



Albemarle County

Legislation Text

File #: 17-598, **Version:** 1

AGENDA DATE: 11/8/2017

TITLE:

Government Operations/Courts Relocation Opportunities Analysis - Advisory Services Update

SUBJECT/PROPOSAL/REQUEST: Progress update by the consultant and staff on the status of work related to evaluation to analyze the feasibility, cost, benefits, partnership opportunities and other impacts to relocate Courts and/or County Administrative functions to a County location.

ITEM TYPE: Regular Information Item

STAFF CONTACT(S): Walker, Letteri, Catlin, Kamptner, Henry

PRESENTER (S): Trevor Henry

LEGAL REVIEW: Not Required

REVIEWED BY: Douglas C. Walker

BACKGROUND: Albemarle County has been engaged for some time in a thorough analysis and assessment of the County's future court needs and the best way to meet those needs. The Board of Supervisors discussed five potential options last October 24, 2016 and took public comment. The court expansion project reflects a major investment of County funds and is the most expensive project in the County's Capital Improvement Program budget; therefore, the Board is particularly interested in ensuring all options have been properly vetted and giving County taxpayers an opportunity to review the identified options and provide comment.

There are two Courts options primarily remaining in consideration.

- Option 1: Renovation of the existing downtown courts complex for the Circuit Court and expansion of the General District Court on the Levy Opera House parcel, which is co-owned between the County and City of Charlottesville.
- Option 5: Build a new General District Court, Circuit Court and associated functions on a parcel in Albemarle County's designated development area, presumptive location identified as the Rio Road/Route 29 area.

The Board established in the November 2, 2016 resolution that the Courts project, in any scenario, must ensure the fair and equitable administration of justice. The Board also directed staff to investigate the potential to which this project could promote its highest strategic priorities of urban development, redevelopment and revitalization. The Board additionally directed staff to further analyze the extent to which Option 5 would be sufficient to encourage a developer to enter a public/private partnership (P3) integrating the Courthouse and/or County Office Building as part of or adjacent to a larger mixed-use development. The resolution directed that these possibilities should be explored and vetted by the County prior to engaging in additional negotiations with the City about the Court facilities remaining in the downtown Charlottesville location, so that the Board has fully developed options to make an informed decision about the future direction of the Court facilities

expansion project.

At the December 14, 2016 Board meeting, staff presented a proposed process for moving forward with the exploration of a P3 to relocate the courts and/or County administration to a site in Albemarle County. At the conclusion of the presentation, the Board directed staff to proceed as proposed. Staff then developed a Request for Proposal (RFP) and proceeded with the solicitation process to contract with a Development Services Advisor during the spring; an RFP review committee selected and contracted with Stantec Consulting Services in June 2017. Stantec presented at the June 14, 2017 Board meeting, introducing the project team, and providing a general schedule update and an overview on P3s. At the October 11, 2017 Board meeting, staff and Stantec presented an update on the analysis work in progress and then focused on the establishment of a Board consensus set of decision-making criteria that will help frame the ultimate decision process.

STRATEGIC PLAN: *Infrastructure Investment:* Prioritize, plan, and invest in critical infrastructure that responds to past and future changes and improves the capacity to serve community needs. *Thriving Development Areas:* Attract quality employment, commercial, and high density residential uses into development areas by providing services and infrastructure that encourage redevelopment and private investment while protecting the quality of neighborhoods. This work directly supports two strategic plan initiatives: *Redevelop Rio/Route 29 Intersection Area;* and *By June 2019, establish direction, complete design, and be under construction for the project to expand the General District.*

DISCUSSION:

The deliverables of the Developer Advisory work are:

- 1) Review data related to Option 1 with a specific focus on understanding the adjacencies of the Courts to the City Courts and impacts of separating them through an adjacency study.
- 2) Analyze the feasibility, cost, benefits and other impacts of Option 5, with the following sub-options:
 - Court House Complex Only
 - County Office Administrative Building Only
 - Combined facility

Some of the key questions to be answered are:

- Will the addition of the Courthouse function generate sufficient additional buying power to serve as an anchor to allow a developer to create a commercial or mixed use center; likewise, for a County Administrative Building or a combined facility?
- What is the development cost of these options initially and over time; annual carrying cost (dependent on financing mechanism); and annual operating cost?
- To what extent could relocation of the courts and/or Administrative Building serve as a catalyst to achieve strategic goals of redevelopment?
- Are there hurdles for developing each option? What are the other benefits, financial or otherwise of each option?
- What are the potential downsides and negative implications of each option?

The purpose of today's Board work session is to review the collated criteria priority ranking feedback from each Board member and establish a common set of priority criteria, tiered for both Qualitative and Risk Management Criteria. (Attachment A) There will be a discussion on the P3 RFP process and the associated typical timeline. The Board will also receive and review at a high level the following reports:

- Adjacency study draft report from the National Center of State Courts (NCSC) (Attachment B)
- Program Analysis draft report that includes information on Courts Option 1 (Courts remaining downtown) and Option 5 (Courts, County Office Building relocation) programming information

(Attachment C and D)

Staff and the consultants will highlight information from the reports and answer questions Board members have. The NCSC consultants, who interviewed the Court's stakeholders and generated the Adjacency Study report, have an unmovable conflict are unavailable to attend the meeting on the 8th but are available for the second meeting on the 16th. Staff scheduled the senior NCSC consultant, who led the Adjacency study effort, to attend the November 16th meeting when a more detailed review can occur and resolve any questions from the Board.

The final objective of the work session is providing an update on the next four to six weeks of the process, including setting the stage for the November 16th work session that will primarily to focus on Adjacency report and other content questions, as well as a closed session to discuss potential P3 scenarios.

BUDGET IMPACT: There are no budget impacts at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Board endorse the Qualitative and Risk Management Criteria after reviewing and achieving consensus.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A--Summarized Criteria Priority worksheet

Attachment B-Draft NCSC Adjacency Report

Attachment C-Draft Stantec Program Analysis Report (County office Building)

Attachment D-Draft Stantec Program Analysis Report (Courts Complex)