

COUNTY COURT OPTIONS

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
	Downtown/Levy	General District Court at County Office Building (COB) w/the City	General District Court at COB w/out the City	County General District and Circuit Courts at COB	County General District and Circuit Courts in County
Financial Information					
Costs by Function:					
General District Court	\$ 30,330,000*	\$ 18,000,000	\$ 13,300,000	\$ 16,950,000*	\$ 15,283,070
Circuit Court	\$ 16,800,000	\$ 16,800,000	\$ 16,800,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 18,716,930
New County Admin Facility	\$ -	\$ 10,500,000	N/A	\$ 12,000,000	
Sub-total	\$ 47,130,000*	\$ 45,300,000	\$ 30,100,000	\$ 35,950,000*	\$ 34,000,000
Proceeds - Sale of Property	\$ (500,000)	\$ (3,100,000)	\$ (3,100,000)	\$ (3,100,000)	\$ (3,100,000)
City Share of Project**	\$ (6,900,000)	\$ (4,500,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Project Cost:	\$ 39,730,000*	\$ 37,700,000	\$ 27,000,000	\$ 32,850,000*	\$ 30,900,000
Project Savings compared to Option 1	\$ -	\$ 2,030,000*	\$ 12,730,000*	\$ 6,880,000*	\$ 8,830,000*
Average Annual Debt Service (Principal plus interest)	\$ 2,802,135*	\$ 2,439,368	\$ 1,814,927	\$ 1,994,801*	\$ 1,838,853
Annual Debt Service Savings	\$ -	\$ 362,767*	\$ 987,208*	\$ 807,334*	\$ 963,282*
15 Year Debt Service	\$ 42,032,025*	\$ 36,590,517	\$ 27,223,903	\$ 29,922,015*	\$ 27,582,797
15 Year Debt Service Savings compared to Option 1		\$ 5,441,508*	\$ 14,808,122*	\$ 12,110,010*	\$ 14,449,228*
Other Evaluation Criteria:					
Parking	City offered 100 spaces - final terms not negotiated	No challenges- small parking changes at COB included in cost	No challenges - small parking changes at COB included in cost	No challenges - small parking changes at COB included in cost	No challenges - surface parking included
County Economic Development Value	None	High value - construction of administration building in the County plus \$2.0M in project savings to invest in County development/ redevelopment partnership	Depends on Board direction - potential for \$12.7M in project savings to invest in County development/redevelopment partnership	High value - construction of administration building in the County plus \$6.8M in project savings to invest in County development/ redevelopment partnership	Highest value - entire project cost of \$34M invested in Courts construction in the County plus \$8.8M in project savings to invest in County development/ redevelopment partnership
Convenience for Downtown Stakeholders	Most convenient	Relatively convenient	Relatively convenient	Relatively convenient	Least convenient
Convenience for County Residents:	Least convenient	More convenient	More convenient	More convenient	Most convenient
General District Court Joint Operational Efficiency	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
County Administration Operational Efficiency	No change	Requires third location for county services	No change for initial phase	Requires third location for county services	No change
Historic Court House Preservation	Yes as part of project	Yes as part of project	Yes as part of project	County proposes to sell Court House to City to address its future Court needs	County proposes to sell Court House to City to address its future Court needs
Future Phasing Opportunity	Minimal opportunity	Yes	Yes with staff relocation	Yes, with additional staff relocation	Yes - most flexible and easy to phase.
Support of County Strategic Redevelopment/Urban Place Making Priorities	n/a	Strong support if new administration building and project savings are invested in urban area	Strong support if project savings are invested in urban area	Strong support if new administration building and project savings are invested in urban area	Strongest support if new Court construction and project savings are invested in the urban area
Implementation Factors:					
Approvals Needed	Legislative	Legislative	Legislative	Referendum	Referendum
Construction Risk	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium/Low (depends on site)
Schedule Risk	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	High initially - Schedule dependent on development partnership
Development Partnership Needed	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
City Partnership Possible	Yes	No - this option not supported by the City	n/a	n/a	n/a

*Number adjusted from Oct. 18 version of document to reflect more precise cost comparison related to phasing between options 1 and 4.

**City may determine need for additional pedestrian improvements which could impact their cost to participate in COB options.

21-Oct-16