Governments respectively.
- **County wants to cap costs** – County should spend whatever is appropriate to rehab City-County Building on long-term basis, taking into account sale of buildings and savings from outside departments that will be co-located. Current estimates to renovate are estimated between $5.9M and $6.6M.
- **City and County are already co-located** – Development team housed at 200 E. Berry and Police at City-County Bldg. will create greater efficiencies for the public.
The Trade

- Each entity will renovate (at their own cost) and trade (approximately) 100,000 sq. ft. for respective functions at $0 rent.
  - Total Police needs equal approximately 100,000 sq. ft.
  - Total Development Team needs equals approximately 100,000 ft.
  - There will exist a City-County Building and 200 E. Berry facility – need to locate departments in most efficient/cost effective way.