

Orange County Space Needs Study

Update - 2004

**ORANGE COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

ACTION AGENDA ITEM ABSTRACT

Meeting Date: October 21, 2004

**Action Agenda
Item No. 1**

SUBJECT: SportsPlex/Facilities Study Reorientation

DEPARTMENT: Manager/Purchasing **PUBLIC HEARING: (Y/N)** No

ATTACHMENT(S):
Executive Summary -2001 Space Needs Study
Outline of Space Study Presentation

INFORMATION CONTACT:
Rod Visser, 245-2308
Pam Jones, 245-2652

TELEPHONE NUMBERS:
Hillsborough 732-8181
Chapel Hill 968-4501
Durham 688-7331
Mebane 336-227-2031

PURPOSE: To provide the Board with updates on: 1) a conceptual plan that could lead to the development of a senior center co-located with the Triangle SportsPlex; and 2) a snapshot of the current status of various projects outlined in the 2001 Space Needs Study, specifically soliciting Board comments about any changes that may have occurred; and to identify a process whereby the study may be updated and alternative solutions identified where warranted.

BACKGROUND:

a. SportsPlex

Orange County and the Triangle SportsPlex, an 82,000 square foot ice skating/swimming/fitness facility located in the Meadowlands Business Park in Hillsborough, have in place a ten-year operating agreement that expires in Spring 2005. The basic terms of that facilities/services agreement provide that in return for \$400,000 from the County each year, the SportsPlex makes available programs of swimming, skating, and other recreational activities to Orange County residents at reasonable rates. The Board has indicated during the past several years that it does not wish to maintain the existing agreement with the SportsPlex after its expiration, but would be interested in other approaches that might ensure that SportsPlex amenities and programming continue to be available to Orange County residents.

During the Board's budget work session on June 21, 2004, staff provided a brief outline of a conceptual plan that could lead to the development of a new senior center co-located with the Triangle SportsPlex in Hillsborough. Staff explained that since Spring 2004, they had been working with the director of a private non-profit agency based in Belmont, North Carolina known as the Linked Economic Development & Affordable Housing Foundation (LEDAHf). This non-profit looks for opportunities to provide benefits to communities and to take some of the burden off of government by linking economic development projects with approaches that increase the stock of affordable housing in a community.

The general concept under development relates to having Eaton Vance, a Boston-based investment firm that currently owns the SportsPlex, being bought out of the facility (either by the County or through some type of partnership). Approximately \$1.5 million in bond money that the County has earmarked for a senior center would be used to carve out and upfit some existing space and complete an addition onto the SportsPlex to create the 15,000+ square feet that was foreseen in the Master Aging Plan for the Central Orange Senior Center. At the June 21 work session, the Board directed staff to continue to flesh out the proposal and bring back a report on progress after the summer break.

At this October 21 work session, County staff and LEDAHF representatives will provide the Board with a presentation outlining how a co-located SportsPlex and Senior Center might be economically advantageous to Orange County and its citizens, and structural options for how the facilities might be owned and operated. Under any circumstances, programming and management of the senior center would be a County operation. Although not a focus at this time, there is also a possibility that an affordable housing component could be added to a SportsPlex/Senior Center plan at a later date.

b. Facility Needs Reorientation

Throughout 2000, staff and Commissioner representatives gathered data and formulated plans to address space needs for County departments through 2010. Results were presented to the Board of Commissioners in March 2001. Although follow up information was presented at various times for specific projects thereafter, the yet-to-be approved study has languished for the past couple of years.

Following discussion with the Chair and Manager, staff suggests that a reconstituted study committee be convened and that revisions to the study be brought forward for full Board consideration within a reasonably concentrated time period. The work session will include a brief snapshot view of each of the projects presented in the original study, along with any changes that modify the project and its direction since the original presentation. In order to ensure that all relevant information is available to the work group, Board members are requested to comment as they deem appropriate, to provide clarity on the project's direction.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: There is no financial impact directly related to discussing these topics at this work session. However, future decisions the Board will make about development and operation of various facilities to be discussed will have significant impacts on future capital and operating budgets.

RECOMMENDATION (S): The Manager recommends that the Board:

1. Receive the report about the conceptual co-location of the SportsPlex and senior center, and provide appropriate direction to staff;
2. Provide clarifying comments regarding the direction of space study projects; and
3. Appoint two (2) County Commissioner representatives to work with staff to bring forward a revised facilities plan (space study) to address operational space needs.

**Orange County Space Needs Study
Preliminary Report
March 29, 2001**

Executive Summary

A. Purpose

The purpose of this study was to produce a multi-faceted space needs analysis that is intended, at a minimum, to meet the following goals:

1. To inventory existing space used by County Departments.
2. To document projected space requirements through 2010 for use in planning future County Capital Investment Plans with respect to the development of new facilities, expanded facilities and/or renovated facilities.
3. To identify issues that affect the quality of how the existing facilities are used and, when appropriate, to offer recommendations as to how facilities might be upgraded to provide a higher level of service,
4. To identify special departmental needs that might impact the ultimate development of a facility.
5. To review departmental data and to explore specific areas that have impacted growth in a department, therefore impacting facility expansion needs. This is an effort to identify growth trends and be able to better predict future space requirements.
6. To take into consideration the place technology in County government and the space needs that result.
7. To present recommended options for addressing County space needs.

B. Principles

The principles observed in the preparation of options and recommendations for future development of County facilities included:

1. Co-location. Co-locating departments with similar functions and/or those that serve the same customer base.
2. Consolidation. Consolidating County operations to as few sites as may be practicable in an attempt to gain operational efficiency and enhance the ease with which citizens may access County services. While consolidation opportunities may be more limited in the Hillsborough area where the County has several facilities scattered throughout the community, the Southern Human Services Center site on Homestead Road offers extraordinary opportunities to create a campus for County services offered in southern Orange County. The County should preserve this location for public use.
3. Ownership. Owning facilities in which county operations are located, as opposed to leasing, except where there exists a compelling business reason to do so.

C. The Questionnaire

The information that forms the basis of the study was derived from a questionnaire completed by all County Departments. The 83 questions are intended to provide a complete picture of County space needs in the following areas:

1. Identification of current space
2. Assessment of current space deficiencies or inadequacies

3. Future space needs based on projected and historical program growth
4. Special considerations of future space (reception areas, specialized services areas, etc)
5. Storage needs, including plans for reducing need through use of technology
6. Meeting Room needs
7. Parking
8. Security concerns
9. Adjacency requirements to other County functions that would yield the expected level of customer service.

Results were incorporated into a database by Freeman White Architects. A copy was provided to the County and it includes the data upon which this report is based.

D. Scope of Study

The study encompasses all County functions whose space needs require solution by 2010, with several exceptions as noted in the report. Recommendations were withheld for a limited number of projects, pending the outcome of work by groups other than the Space Needs Task Force. Those projects will be incorporated into the Final Space Needs Task Force Report, scheduled for publication in Fall 2001.

E. Options and Recommendations – Overview

Departments were grouped into functional classifications according to their primary service delivery, and the data for each functional classification were assessed for both current adequacy and long-term need. Various options were developed for meeting the stated needs through expansion of existing County buildings or construction of new ones. Through Task Force deliberation, a recommended option was selected for each function using the criteria below.

1. Criteria for Selection of Recommended Option.
 - a. Overcrowded facility. The present facility is significantly overcrowded.
 - b. Growth and no recent new space. The Department has been allocated no additional space over the past decade although significant employee growth or increases in service demands have occurred.
 - c. Improved service and/or collaboration. Carrying out the Task Force recommendation will provide significant opportunities for improved service delivery and/or collaboration among like function departments within County government.
 - d. Reduced rental costs. Carrying out the Task Force recommendation will provide the opportunity to significantly reduce the cost of, or eliminate the need for, existing property for which the County currently pays rent.
 - e. Long-standing need. The initiative is a long-standing need with considerable public support.

2. Rationale for Construction of County facilities

Less than \$10 million of County money has been used to construct county facilities since 1990, although the County has grown considerably during that same time period. In some respects, this report reflects the significant space deficit under which County operations exist. As a point of comparison, it should be noted that during the 1990's the County spent \$140 million on school construction to provide the excellent schools of which we are so proud.

3. Levels of Need

The needs have been categorized into three levels, in an attempt to address them in a priority order as well as to group the resulting projects into segments that are realistic in term of the size

of the undertaking. Funding and commencement of the design and construction process would be anticipated as indicated below.

- a. Level 1 projects are proposed for funding in fiscal years 2001-2003. Funding could come through the bond proposed for November 2001 or through alternative funding mechanisms such as Certificates of Participation (COPs) or other private placement mechanisms.
- b. Level 2 projects are, in general, proposed for funding in fiscal years 2003-2007. It is not required that all Level 2 projects would be funded in a single fiscal year, but rather may be spaced out during the 2003-2007 time period, contingent upon the timing need for building occupancy.
- c. Level 3 projects are proposed for funding in fiscal years 2007-2010.

F. Level 1 and Justice Facilities—Recommended Projects

Level 1 projects are those that should be addressed in fiscal years 2001-2003 and they include:

1. Government Services Center (GSC) Expansion
2. Planning and Ag Building Renovations/Farmers Market

These two projects were selected because of the pressing need for relieving overcrowding both at the GSC and Planning and Ag Building, and the desirable co-location of facilities at the Government Services Center. Also, the resulting availability of space at the Planning and Ag Building provides an excellent location for addressing the long-standing desire to have a farmers market, as well as to provide additional space for related functions.

In addition, it is recommended that the following project be pursued in the same time frame as Level 1 projects:

3. Justice Facilities Expansion—Phase 1

A Master Plan for the Justice Facilities campus segments the expansion into four Phases. Phase I is considered in this report as a Level 1 project. Information regarding expansion of Justice Facilities is included in a 1995 Report and subsequent County Commissioner action. The County is mandated to serve the Court needs.

G. Level 2—Recommended Projects

1. Animal Shelter/Animal Control
2. Emergency Management Expansion
3. Public Works/Transportation Expansion
4. 112 N. Churton Street Minor Renovation
5. Court Street Annex Minor Renovation

H. Level 3—Recommended Projects

1. Whitted Human Services Center Expansion
2. Southern Human Services Center Expansion
 - a. Expansion of Center building
 - b. Renovation of the residence for use as a conference center (meeting space for Center)

I. Uncategorized Projects

1. Senior Centers
2. Solid Waste and Recycling Center, and Master Plan

J. No Action Recommended.

Three facilities are briefly discussed in the report, however, no action is recommended during the study period through 2010. The facilities include:

1. Purchasing and Central Services Building, 129 East King Street, Hillsborough
2. Northside Community Center, Caldwell Street Extension, Chapel Hill
3. Skills Development Center, 503 West Franklin Street, Chapel Hill

K. Cost Estimates, Conclusions and Recommended Actions

1. Cost Estimates

The cost estimates put forth in the report are based on current knowledge and markets present in 2001. Construction estimates should be revised at the time of funding to reflect the then-current market.

The recommended projects reflect an estimated expenditure of the following amounts:

- a. \$14 million of Level 1 plus Justice Facility Projects (2001-2003)
- b. \$3 million for Level 2 projects, unadjusted for inflation, (2003-2007)
- c. \$10 million for Level 3 projects, unadjusted for inflation, (2007-2010)
- d. Unspecified construction costs for uncategorized projects

2. Conclusions

Based on information submitted by County Departments, the Space Needs Task Force believes that the projects cited in this report reflect a fair assessment of space needs through the year 2010 for the functions evaluated. With the exception of Justice Facility development particularly in Chapel Hill/Carrboro, the projects evaluated in this report would appear to address County department space needs for significantly beyond the period covered by the study.

However, as noted in this preliminary report, there were projects that were not evaluated due to outstanding issues that precluded definitive recommendation. Therefore, in the Fall of 2001 after further information is available, the Task Force will prepare a final report.

3. Recommended Action

The Space Needs Task Force recommends that the Board of County Commissioners:

- a. discuss the Preliminary Report and provide comments
- b. approve the Executive Summary of the report, and forward it to the Capital Needs Task Force
- c. receive the rest of the report pending completion of the Final Report in Fall 2001

L. Space Needs Task Force Members

Questions regarding the substance of this study may be addressed to any of the Task Force members:

Margaret Brown, County Commissioner
 Alice Gordon, County Commissioner
 John Link, County Manager
 Pam Jones, Director of Purchasing and Central Services

1 **Facilities Study
Reorientation**

October 21, 2004

2 **Background**

- Report first presented March 2001
- Subsequent discussions project oriented
 - Justice Facilities
 - Southern Orange Senior Center
- Report never adopted
- Departmental space needs still unmet

3 **Presentation Goal**

- Provide project snapshot
- Identify any changes
- Receive BOCC comments about project direction
- Suggest a process to move forward

4 **Level One Projects**

- Government Services Center (GSC) Expansion
- Planning and Ag Building Renovations/Farmers Market
- Justice Facilities--Phase I
- Conversion of SHSC Residence to Conference Center

5 **Government Services Center**

- Changes
 - Pursue no addition to existing building
 - Leave Government Services Center-Annex in place
- Impacts Planning/Ag Building project

6 **Planning and AG Building Renovations**

- Changes:
 - Farmer's Market to be located downtown
 - Planning and Environmental Health not relocated to GSC

- Impacts Government Services Center Project

7 **Justice Facilities—Phase I**

- Changes:
 - No parking deck should be built
 - No additional expansion of courthouse beyond Phase I
 - Existing Sheriff's office to be left intact

- Impact
 - Possible new project: Sheriff's office upfit for alternative use
- Funding:
 - Currently funded
 - Programming on-going

8 **Residence at Southern Human Services Center**

- Changes:
 - Study group may wish to consider expanding use of facility pursuant to a recently submitted staff proposal
- Funding:
 - Funds available through 2/3 net debt bonds

9 **Level Two Projects**

- Animal Shelter/Animal Control
- Emergency Management Expansion
- Public Works/Transportation Expansion
- 112 N. Churton Street and Court Street Annex, minor renovations

10 **Animal Shelter/Animal Control**

- Changes:
 - Shelter now under County operation
 - Changes require major revamp of space study recommendations
- Funding:
 - Project not currently funded

• Note: lease at current facility expires 12-31-06. Although LINC has indicated lease extension, dependent upon progress of Carolina North project. County is moving forward with exploration of new site

11 **Emergency Management Expansion**

- Changes
 - Homeland Security requirements
 - Emergency transport now a County function (previously handled by Squads)

12 **Public Works/Transportation Expansion**

- Changes:
 - OPT has moved to mobile unit, leased by State at Public Works site

13 **112 N. Churton Street**

- Changes:
 - None Clerk of Court still plans to relocate the employees in this building back to courthouse when Phase I is completed

14 **Level Three Projects**

- Whitted Building
 - Library Task Force Report considerations will help define direction at this site
- Southern Human Services Center
 - No changes from original discussions

15 **Homestead Road Campus**

- Changes:
 - Modify master plan to reflect protected hardwood area in southwest corner

- More specifically define future projects that may need to be built in order to ensure site availability at the appropriate time

16 **Southern Orange Senior Center**

- Programming on-going with planning committee
- Community Design Committee (CDC) review completed 10-20-04
- On track to be completed by June 30, 2006

17 **Central Orange Senior Center**

- Changes
 - None from original study

18 **Northern Human Services Center**

- Changes
 - Include Task Force recommendations into the revised facilities plan
- Funding
 - Infrastructure development currently funded with additional funds from 2/3 Net Debt Bonds forthcoming.

19 **Parks Operations/Storage Facility**

- Not included in original space study
- Located at Public Works facility, Hwy86N
- Project currently under design
- Funding:
 - \$675,000 in current CIP
- Targeted completion by August 1, 2005

20 **Moving Forward**

- Convene reconstituted study group
 - Two (2) BOCC representatives
 - Small work group (DTCC staff work group suggested)
- Involves all department heads and key staff

21 **Moving Forward**

- Concentrated timeline for revised study
 - Five major meetings
 - PRELIMINARY recommendations targeted for completion mid-January 2005
 - Final report targeted for completion March 2005

22

