

Attachment 3

Facilities Management Division Downtown Civic Campus Scoping Report Proviso Response

Ordinance 18110
King County 2015/2016 Budget
Section 55, Proviso P1
March 2016

Scoping Report

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Methodology.....	4
3. Strategic Facility Plan Scope (Scoping Report).....	6
4. Budget and Schedule for Strategic Facility Plan.....	9
5. Next Steps	10
Appendix 1: King County Downtown Civic Campus Master Plan Scoping Outline	122

Scoping Report

1. Introduction

As part of the 2015-2016 Capital Budget, \$1,226,751 was appropriated for project number 1124472 KCCH Mechanical Systems Revitalization. This project was originally envisioned to do an in-depth study of the mechanical systems in the King County Courthouse (KCCH). However, based on concerns about the potential cost of \$100 million to \$200 million to replace mechanical and other systems, the King County Council, in September 2015, included a proviso in ordinance 18110 to develop a scoping report to outline a process to evaluate the County's future operational and space needs. This proviso had the effect of placing on hold the mechanical system study. The full text of this proviso is shown below:

King County Ordinance 18110, Section 55, Facilities Management Division Internal Service Fund:

"PI PROVIDED THAT:

Of this appropriation, \$720,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the executive transmits a scoping report on the county's future operational and space needs in the downtown Seattle campus as a whole and updates the Real Property Asset Management Plan as mandated by K.C.C. 20. 12.100 and a motion that approves the report and the motion is passed by the council. The motion shall reference the subject matter, the ordinance number, the ordinance section number and the proviso number in both the title and body of the motion.

The scoping report shall include, but not be limited to:

A. A plan for identification of the tenants' future operational and space needs within King County's downtown Seattle civic campus through 2025, including, but not limited to, total useable square feet, a list of current King County operations, staffing and space utilized at each location, current unoccupied, useable square feet at each location, and potential funding alternatives, including public/private partnerships. The civic campus shall include, but is not limited to, the following properties and the tenants thereof:

- 1. The King County Courthouse;*
- 2. The Chinook building;*
- 3. The King County Administration building;*
- 4. Vacant land adjacent to the Goat Hill parking garage;*
- 5. The Yesler building; and*
- 6. 420 Fourth Avenue;*

The executive must file the motion required by this proviso by March 1, 2016, in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers, the council chief of staff, the policy staff director and the lead staff for the government accountability and oversight committee, or its successor.

Scoping Report

This report is in response to the portion of this proviso related to the scoping report on the County's future operational and space needs in the downtown Seattle campus. It outlines the Facilities Management Division's (FMD) proposed approach to develop a Strategic Facility Plan (SFP), a first step in developing a downtown Seattle Civic Campus Master Plan for the County. The SFP would set forth the County goals, guiding principles, cost analysis, and future projections of operational and facility needs.

2. Methodology

Prior to developing the plan for the scoping report, FMD researched various agencies and sources on what processes, information and analysis is typically considered in these types of studies. Of the information that was reviewed, the following plans were found to be the most helpful in understanding the approach generally taken by public agencies in assessing future space needs:

1. University of Kansas. *2014-2024 Campus Master Plan*, 2014.
2. King County. *District Court Facility Master Plan*. 2007.
3. Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. *Comprehensive Facilities Plan Update Guidelines*. September 2015.
4. Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. *Comprehensive Facilities Plan Update Process*. September 2015.
5. City of Seattle. *Seattle Municipal Civic Center Master Plan*. June 1999.
6. University System of Georgia Board of Regents. *Physical Master Planning Template*. 1996.

After reviewing this information, FMD was able to determine that a common framework exists among the various types of facility planning documents. These plans generally contain: 1) the long range vision of the organization, 2) an analysis of the existing facilities, 3) future facility needs analysis, and 4) recommendations for future development concepts. This general structure is described in The International Facility Management Association (IFMA) document "Strategic Facility Planning: A White Paper." As defined in this document, the Strategic Facility Plan (SFP) identifies the type, quantity, and location of spaces required to support the organization's initiatives based upon the organization's vision. The diagram below identifies the process of how an SFP is developed around four components: Understanding (data gathering), Analysis, Planning, and Acting.

Scoping Report

Figure 1. SFP Process



Components of the Strategic Facility Plan (SFP)

Understanding

This portion of the SFP gathers information about the organization such as: long term vision/mission, inventory of existing facilities, an assessment of the facilities condition, future space and functional requirements, and financial resources.

Analysis

Once the data gathering phase is completed, an analysis is then undertaken to compare how the current inventory and condition of the facilities align with the future needs. This process identifies the gap that must be addressed in the planning phase.

Planning

Once the gap between the current conditions and future needs is fully understood, the planning phase develops alternatives or scenarios to solve the gap while considering the constraints and opportunities available to the organization, and identifies a preferred recommendation.

Acting

In this phase, the recommendations of the SFP would inform the development of a detailed master plan that would include specific plans for a building, phasing plans, campus wide development guidelines, and infrastructure improvements. After master plan completion, a more detailed level tactical plan could be developed that aligns the county's budgeting and planning cycles.

As described above, the Strategic Facility Plan guides the Master Plan. The Master Plan is more site specific and provides the framework for the development of the physical environment. The table below shows the major components of each type of facility plan and helps distinguish between them.

Scoping Report

Table 1. Comparison of plan types

Strategic Facility Plan	Master Plan	Tactical Plan
Existing Conditions Analysis	Site-specific physical plan for buildings	Maintenance Schedules/plans
Organizational needs statement	Infrastructure and systems within the site	Operational Plans
Gap Analysis	Aesthetics of buildings and grounds	Building floor plans/ stacking plans
Alternatives and possible recommendations for new space/buildings	Phasing plan for buildings	Architectural designs/ configurations
Facility cost projections/life cycle cost analysis	Construction estimates	Operating budgets
Capacity analysis and use recommendations	Engineering assessments	Floor plans or occupancy charts

(IFMA, Strategic Facility Planning: A White Paper, 2009, page 8)

This approach recommended by the IFMA was used to develop the scope of work, cost, and schedule required to identify the County’s future operational and space needs in the downtown Seattle campus. An example outline of the resulting Plan’s contents is included in Appendix 1.

3. Strategic Facility Plan Scope (Scoping Report)

A. Understanding (Data gathering)

During this phase of the SFP, FMD and their consultants perform extensive work to gather data related to developing the guiding principles for the long range vision of the downtown campus, operational needs of County agencies within the campus, and an inventory and assessment of the conditions of facilities. This information will be collected from existing sources, or developed by either FMD or consultants, and will generally fall into four components:

1. Guiding Principles (Long term Vision/Mission)

The project team, made up of representatives from the various County agencies and County leadership, will help define a unified vision for the future of the King County campus through a series of facilitated workshops. The unified vision will consist of guiding principles for the project that could include equity and social justice, environmental stewardship, and fiscal responsibility, and concepts and goals for the project such as enriching the public experience and designing for flexibility.

2. Operations

- a. Budget and Growth projections
- b. Staffing projections
- c. Future space needs

The collection of information related to county agencies will require a substantial internal effort for each agency to identify their current operations, staffing, and space utilization, as well as the

Scoping Report

foresight to project their future operational and space needs over the next ten years. This information will be developed using the County’s business plan model or through a series of agency meetings, interviews, and questionnaires delivered by the project team and consultants.

3. Existing Facilities

- a. Inventory of downtown Seattle properties (Figure 2)
- b. Condition

FMD and their consultants will collect information to document and assess the current conditions of our campus, neighborhood, and facilities. Building systems covered in the condition assessment include mechanical, electrical, structural, building envelope, accessibility, energy use, hazardous material inventory, and code compliance. The assessment will include deferred maintenance, current and upcoming projects, and corrective costs for each facility. The consultants will identify the space utilization of each facility to determine its overall efficiency of space. A more detailed assessment of the King County Courthouse (Courthouse System Revitalization Assessment Project) will be underway by end of the first quarter of 2016.

Figure 2. King County Downtown Seattle Properties



Though not specifically identified in the proviso, FMD recommends the inclusion of the King Street Center (KSC) in the Downtown Campus planning process due to its close proximity and the importance of the county KSC tenants in the larger context of the long term service delivery vision/mission of the County.

Scoping Report

4. Financial Resources

The Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget, FMD, and the consultant will identify potential sources of funds that could possibly provide funding for the implementation of the SFP, master plan and tactical plans. Possible sources of funding may include:

- a. Property Sales
- b. Land values
- c. Development rights
- d. Operational savings
- e. Bond Financing
- f. Voter approved levy
- g. Public private partnerships
- h. Leases to non-county tenants

B. Analysis

Comparing the needs and vision with current conditions creates the gap analysis. This process identifies the deficiency in the existing facilities and associated conditions relative to King County's future operational needs, principles, and goals generated in the Understanding phase of the SFP process.

C. Planning (Alternatives Analysis)

Using the information gathered in the previous phases, the consultants work with the project team to develop alternative scenarios that would resolve the gap between the future facility needs and the existing facilities. Analysis of each alternative would assess its responsiveness to the guiding principles, capacity to meet future space needs, initial cost, ongoing operating cost, schedule, and financing options. The project team then selects a preferred alternative for approval after receiving input from various stakeholders.

The project team creates, and at this phase, finalizes the Plan's design guidelines that incorporate King County code requirements and values such as accessibility, sustainable design, energy efficiency, as well as a framework for the design of space, wayfinding, and aesthetics. These design guidelines together with the project's guiding principles, goals, and program form the visual and logical concepts for the recommended alternative. The project consultants, with guidance from the team, develop the preferred alternative with more detail to create a feasible solution to meet the County's needs and goals. That preferred alternative would be subject to the approval of the County Executive and County Council.

D. Action Plan

In this phase of the SFP, a preferred alternative for the long term development of the downtown campus would be recommended. Consideration of this alternative would be reviewed by elected officials and a tactical plan would be developed to implement the vision. It is anticipated that the first step in implementing the SFP would be the development of a comprehensive Master Plan for the downtown campus that would include Master Plan Guidelines, specific plans for each facility, phasing plans, and cost estimates.

Scoping Report

4. Budget and Schedule for Strategic Facility Plan

A. Budget

The costs to create the Plan are primarily driven by consultant fees and staffing for FMD’s efforts. The total estimated cost to create the Plan is approximately \$3.5 million. Each phase requires an extensive effort which is broken down into tasks and associated costs as summarized in Table 2. Estimated costs include consultant fees, FMD costs, and a 20% project contingency. This estimate does not include costs for client agency time.

B. Schedule

The project commencement date is partially dependent on the date of County Council and County Executive approval of the project and capital appropriation. The project duration is based on the estimated length of time to complete each task. A summary of the estimated durations of each phase is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. SFP Budget and Schedule

Phase	Task Summary	Estimated Costs	Duration (months)
1. Understanding			
Project Initiation*	Identify and assemble project team	\$286,000	10
	Consultant Selection	(FMD \$146k, Consultant \$140k)	
	Develop vision, guiding principles, concepts, and goals		
	Engage stakeholders and community		
	Create Project Charter and Project Management Plan		
Existing Conditions Analysis*	Analysis of campus context	\$522,000	6
	Inventory and assess facilities	(FMD \$268k, Consultant \$254k)	
	Create report of existing conditions		
Facility Needs Analysis*	Identify operational and space needs by agency	\$403,000	7
	Identify campus-wide operational and space needs	(FMD \$207k, Consultant \$196k)	
	Create Facilities Needs Analysis report		
2. Analysis			
	Identify gaps in existing conditions and county needs	\$150,000	6
	Create Gap Analysis report	(FMD, Consultant \$75k)	
3. Planning			
Alternatives Analysis	Develop solutions and concepts to address county needs	\$1,285,000	8
	Create Alternative Plans report	(FMD \$660k, Consultant \$624k)	
	Select preferred alternative		
4. Action Plan			
Recommendation	Develop preferred alternative	\$185,000	4
	Create recommendation report	(FMD \$95k, Consultant \$90k)	

Scoping Report

Strategic Facility Plan	Create final Strategic Facility Plan	\$79,000 (FMD \$40k, Consultant \$39k)	3
Consultant Cost subtotal		\$1,418,000	-
FMD Cost subtotal		\$1,491,000	
20% Project Contingency		\$581,000	
Totals		\$3,490,000	2.7 years*

*Phases with some tasks performed at the same time as other phases therefore reducing overall project duration

5. Next Steps

Robust and inclusive strategic facility planning is a recommended practice and it requires considerable resources. As itemized in the SFP Budget and Schedule (Table 2 above) the cost to proceed with the planning approach outlined in this scoping report is \$3.5 million. In light of the \$50 million projected General Fund biennial budget deficit, along with the backlog of major maintenance and agency requested capital improvements, prioritizing long term planning over immediate needs is a challenging decision.

In September 2016 FMD will complete a response to the Courthouse Mechanical Systems Revitalization project proviso in the 2015/2016 biennial budget. This proviso requires an evaluation of the condition and projected replacement costs of the courthouse building infrastructure systems. Upon completion of the proviso it is anticipated that \$400,000 of budget will remain available in the Courthouse Mechanical Systems Revitalization project.

The county has a few options with regard to the SFP, the budgeting of the SFP and the use of projected Courthouse Revitalization study budget remaining at completion in September.

1. Strategic Facility Plan (SFP):
 - Approve
 - Approve with modifications
 - Don't approve
2. \$3.5 million SFP cost:
 - Finance and budget the \$3.5 million with the approval of the SFP
 - Consider financing and budget options in the 2017/2018 budget
 - Postpone funding decisions until after the 2017/2018 biennial budget balancing.
3. Projected \$400,000 remaining Courthouse Revitalization budget:
 - Complete the "Existing Conditions Analysis" section of the SFP scope (see pages 7 & 9)

Scoping Report

- Fund a portion of the SFP \$3.5 million budget
- Cancel and repurpose for other capital or operating budget needs in the 2017/2018 budget process.

Scoping Report

Appendix 1: King County Downtown Civic Campus Strategic Facility Plan Scoping Outline

1. Introduction

- a. Background
- b. Purpose

2. Understanding (data gathering)

- a. County guiding principles (Long term Vision/Mission/Goals)
 - i. Vision/Mission
 - ii. Comprehensive Plan
 - iii. Equity and Social Justice
 - iv. Environmental Sustainability
 - v. Fiscal Responsibility
 - vi. Strategic Plans, Policies, and Goals
- b. Operational Needs
 - i. Program
 - 1. Operational needs analysis by agency
 - a. Analysis and 10 year projections
 - i. Current and future operations
 - ii. Current and future staffing
 - 2. Space needs analysis by agency
 - a. Analysis and 10 year projections
 - i. Space use categories
 - ii. Current and future square feet by category
 - b. Adjacencies & circulation by function
 - i. Jail to courtrooms
 - ii. Judges to courtrooms
 - iii. Public to courtrooms, public services
 - iv. Secure spaces
 - 1. Required
 - 2. Preferred
 - v. Non-secure
 - c. Public services
 - 3. Circulation
 - a. Public
 - b. Private
 - c. Secure
 - d. Deliveries
 - ii. Information Technology
 - iii. Security

Scoping Report

- c. Existing Facilities
 - i. Context
 - 1. Neighborhood and history
 - 2. Surrounding buildings
 - a. Functional Use
 - b. Floor area ratios
 - c. Height, density, mass characteristics
 - 3. Open space
 - 4. Zoning
 - ii. Inventory
 - 1. King County Courthouse – courtrooms & support offices, public services, offices, work release program
 - 2. The Chinook building – offices, retail, some public services
 - 3. King County Administration building – public services, offices, winter homeless shelter
 - 4. The Yesler building – public services, offices
 - 5. 420 Fourth Avenue – temporary use as homeless shelter through April 2016
 - 6. King Street Center – offices, Metro public services (note: King Street Center is not included in proviso properties list)
 - 7. King County Correctional Facility – detention, courtrooms, support offices (not included in proviso list)
 - 8. Goat Hill Garage (not included in proviso list)
 - 9. Vacant Land adjacent to the Goat Hill Parking Garage
 - iii. Assessment of Facilities
 - 1. Current conditions
 - 2. Space Utilization
 - 3. Vacant useable space
 - 4. Conformity to square footage standards
 - 5. Circulation
 - 6. Adequacy by space type
 - 7. Public Services
 - iv. Circulation
 - 1. Public
 - 2. Private
 - 3. Secure
 - 4. Deliveries

3. Gap Analysis (what we have vs. need/want)

- a. Guiding principles
- b. Building systems
- c. Facility Condition
- d. Operational Needs

Scoping Report

- e. Public Service needs
- f. Space Needs
- g. Arrival, access, circulation and transit
- h. Information Technology
- i. Security

4. Planning (Alternatives Development)

- a. Alternative One
 - i. Concept
 - ii. Response to Guiding Principles
 - iii. Considerations
 - 1. Political
 - 2. Community
 - iv. Phasing
 - v. Cost
 - 1. Project Cost
 - 2. Financing including public/private partnership
 - 3. Operating
- b. Alternative Two
- c. Alternative Three
- d. Alternative Four

5. Recommendations (Action Plan)

- a. Preferred Alternative
 - i. Schematic site plans of campus and surrounding area
 - ii. Opportunities
 - 1. Partnerships, real estate strategies
 - 2. Develop underutilized areas
 - 3. Connected infrastructure
 - 4. Fiscal stewardship
 - 5. Environmental stewardship
 - 6. Integrate Building Information Modeling (BIM)
 - 7. Standardization, consistency through guidelines
 - 8. Develop maintenance guidelines
- b. Master Plan Design Guidelines