

ORW: DANA CRAWFORD 503.680.7352  
ADROIT: RYAN BUEGLI

Ashland City Hall Feasibility Study  
Cost Model  
Fall 2016 (Additional info provided Summer 2017 for Cititzen Advisory Committee)

Design Assumptions

- 1. Exterior materials of brick veneer, some storefront and curtain wall, moderate civic features (e.g. wood soffit), solar panels on roof.
- 2. Structure for standard options is steel, complying with OSSC standard building code (not Essential Facility). Structural alternate includes surcharge for upgrading to essential facility.
- 3. Interior materials similar to class A office space.
- 4. For option 5 underground parking, can be fireproofed steel or concrete, and ventilated.
- 5. Assume 2000 SF of compact storage.

Cost Modeling Assumptions

- 1. To reflect an appropriate level of cost specificity for a Feasibility Study, building and parking costs are rounded to nearest \$10K, others to nearest \$1K.
- 2. All labor rates based on prevailing wages.
- 3. Solar allowance calculated as 1.5% of Construction Subtotal (4B and 5B are identical to 4A and 5A).
- 4. Construction Contingency calculated as 5% of Construction Subtotal.
- 5. \$75 / SF assumed for seismic renovation & finish improvements at Community Development.
- 6. \$350 / SF assumed for 2nd & 3rd floor level additions at Community Development.
- 7. \$225 / SF assumed for basement construction at City Hall.
- 8. \$325 / SF assumed for new Civic level construction at City Hall and N. Pioneer.
- 9. \$385 / SF assumed for new Civic level construction combined with preserving exterior walls (North & West) at City Hall.
- 10. \$65 / SF assumed for interior reconfiguration at Community Development.
- 11. \$55 / SF assumed for minor interior reconfiguration at Community Development (paired with Historic Preservation option).
- 12. \$35,000 / parking stall assumed for underground parking structure with deep excavation, shoring, and ventilation.
- 13. For temporary facilities, assume \$1.5/SF/Month for leased space outside of downtown (as an alternative, modulares cost \$2/SF/Mo to deliver, set with jacks, with stair or ramp).
- 14. For temporary utilities, assume \$.35/SF/Month for heat/cool, power, phones, water, sewer.
- 15. Move costs based on professional mover (insured, prevailing wages) of \$1.25/SF per move.
- 16. Other Soft Costs include permits, System Development Charges, design fees, furnishings, survey, geotechnical, and other miscellaneous costs.
- 17. Escalation is difficult to predict over several years. Estimated here at 5.5% per year (compounded).

Option	New SF	Renov SF	Total SF	Parking SF	Solar SF	Construction Time (mo.)	Move Time (mo.)	Total Time (mo.)	Building Cost	Parking Cost	Construction Subtotal	Solar Cost (1.5%)	Contingency 5%	Construct'n Cost	Temp Space (rent)	Temporary Utilities	Moving (out+in)	Other Soft Costs 30%	Sell ComDev	Total Cost 2016	Total Cost 2021
3: Community Development, Expansion	12,440	9,630	22,070	None	4,000	11	1	12	\$5,080,000	\$0	\$5,080,000	\$77,000	\$254,000	\$5,411,000	\$174,000	\$41,000	\$34,000	\$1,624,000	\$0	\$7,284,000	\$9,520,000
4A: City Hall (New) and ComDev (some interior)	14,800	3,000	17,800	None	4,000	15	1	16	\$4,640,000	\$0	\$4,640,000	\$70,000	\$232,000	\$4,942,000	\$72,000	\$17,000	\$21,000	\$1,483,000	\$0	\$6,535,000	\$8,541,000
4B: City Hall (Historic) and Com Dev (some interior)	14,800	3,000	17,800	None	4,000	15	1	16	\$5,280,000	\$0	\$5,280,000	\$70,000	\$264,000	\$5,614,000	\$72,000	\$17,000	\$21,000	\$1,685,000	\$0	\$7,409,000	\$9,684,000
5A: Lithia + Pioneer, 20 parking+50 UG parking	26,135	0	26,135	25,795	9,000	16	0.5	16.5	\$8,500,000	\$2,210,000	\$10,710,000	\$161,000	\$536,000	\$11,407,000	\$0	\$0	\$22,000	\$3,423,000	-\$2,500,000	\$12,352,000	\$16,144,000
5B: Lithia + Pioneer, 20 parking+100 UG parking	26,135	0	26,135	43,815	9,000	18	0.5	18.5	\$8,500,000	\$4,130,000	\$12,630,000	\$161,000	\$632,000	\$13,423,000	\$0	\$0	\$22,000	\$4,027,000	-\$2,500,000	\$14,972,000	\$19,568,000

	New SF	New \$/SF	New \$	New Bsmt SF	New Bsmt\$/S	New Bsmt\$	Renov SF	Renov \$/SF	Renov \$	Building \$	Rounded
3: Community Development, Expansion	12440	350	\$4,354,000				9630	75	\$722,250	\$5,076,250	\$5,080,000
4A: City Hall (New) and ComDev (some interior)	11100	325	\$3,607,500	3700	225	\$832,500	3000	65	\$195,000	\$4,635,000	\$4,640,000
4B: City Hall (Historic) and Com Dev (minor interior)	11100	385	\$4,273,500	3700	225	\$832,500	3000	55	\$165,000	\$5,271,000	\$5,280,000
5A: Lithia + Pioneer, 20 parking+50 UG parking	26,135	325	\$8,493,875							\$8,493,875	\$8,500,000
5B: Lithia + Pioneer, 20 parking+100 UG parking	26,135	325	\$8,493,875							\$8,493,875	\$8,500,000

	Option 3	Option 4A	Option 4B	Option 5A	Option 5B
New Area SF	12,440	14,800	14,800	26,135	26,135
Renovated Area SF	9,630	3,000	3,000	0	0
Total Area SF	22,070	17,800	17,800	26,135	26,135
Parking Area SF	None	None	None	25,795	43,815
Construction Time (Months)	11	15	15	16	18
Move Time (Months)	1	1	1	1	1
Total Time (Months)	12	16	16	17	19
Building Cost	\$5,080,000	\$4,640,000	\$5,280,000	\$8,500,000	\$8,500,000
Parking Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,210,000	\$4,130,000
Construction Cost Subtotal	\$5,080,000	\$4,640,000	\$5,280,000	\$10,710,000	\$12,630,000
Solar Cost (1.5%)	\$77,000	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$161,000	\$161,000
Construction Contingency (5%)	\$254,000	\$232,000	\$264,000	\$536,000	\$632,000
Total Construction Cost	\$5,411,000	\$4,942,000	\$5,614,000	\$11,407,000	\$13,423,000
Temporary Space (Rent)	\$174,000	\$72,000	\$72,000	\$0	\$0
Temporary Space Utilities	\$41,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$0	\$0
Moving (Out + In)	\$34,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
Other Soft Costs (30%)	\$1,624,000	\$1,483,000	\$1,685,000	\$3,423,000	\$4,027,000
Sell Community Development	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$2,500,000	-\$2,500,000
Total Cost 2016	\$7,284,000	\$6,535,000	\$7,409,000	\$12,352,000	\$14,972,000
Total Cost 2021	\$9,520,000	\$8,541,000	\$9,684,000	\$16,144,000	\$19,568,000

① New 35 4,354,000 + 116,500 + 722,250 = 5,187,750  
From 50 9193442 / 5161f

may been

MAY THE LOW COMPETITION?

BUILDING

PARKING

5A > 325/SF  
5B

.....

Approved Criteria

- 1) Option is cost effective: The City is spending public dollars wisely.
- 2) Option provides flexibility: Provides the City with design and operational flexibility to meet current and future needs.
- 3) Preserves civic use of the existing City Hall.
- 4) The option is acceptable to voters.
- 5) Retains a downtown presence.
- 6) The option addresses parking for employees and customers.

Options

Score each criteria for each of the following options using the corresponding list above with a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). The following options correspond to the August 10 memo from Kaylea.

**I. City Hall Expansion (2 alternatives)**

- a. Rebuild existing City Hall \$8.5 M  
1.                      2.                      3.                      4.                      5.                      6.
  
- b. Rebuild existing City Hall and retain stucco veneer \$9.7 M  
1.                      2.                      3.                      4.                      5.                      6.

**II. Community Development Expansion/Consolidation \$9.5 M**

1.                      2.                      3.                      4.                      5.                      6.

**III. Consolidate at new Construction at Lithia/Pioneer (2 alternatives)**

- a. Include 1 level of underground parking (50 stalls) \$16 M  
1.                      2.                      3.                      4.                      5.                      6.
  
- b. Include 2 levels of underground parking (100 stalls) \$19.6 M  
1.                      2.                      3.                      4.                      5.                      6.

**IV. Courts/Civic Center (2 alternatives)**

- a. Partitioned (retains ComDev) \$10 M  
1.                      2.                      3.                      4.                      5.                      6.
  
- b. Centralized (incorporates ComDev) \$13 M  
1.                      2.                      3.                      4.                      5.                      6.

**V. Briscoe School \$8.1 M**

1.                      2.                      3.                      4.                      5.                      6.

# Memo

---

TO: Ad-hoc City Hall Advisory Committee  
FROM: Kaylea Kathol, Engineering  
DATE: August 10, 2017  
RE: **Final list of tenable options for the replacement of City Hall**

---

When the Committee first met on April 26, 2017, staff presented a list of 13 alternatives for the replacement of City Hall. In the time that has passed, some alternatives have been eliminated over uncertainty relating to property acquisition, including alternatives proposed for the railroad property and the Elks parking lot. Other alternatives, specifically an in-kind rebuild of City Hall and seismic rehabilitation of the existing building, have been removed from the list due to their inability to accommodate the City's current and projected space needs. The following list enumerates the alternatives that remain consistent with the Committee's charge to identify the best option for replacing City Hall that meets the work space needs through 2031 and provides reasonable degree of seismic safety for employees.

Alternative*	Cost Estimate	Timeline (months)
1. ComDev: Expand & Consolidate	\$ 9.5 M	11
2. Right-Size City Hall + Keep ComDev	\$ 8.5 M	16
3. Right-Size/Keep Stucco City Hall + Keep ComDev	\$ 9.7 M	16
4. New @ Pioneer Parking & 50 UG Stall	\$ 16.1 M	17
5. New @ Pioneer Parking & 100 UG Stall	\$ 19.6 M	19
6. New @ Civic Center + Consolidate**	\$ 12.9 M	17
7. New @ Civic Center + Keep Com Dev**	\$ 11 M	16
8. Briscoe School + Consolidate**	\$ 8.1 M	16

\*Alternative descriptions provided on following pages

\*\*Alternatives developed by City after ORW completed Feasibility Study. Costs and timelines were estimated by staff, based on construction assumptions used in the Feasibility Study.



## City Hall On-Site Expansion (2 Alternatives)

Rebuild City Hall on site, including a basement and three floors, in order to meet the City's space needs. Reconfigure Community Development building to ensure room for growth. One alternative offers a total rebuild, and the other alternative proposes to retain the historic stucco veneer on the north and east surfaces of the building

- ☐ Proposed total area of completed project: **14,800 ft<sup>2</sup>**
- ☐ **Cost (2 alternatives):**

<b>Total rebuild/expand:</b>	<b>\$8.5 M</b>	<b>(\$574/sf)</b>
<b>Rebuild/expand, preserve facade:</b>	<b>\$9.7 M</b>	<b>(\$655/sf)</b>

## Community Development Expansion/Consolidation

Add an additional two floors to the Community Development building in order to consolidate functions currently housed in City Hall and Community Development.

- ☐ Proposed total area of completed project: **22,070 ft<sup>2</sup>** (inc. new area and renovated area)
- ☐ **Cost:** **\$9.5 M** **(\$430/sf)**

## Consolidate at New Construction at Lithia/Pioneer (2 Alternatives)

Consolidate functions housed in City Hall and Community Development in a new building on the existing City-owned parking lot at Lithia Way and N. Pioneer Street. Profit from the sale of the Community Development Building would be applied toward construction. One alternative offers one level of underground parking and the other offers two levels.

- ☐ Proposed total area of completed project: **26,135 square feet**
- ☐ **Cost (2 alternatives):**

<b>1 level of UG parking (50 stalls):</b>	<b>\$16 M</b>	<b>(\$612/sf)</b>
<b>2 levels of UG parking (100 stalls):</b>	<b>\$19.6 M</b>	<b>(\$750/sf)</b>

## Courts/Civic Center (2 alternatives)

Build a new City Hall at the location currently occupied by Courts/Civic Center. The new structure would necessarily incorporate the courts and council chambers. The first alternative, termed "centralized", would incorporate the functions at the courts building, City Hall, and ComDev. The second alternative, described as "partitioned", would result in the City retaining ComDev and building a smaller structure at the current courts location.

- ☐ Proposed total area of completed project: **17,520 ft<sup>2</sup> (partitioned) to 27,470 ft<sup>2</sup> (centralized)**
- ☐ **Cost (2 alternatives):**

<b>Partitioned:</b>	<b>\$10 M*</b>	<b>(\$570/sf)</b>
<b>Centralized:</b>	<b>\$13 M*</b>	<b>(\$473/sf)</b>

\* These estimates were developed by Staff using the cost modeling assumptions provided in the architect's feasibility study. Professional estimate is advised.

## Briscoe School

Move City Hall and Community Development functions to Briscoe School.

- ☐ Proposed total area of completed project: **33,980 ft<sup>2</sup>** (existing structure)
- ☐ **Cost:** **\$8.1 M** **(\$238/sf)**

\* In 2005, Ashland School District commissioned a facilities report and seismic evaluation of Briscoe School to develop a cost estimate for necessary upgrades and repairs. Briscoe has been closed since 2004, so the facilities report naturally evaluated conditions through the lens of school operations. The study evaluated architectural, mechanical and plumbing systems, electrical systems, and structural (seismic) conditions. Total costs to implement all improvements was \$6.5 million. It should be noted that costs included the addition of some parking (approximately 18 or 19 spaces). The City has updated the construction costs to 2016 values based on the actual national average Historical Cost Index<sup>1</sup>. Most items originally evaluated by the District were included in the City's updated estimate, with the exception of a line item for expanding the kitchen and replacing its equipment. The total 2016 estimate was approximately \$8 million (including \$2.5 million in seismic retrofits). The 2016 estimate was then escalated by 5.5 percent per year for five years to provide a cost estimate of \$10.6 million in 2021. If the City sells the Community Development building for \$2.5 million<sup>2</sup>, proceeds could be applied toward the project for a **total cost of \$8.1 million**. Professional estimate is advised.

<sup>1</sup> <http://info.thegordiangroup.com/RSMeans.html>. City used actual 2005 cost index (151.6) and actual 2016 cost index (207.3).

<sup>2</sup> Real Market Value in 2016, Jackson County Property Data Online



# Memo

---

DATE: August 9, 2017  
TO: ad hoc City Hall Advisory Committee  
FROM: John Karns, interim city administrator  
RE: Another perspective

---

I recently sent an email to employees in both the Community Development building and in City Hall to inform them of your work and the criteria/priorities you have developed as you vet the alternatives for the replacement of City Hall.

I was interested to hear from city employees how they would rank the criteria you developed and invited them to use colored dots to “vote”. A large “ballot” was posted in both buildings and employees were allocated three dots.

I am also interested in how customers of both City Hall and Community Development/Public Works might rank the criteria and will soon post similar ballots in the lobby of both buildings inviting customers to participate in the process.

In order of highest to lowest, here are the employee rankings by City Hall employees.

- 1) Provides consolidated services (within the same building)
- 2) Provides off-street parking for employees and customers
- 3) Services are conveniently located (within a short walk)
- 4) Cost effective (wise use of public money)
- 5) Outside Hosler Dam inundation zone
- 6) Retains downtown presence, Preserves historic façade of an existing building.

The remaining criteria did not receive any dots:

- Site (location of new building) provides flexibility
- Preserves historic use of existing City Hall (not necessarily current administrative functions)
- Provides parking that can be converted to other uses
- Potential to increase public parking (may accommodate a surface lot or parking structure)
- Located on the Plaza
- Avoids legal cloud relating to current deed
- Construction Impact (on traffic, parking, pedestrians, businesses, residences)

Here are the employee rankings, highest to lowest, by Community Development/Public Works employees.

- 1) Provides off-street parking for employees and customers
- 2) Retains downtown presence
- 3) Site location provides flexibility, Services are conveniently located (within a short walk), Outside Hosler Dam inundation zone (each received the same number of dots)
- 4) Preserves historic use of City Hall, Provides consolidated services (within same building), Potential to increase public parking (may accommodate a surface lot or parking structure) (each received the same number of dots)
- 5) Acceptable to voters, Preserves historic façade (each received the same number of dots)
- 6) Cost effective (wise use of public money)



The remaining criteria did not receive any dots:

- Located on Plaza
- Avoids legal cloud relating to current deed
- Construction impact (on traffic, parking, pedestrians, businesses, residences)

Obviously, this is simply a snapshot of the sentiments of city employees in both buildings but I think it offers an interesting and different perspective.

I hope to have the “ballots” posted for customers in the next couple of days and will forward the ranking results to you soon.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration of this important issue.

