DON ABEL
[MS-0398.039.010.012]

RECEIVED
JAN 27 1992
Ans'd. DA

DATE: February 11, 1992

TO: Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

SUMMARY:

Issues

1. Should the Board of Supervisors direct that a Request for Proposals be issued for the Downtown Court/Office Buildings?

2. Should the Board direct that certain cost saving measures be incorporated into the design of the Downtown Court/Office Building?

3. Should architectural renderings be submitted and evaluated as a part of the response to the RFP?

4. Should the developers be allowed to combine development teams, submit responses on different sites (than those proposed in the response to the Request for Qualifications) or be allowed to submit proposals which provide space only for the courts.

5. Should developers be allowed to provide only Court space on the County property bounded by Front, B, First, and C.

6. Should the County, separate from the RFP process for the Downtown Court/Office Building, test the market to see whether an existing building could accommodate the space requirements of the District Attorney and Adult Probation.

7. Should the relative environmental impacts be considered in the evaluation of responses to the Downtown Court/Office Building RFP?

8. Should the Board approve a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency which provides $800,000 for twenty five years for 16 additional courtrooms in Downtown San Diego?

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

Recommendation(s)
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER:

1. Approve the issuance of a Request for Proposals for a Downtown Court/Office Building, which includes a Program Statement that incorporates various cost saving measures included in Attachment 1.

2. Direct that the following also be incorporated in the Request for Proposals:

   - The existing pre-qualified developers be allowed to combine teams and/or submit joint proposals.

   - The existing pre-qualified developers be given the option of providing a "court only" project on the County property at Front/B, or any other site within the five block radius of the Courthouse.

   - Developers be given the option of submitting a combined Court/Office project.

   - Developers be given the option of submitting their proposal on a different sites than those identified in their initial response to the Request for Qualifications.

   - The evaluation of developer cost proposals should only consider the developer fee, architectural/design/engineer costs, land costs, and the general contractor fee and not consider a proposed budget for the entire facility.

3. Direct that the Department of General Services issue a separate Request for Proposals for an existing office building to accommodate the District Attorney and Adult Probation space requirements.

4. Direct that the evaluation of the Downtown Court/Office Building Request for Proposals consider "block diagrams" showing a general space plan, as opposed to schematic designs and renderings as a part of the response to the RFP.

5. Determine that the County will provide financing for a new Court/Office Building but defer any decision on the specific type of financing to be provided.

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

6. Direct that the Department of Purchasing and Contracting renegotiate the Downtown Courthouse Expansion and EIR-consultant contract with Michael Brandman Associates in order to evaluate the relative environmental impacts of the responses to the Downtown Court/Office Building RFP.

7. Approve the Memorandum of Understanding with City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency for the funding of sixteen new courtrooms in Downtown San Diego.

Advisory Statement
N/A

Fiscal Impact
The table below summarizes the estimated revenue available to fund the Downtown Court/Office Building:

Source of Funds	Amount
Budgeted El Cortez Lease	$1,139,600
Lease Consolidation Savings [1]	2,757,582
District Attorney Family Support Reimbursement	350,000
City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency	800,000
Courthouse Construction Fund	$2,000,000
	$7,047,182

[1] This includes the following leases: Superior court Payroll (Centre City Building), District Attorney (Wells Fargo,), Grand Jury (First National Bank), Adult Probation (Ohio Street), Law Enforcement Review Board (estimate), Public Defender (Centre City Building), Alternate Public Defender ( ), and Alternate Defense Counsel ( ). This does not include the Home Saving Superior Court lease as that would be "double counting" with the El Cortez lease. The District Attorney lease savings has been adjusted upward by estimated operating expenses as it is a net lease. All data is projected rent for years from today (February 1996).

The table below summarizes the estimated financial impact of various building scenarios accommodating existing space requirements. Please note that for construction on County owned land the estimated $7,047,182 in revenue is reduced by the amount of rent received for the Front/B Park Lot ($267,312) from Ace Parking.

The table below summarizes the financial impact of various building scenarios:

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

TABLE

BUILDING SCENARIO	REVENUE	ANNUAL OCCUPANCY COSTS	SURPLUS/ SHORTFALL
Average quality building, County land, no implementation of cost reductions in Attachment A	$6,777,870	$7,244,000	(466,130)
Better quality building, County land, no implementation of cost reductions in Attachment A	$6,777,870	$8,470,000	(1,692,130)
Average quality building, standard city block, privately owned land, no implementation of cost reductions in Attachment A	$7,047,182	$8,452,000	(1,404,818)
Average quality building, County land, implementation of cost reductions in Attachment A	$6,777,870	$6,310,000	467,870
Average quality building, standard city block, privately owned land, implementation of cost reductions in Attachment A	$7,047,182	$7,518,000	(470,818)

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

TABLE

EXISTING AND PROJECT SPACE NEEDS FOR THE DOWNTOWN COURT/OFFICE BUILDING (GROSS SQUARE FEET) [1]

	CURRENT NEED	2010
Superior Court (2)	136,426	165,130
District Attorney	175,973	293,165
Marshal	8,918	12,285
Probation	27,374	35,035
Law Review Board	3,205	3,556
Grand Jury	3,445	3,445
	355,341	512,616

(1) Estimated net area requirements were increased by 30% to reflect internal department operation, building circulation and core facilities, including electrical distribution, metering, mechanical plan, and distribution areas.

(2) This includes sixteen courtrooms/direct support space and Superior Court Administration. The sixteen courtrooms includes an additional 10% internal circulation factor.

The estimated cost savings for various cost reduction options are as follows:

Method	Total Savings [1]	Annual Savings
Constructing an average quality building as opposed to high quality building	$13,000,000	$1,200,000
Housing the facility on County land [2]	$ 5,880,000	$ 365,688
Space reductions Attachment A	$6,115,000	$ 743,000
Quality reductions Attachment A	$2,085,000	$ 191,000
Total	$27,000,000	$2,499,688

(1) This includes hard/soft construction costs and financing costs.

(2) Total estimated savings ($633,000) is reduced by the amount of parking lease revenue ($267,312).

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

Alternatives

Our lease negotiation consultant, Cushman Realty, has identified several options that the Board could pursue for this project. Details of the Cushman comments are found in Attachment ___. The alternatives are as follows:

1. Identify a site(s) upon which the County prefers to house the Downtown Court/Office Building, and then select the most qualified development team to construct a facility at that location. This process would provide the opportunity for an outright purchase or condemnation of the land, if it was not County owned. The City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency might assist in these efforts. The developer would not have to be concerned with the issue of land costs.

2. Identify a site(s) upon which the County prefers to house the Downtown Court/Office Building and then individually select each team member through a competitive bid process. This is the more traditional approach to acquiring space and would probably add about a year to the process of completing the building. One of the advantages associated with the design build approach is that it encourages the selection of a development team which has worked together on a major project. This is less likely to occur with a traditional procurement.

3. Allow the developers to submit a full cost proposal on any downtown property. This was the original approach contained in the draft RFP presented to the Board in November. However it is now believed best to not have the developers submit full cost proposals on the entire building. At this point in time no matter now tight our building specifications are there is still the opportunity to "low ball" certain quality elements of the building which would then be found to be unsatisfactory to the County/Courts.

4. Allow the developers to submit proposals on a Courts component and then lease space for the District Attorney and Adult Probation. This option would result in a County owned Court building with continued leases for the District Attorney. In today's soft real estate market it is likely that the first ten to fifteen years of occupancy cost would be lower for a lease as opposed to an ownership position. However, the County would not eventually end up with an asset.

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

In addition to these options Cushman has recommended that the County select at least two developers to negotiate a final offer for the facility.

BACKGROUND:

There have been a number of actions over the past eight months regarding the proposed Downtown Court/Office Building:

1. On May 29, 1991 (71) the Board approved in principle, subject to environmental review, the acquisition of a new Court/Office building(s), 8-10 courtrooms, and other office functions as appropriate.

2. On June 11, 1991 (60) the Board approved a two step process for acquiring additional court/office space with the issuance of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) followed by a Request for Proposals (RFP).

3. An RFQ was issued on June 25, 1991 and twenty responses were received. Nine development teams were deemed qualified to submit responses to a RFP.

4. On November 5, 1991 the Board was presented with a number of issues and recommendations regarding the proposed building including approval of the issuance of an RFP, approving in principal a Memorandum of Understanding for the funding of sixteen courtrooms by the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency, narrowing the search area for the building to three blocks from the courthouse, proposed methods of financing, and whether the County owned property bounded by Front, B, C, and First should still be considered for development. <u>In the Chief Administrative Office's report, it was indicated that there was an estimated $3.0 million annual shortfall between available revenue and estimated cost (debt service and operating expenses) of providing for current space requirements.</u>

5. On November 5, 1991 (59) and November 6, 1991 (23) the Board directed that:

   - There be recommendations on the ways to reduce the project's costs and space requirements before the issuance of Request for Proposals.

   - There be a consideration of major materials and a design element as a part of the RFP process (ie. how the County could control the quality of the building through specifications included in the RFP and whether the developers should be required to submit renderings and

have these considered as a part of the evaluation process).

- Staff review the Memorandum of Understanding with the Centre City Development Corporation (ie. the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency).

- The County's real estate consultant and the County's lease negotiation consultant make recommendations on ways to minimize the County's costs for the new 16 Court Downtown Court/Office Building, and ways to maximize the County's negotiating options in the RFP process.

- The Chief Administrative Office schedule a two hour workshop to review and discuss the space planning assumptions projections, and consultants recommendations for the proposed 16 Court Downtown Court/Office Building.

- The search area be expanded from three blocks to five blocks from the front entrance to the existing construction.

- The number of providing spaces before reevaluating proposed facility.

- Developers be given the opportunity to construct their projects on the County-owned Front/B property.

Much of the information and recommendations contained in this report have been developed in consultation with the consultants retained by the County. The County's real estate consultant Peat Marwick developed the financial analysis of proposed building programs and coordinated the efforts of other consultants. Gafcon Inc. prepared cost estimates for the proposed building program and estimated possible cost savings. Austin Hansen Architects reviewed the urban design implications of development of the County owned site and a standard city block. Cushman Realty, the County's lease negotiation consultant, provided input regarding the structure of the RFP and our negotiating strategy.

The primary focus of this report will be on answering the following questions:

1. <u>What are the possible ways to reduce the cost of the Downtown Court/Office Building</u>? This will consider the identified capital cost savings associated with elimination of certain features that had been programmed in the cost figures presented to the Board on November 5, 1991. Implementation of

possible cost cutting measures will have to consider their impact on departmental operations and building operating/maintenance costs.

2. What is the financial impact of proceeding with the project and how will it be financed? This will consider the revised cost of the building resulting from the implementation of recommended cost saving measures, as well as the current available revenue. In addition there will be a discussion of potential financing vehicles for the project (eg. developer financing, San Diego Regional Building Authority, San Diego Capital Assets Leasing Corporation).

3. What negotiation strategy should be used to select a developer for the Downtown Court/Office building? This will include a discussion of perhaps selecting several finalists for exclusive negotiations and allowing the developers to submit proposals on a different site than that indicated in their response to the RFQ.

Recommendations/Discussion.

The purpose of this section is to present a discussion of each one of the Chief Administrative Officer's recommendations. At the November 5, 1991 the Board had a number of questions and request for information regarding the Downtown Court/Office Building. Attachment 2 responds to these questions.

Recommendation 1: Approve the Issuance of a Request for Proposals for a Downtown Court/Office Building which includes a Program Statement that incorporates various cost saving measures in Attachment 1.

Discussion:

The $3.0 million annual gap can be reduced by: reducing the quality of the building from high to average quality, incorporating various cost savings measures identified in Attachment A, and perhaps hooking into the downtown cogeneration plan operated by _ _____. The estimated cost savings associated with using an average quality building is $_____. Incorporation of cost savings measures could reduce annual costs by $_____. The cogeneration option could reduce annual operating costs by $.

An example of an average quality building is the First National Bank Building (formerly known as Columbia Centre). An example of an upgraded quality building is the First Interstate Bank facility at Fourth/B. The primary difference between the costs of an average as opposed to upgraded quality building is related to the outer "skin" of the building and its supportive structure. Average

quality buildings tend to have more glass while upgraded quality buildings have more granite and marble. From an architectural standpoint both types of buildings can be aesthicallly pleasing or ugly. It should be noted that part of the reason the $3.0 million gap has been reduced is that the original estimated costs of construction were simply too high.

Retail and parking uses do not offer any significant revenue potential for this project. There is a glut of ground floor retail space in downtown San Diego. Retail leases run about $___ a square foot and to fully service this space costs $___ a square foot. It costs about $___ a month to finance and operate below grade parking. Monthly parking revenue averages about $__ /space.

It has also recommended by the consultants that because of design and cost considerations, on site parking should be kept to a maximum of one space per 1000 square feet of gross floor area. It is likely that most of the parking for the site would be provided below grade. Underground parking cost $20,000 per space. Above grade parking costs around $10,000 per space. Should funds become available most of the parking demand should be accommodated off-site. Providing parking at a remote site away from the core of downtown, is consistent with the Centre City Community Plan.

Recommendation 2: Direct that the following be incorporated in the Request for Proposals:

- The existing pre-qualified developers be allowed to combine teams and/or submit joint proposals.

- The existing pre-qualified developers be given the option of providing a court only project at the County property at Front/B or any other site within the five block radius of the Courthouse.

- Developers be given the option of submitting a combined Court/Office project.

- Developers be given the option of submitting their proposal on a different site than that identified in their response to the Request for Qualifications.

- The evaluation of developer cost proposals should only consider the developer fee, architectural/design/engineer costs, land costs, and the general contractor fee and not consider a proposed budget for the entire facility.

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

Discussion:

In view of today's economic climate it is to the County's advantage to consider as many options as possible. Inevitably this will complicate the evaluation process.

In order to strengthen their projects, it is believed that developers should be allowed to combine their proposals. This could perhaps involve the submission of a proposal for an office building on one site, and a court building at another location. Actual team members should not be allowed to change without the permission of the County.

It is believed that the County should consider housing courts and compatible uses (Marshal, Grand Jury, Superior Court Administration, Law Enforcement Review Board) on Front and B Street, and have the District Attorney and Adult Probation Supervision at another location. The architectural consultant, Austin Hansen, found that while construction of a new facility on the County Front/B property is the least expensive scenario (i.e. because the County owns the land), the site is not the best alternative from an urban design perspective. There is only 30,000 square feet of vacant land available for development. A typical City block has 60,000 square feet. Because of the cost of demolition, and replacement of the Law Library, it is unlikely that its 10,000 square foot footprint would be available for immediate development. If one only counts the 30,000 square foot parcel in calculating Floor Area Requirements (FAR), meeting current requirements would result in an FAR of 12.3. Accommodating future requirements results in an FAR of 17.5. The City of San Diego has a maximum FAR of 10.0 for this site. If one counts the 10,000 square foot Law Library lot in the FAR calculations then existing space requirements for court and office functions can be below the City's FAR. With implementation of space saving measures and counting the Law Library lot in FAR calculations, the Front/B lot can meet the FAR guidelines for the City of San Diego. In summary, the County property at Front/B, while not ideal from an urban design and development perspective, can accomodate the ultimate space requirments for the Downtown Court/Office Building with the implentation of certain space reductions.

Therefore developers would still be allowed to submit a joint Court/Office project on a privately owned site or at the County property at Front/B. With respect to proposed sites, it is believed that the developer should be allowed to improve their position (eg. moving nearer to the Courthouse) by planning their development on another site. Proof of control would still be required for privately owned sites.

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

Recommendation 3: Direct the Department of General Services to issue a separate Request for Proposals to acquire space in an existing office building for the District Attorney and Adult Probation. As indicated previously, it may be to the County's financial advantage to build courts only at Front/B, and acquire additional existing office space if such space can meet program requirements (eg. consolidation of all of the District Attorney's functions into one building). Such proposals could be compared with the responses to the separate Downtown Court/Office Building RFP. It is not believed prudent to allow the existing developers to now find an existing office building as a part of their proposal. This would tend to bid up the price of existing office buildings which have a substantial amount of space available (i.e. several developers could be competing for the exclusive right to represent the same building). It should be noted that there was one developer (Kajima) who submitted a proposal to provide office space in the Bank of California Building and build a new court facility at the same site. This developer would be allowed to submit a response to this RFP and then respond separately to the Downtown Court/Office RFP.

Recommendation 4: Direct that the evaluation of the Request for Proposals include "block diagrams" showing a general space plan, but do not consider schematic design and renderings as a part of the response to the RFP.

Discussion:

It is the recommendation of Austin Hansen, Peat Marwick and Cushman Realty that it is not advisable to require architectural renderings as a part of the response to the RFP. The submission of a rendering implies that the architectural team has specific information on the height, mass, and detailed specifications on the exterior of the building. Typically such information would not be available until a schematic design is complete. It would probably take at least 3-4 months to compile such information, at considerable expense to the developers, to complete such a design. The County can obtain the type of building it wants by providing detailed program specifications and employing an architectural team who has designed high quality buildings.

Recommendation 5: Determine that the County will provide financing for a new Court/Office Building but defer any decision on the type of financing.

Discussion:

The type of financing to incur will be dictated by market conditions at the time a final deal is negotiated. For example if long and short term interest rates are near each other, it makes

more sense to use a Joint Powers (i.e. the interest that must be financed during construction can be reinvested at a rate at or near the cost of funds to the County). The table on the following page summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of possible financing methods:

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

SUMMARY OF ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF FINANCING
OPTIONS FOR THE DOWNTOWN COURT/OFFICE BUILDING

METHOD	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Joint Powers Authority (e.g. San Diego Regional Building Authority)	This allows the County to use the build to suit approach. Bonds are tax exempt. This relieves developer of obtaining private financing. County obtains ownership position.	Private and federal office uses of building limited to 10% of bond proceeds. Interest during construction must be fully funded at the times bonds are issued. This can be a significant disadvantage if interest rate paid on bonds is significantly more than interest earnings on construction fund.
Lease with Option to Purchase (SANCAL financing)	This allows the build to suit approach bonds are tax exempt. This relieves developer of obtaining permanent financing. Interest during construction does not have to be fully funded. County obtains ownership position.	Issuance of bonds at a future date is subject to interest rate uncertainty. Private and federal office uses are limited to 10% of building occupancy.
Taxable Bonds	Interest during construction does not have to be fully funded. This relieves developer of obtaining permanent financing. There is no restriction on the amount of space that can be occupied by private or federal tenants, thus providing flexibility for expansion.	Interest rates can be 2-3% higher than tax exempt financing.
Lease	This allows the County to take advantage of depressed real estate market. Effective rent is likely to be lower for the first ten years than obtaining ownership position.	Developer must provide financing. County does not eventually own an asset.

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

Because of the difficulty in obtaining private sector financing in today's economic climate, it is believed prudent for the County to provide the financing. This approach is also likely to reduce the cost of funds. The disadvantage to this approach is that requiring the developer to provide financing would be a "defacto" way of identifying the financial strength of the developer (i.e. weaker developers would find it difficult to receive a financial commitment).

Recommendation 6: Direct that the Department of Purchasing and Contracting renegotiate the Downtown Courthouse Expansion EIR-Consultant contract, with Michael Brandman Associates so that there be an evaluation of the relative environmental impacts of the responses to the RFP.

Comment: On October 1, 1991 (23), the Board approved a contract with Michael Brandman Associates for the preparation of an environmental impact report for the expansion of the Downtown Courthouse. It is recommended that the scope of work be modified to reflect an assessment of the relative environmental merits of responses to the RFP. This modification could occur within the project budget. The California Environmental Quality Act encourages such an assessment. It would also eliminate a challenge to the selection of a developer because environmental factors had not been considered as a part of the evaluation.

Recommendation 7: Approve the Memorandum of Understanding with City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency for the funding of sixteen new courtrooms in Downtown San Diego.

Comment: This provides for the funding of sixteen courtrooms. The County would receive $800,000 for 25 years.

Respectfully submitted,

NORMAN W. HICKEY
Chief Administrative Officer

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA ITEM
INFORMATION SHEET

SUBJECT: Downtown Court/Office Building

SUPV. DIST.:

COUNTY COUNSEL APPROVAL: Form and Legality ( )Yes ( )N/A
( )Standard Form ( )Ordinance ( )Resolution

AUDITOR APPROVAL: ( )N/A ( )Yes 4 VOTES: ( )Yes ( )No

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW: ( )Yes ( )No

CONTRACT REVIEW PANEL: ( )Approved_____ ( )N/A

CONTRACT NUMBER(S):

PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOARD ACTION:

BOARD POLICIES APPLICABLE:

CITIZEN COMMITTEE STATEMENT:

CONCURRENCE(S):

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: Chief Administrative Officer

CONTACT PERSON: Rich Robinson

_____ February 11, 1992
DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE **MEETING DATE**

Attachment 2

The purpose of this attachment is provide answers to some of the specific questions raised at the November 5, 1991 Board meeting. Some of the other issues have been covered earlier in the Board letter:

1. How were with the prior cost estimates derived for the Downtown Court/Office Building ?

These estimates were based upon prior OMNI Group estimates of construction costs for a new Downtown Courthouse Expansion. The OMNI Group had assumed that the building would be above average or high quality construction consistent with many such other Courthouse projects throughout the State. As we have found out in this study there is considerable potential variance in the cost of an court/office building depending on the quality of materials used etc.

2. Is the amount of parking adequate to provide for employee, visitors, and jurors ?

Because of the significant cost of providing on site parking, the McGraw/Baldwin Program Statement prepared last year assumed that there would be a minimal amount of on- site parking provided at the new facility. There was a total of parking spaces programmed for the facility. Based upon the estimated number of employees ( ), peak jury activities, and visitors there is an estimated demand for parking spaces. It is believed however that such parking demand could be accommodated on surface lots or perhaps at some point in time at a peripheral stand alone parking lot. At this time funds are not available to construct such a facility.

3. Should the three block preference map be changed ?

No matter what three block definition is used there will be controversy. The original three block preference map took the most liberal approach to the Courthouse location (ie. it defined the facility from its most northern and southern boundaries). In that we do not know at this time where the new entrances to the Courthouse will be in the future, it is felt that this is the best approach. For example, if a Criminal Courts Annex was built at the North end of the Courthouse this could become one of the main entrances to the Courthouse.

4. Should the County reconsider the City of San Diego Memorandum of Understanding as it relates to the proportion of judicial positions to be provided in Downtown San Diego ?

The existing MOU provides that the Downtown area will accommodate a relative proportion of future projected as growth contained in the OMNI Master Plans for regional court facilities. The judicial projections contained in these studies assumed that there would be full service branches of the Superior Court and that the judicial

positions would be filled as dictated by workload. Because of the significant projected growth in population in the El Cajon, South Bay, and North County judicial districts, there are proportionately more judicial positions assumed in the outlying districts.

5. How was the Downtown Courthouse RFP developed ?

The RFP was developed with the input from the evaluation committee for the responses to the Request for Qualifications, County staff, the Centre City Development Corporations staff, the Superior Court, the District Attorney, the County's real estate consultant, and Cushman Realty.

6. How were the staff projections developed ?

They are largely based on the historical trend in workload area during the 1980's. In particular the workload for the District Attorney was based upon the significant increase in Criminal filings. For example, in 1980 there was a total of criminal filings for the District Attorney. In 1990 there were criminal filings. This study assumed an average annual growth rate of % for the District Attorney staff. Between 1980 and 1990 the average annual growth rate in District Attorney staff was %. In short the projections of staff requirements are not out of line with historical experience.

7. Should the proposers provide their own financing team (eg. underwriters, bond counsel, financial advisor) ?

It is felt best to have the County directly control the process of arranging financing. If SANCAL was used then we could use existing financial teams. If the Joint Powers Authority (eg. Regional Building Authority) was used then it would be likely that RFP's would be issued for financial services.

8. What are the impacts of the Courts on the Downtown San Diego economy ?

According to the Centre City Development Corporation (June 27, 1990 letter from Paul Desrochers, Assistant Vice President to Jack McGrory, the Assistant City Manager) approximately 36 % of the Downtown employees are directly or indirectly involved with the legal services industry. It was estimated that these employees would account for about $ 84,000,000 annually in sales for meals, goods, and services.

ATTACHMENT A

JANUARY 24, 1992

DOWNTOWN COURT/OFFICE BUILDING
SUGGESTED COST SAVINGS ITEMS <u>QUALITY REDUCTION ITEMS</u> (summary)

1. The following items, which are a part of the "Court Module" as requested by the Courts, are suggested to be changed to reduce the cost of the project by the amount so noted:

A.	Reduce the 14' high ceiling to arena and bench only:	$ 107,000
B.	Change courtroom to:	
	1) Change bench area method of construction from cabinetry to conventional framing:	120,000
	2) Eliminate 50% of walls to be paneled:	51,520
	3) Delete requirement that judges' chairs be leather:	4,800
C.	Change judges' chambers to have:	
	1) Reduced grade of carpet to match high use areas:	7,462
	2) Painted walls instead of vinyl wall covering:	10,368
	3) Eliminate the light and duplex outlet in robe closet:	2,720
D.	Change judge's toilet rooms to have (same as existing quality in SBRC) to have: wall-hung lavatories instead of plastic laminate vanities, sheet vinyl floors instead of ceramic tile, painted walls instead of ceramic tile, medicine cabinets instead of full width mirrors:	31,792

2.	Change the tile-setting method from mortar-set to thin-set in all toilet rooms:	8,400
3.	Eliminate the requirement that acoustical system be "z-spline" in any area:	48,000
4.	Specify wall hung china non-refrigerated drinking fountains instead of electric chilled water type:	24,500
5.	Specify wall hung lavatories instead of lavatories set in vanities of plastic laminate in all toilet rooms:	10,240
6.	Simplify cabinetry in lounges, jury deliberation rooms, kitchenettes and other places where "kitchen-type" cabinets are specified:	18,000
7.	Eliminate vinyl wall covering in all areas except high public use areas:	45,000
8.	Eliminate escalators between court floors and install high speed elevators:	636,000
9.	Use existing private down town chilled water "loop" for HVAC:	<u>450,000</u>
	TOTAL----------	$1,575,802

DNTNCTCS.15

JANUARY 24, 1992

DOWNTOWN COURT/OFFICE BUILDING
SUGGESTED COST SAVINGS ITEMS **SPACE SAVING ITEMS** (summary)

1. The following items, which are a part of the "Court Module" as requested by the Courts, are suggested to be changed to reduce the cost of the project by the amount so noted:

A.	Reduce the size of some of the courtrooms to 40X32:	$ 165,578
B.	Reduction of the number of hearing/conference rooms:	126,288
C.	Cluster the research attorney's and calendar clerks:	27,776
D.	Eliminate one of the restricted corridors:	151,200
E.	Reduction of one interview room per courtroom:	109,120
F.	Allow every two courtrooms to share one sound-lock:	59,520
G.	Reduce the judges' chambers size to 250sf:	49,600

2.	Eliminate the criminal holding areas adjacent to the courtrooms:	1,559,600
3.	Eliminate the pro-tem judges' chambers:	21,700
4.	Reduce the number of kitchenettes from 6 to 2:	24,800
5.	Eliminate the private staff lounge for the Superior Court:	127,500
6.	Reduce size of all spaces to the County standards: Note: this does not include "court module"	1,886,308
7.	Combine the children's snack room in the District Attorney's Family Support Division with the children's waiting room:	6,200
8.	Reduce the size of the urinalysis testing room from to 100sf:	55,800
10.	Reduce the Marshall's shower/locker room space to 400sf:	49,600
	TOTAL----------	**$4,420,590**

DNTNCTCS.14

JANUARY 24, 1992

DOWNTOWN COURT/OFFICE BUILDING
SUGGESTED COST SAVINGS ITEMS **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS WITH NO COST ATTACHED**

1. Eliminate the requirement that every senior attorney's office and every judges' chamber have a window.
   Method: allow for more freedom in design to allow a chamber to be on an inside wall if necessary; we would in this case try to get more "borrowed light" into each of these spaces.

2. Reduce the amount of on-site storage for files
   Method: reduce each user by the following: (and find less expensive storage space elsewhere)
   A. District Attorney by 20% of 35,770sf =
   B. Superior Court by 20% of 4,310sf =
   C. Adult Probation by 20% of 250sf =
   D. Grand Jury by 20% of 50sf = total = 8076sf

3. Split the users into two buildings on different sites -
   Method: build a "standard office building" for the District Attorney with a typical core and efficient bay spacing without trying to coordinate the column spacing over the special courtroom column spacing; then build a courts building with its special bay spacing needs.

4. Provide no parking floors in the building except for judges and VIPs and lease (or not lease and let all others find) parking elsewhere.

5. Build our entire building for all users on the County owned land and not be out the cost of land; this would mean not complying with CCDC restrictions for the "Floor-area-ratio" (above grade building floor area relationship to square footage of site) which is 12 with the bonus for providing pedestrian oriented street level usage.

6. Provide all parking above grade and at street level instead of underground and cladding the parking levels with an inexpensive "utilitarian" skin; this is also against CCDC regulations.

7. Clad the entire building with an inexpensive "window-wall" skin.

DNTNCTCS.06