

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: 11/14/16

Original Fiscal Note

Substitute Fiscal Note

SUBJECT: Courthouse Complex Planning Program Phase III

FISCAL EFFECT:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Direct County Fiscal Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Expenditures |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Staff Time Required | <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Expenditures |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Operating Expenditures
(If checked, check one of two boxes below) | <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Revenues |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Absorbed Within Agency's Budget | <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Revenues |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not Absorbed Within Agency's Budget | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Operating Expenditures | <input type="checkbox"/> Use of contingent funds |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Operating Revenues | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Operating Revenues | |

Indicate below the dollar change from budget for any submission that is projected to result in increased/decreased expenditures or revenues in the current year.

	Expenditure or Revenue Category	Current Year	Subsequent Year
Operating Budget	Expenditure	0	0
	Revenue	0	0
	Net Cost	0	0
Capital Improvement Budget	Expenditure	0	0
	Revenue	0	0
	Net Cost	0	0

DESCRIPTION OF FISCAL EFFECT

In the space below, you must provide the following information. Attach additional pages if necessary.

- A. Briefly describe the nature of the action that is being requested or proposed, and the new or changed conditions that would occur if the request or proposal were adopted.
- B. State the direct costs, savings or anticipated revenues associated with the requested or proposed action in the current budget year and how those were calculated. ¹ If annualized or subsequent year fiscal impacts are substantially different from current year impacts, then those shall be stated as well. In addition, cite any one-time costs associated with the action, the source of any new or additional revenues (e.g. State, Federal, user fee or private donation), the use of contingent funds, and/or the use of budgeted appropriations due to surpluses or change in purpose required to fund the requested action.
- C. Discuss the budgetary impacts associated with the proposed action in the current year. A statement that sufficient funds are budgeted should be justified with information regarding the amount of budgeted appropriations in the relevant account and whether that amount is sufficient to offset the cost of the requested action. If relevant, discussion of budgetary impacts in subsequent years also shall be discussed. Subsequent year fiscal impacts shall be noted for the entire period in which the requested or proposed action would be implemented when it is reasonable to do so (i.e. a five-year lease agreement shall specify the costs/savings for each of the five years in question). Otherwise, impacts associated with the existing and subsequent budget years should be cited.
- D. Describe any assumptions or interpretations that were utilized to provide the information on this form.

A. The resolution recognizes the conclusions reached in Phase I of the Courthouse Complex Planning Program, acknowledges the work completed in Phase II, and agrees with the need to continue on to Phase III as described.

B. Phases I and II of the Courthouse Complex Planning Program were funded out of Consolidated Facilities Planning Steering Committee operating budget. There is a budget appropriation of \$500,000 in the 2017 Adopted Capital Improvements Budget to account for a portion of Phase III, specifically to create a Courthouse Complex Master Space Plan and develop implementation strategies. It is anticipated that Phase III will need to extend into 2018 and another capital request would be submitted in 2017 to fund the additional effort for Phase III.

C. No impacts on 2016 budget. As stated, there is a budget appropriation in the 2017 Adopted Capital Improvements Budget to account for a portion of the Phase III scope of work. The County hired consultants HGA, Justice Planning Associates, Inc. and IBC Engineering Services, Inc. to address Phase I of the Courthouse Complex Planning Program, which resulted in the preparation of the Milwaukee County Courthouse Project Final Report dated February 8, 2016. The consultants recommended Option 1B, which has been incorporated in the attached resolution. Option 1B demolishes the Safety Building and constructs a new Criminal Courthouse on the Safety Building site. The estimated conceptual cost for Option 1B is \$184 million, which does not include other potentially significant costs, such as improvements to the Historic Courthouse, swing space costs, and relocation and tenant improvement costs. No funding for implementation of Option 1B is being requested at this time. The conceptual cost estimate will be refined as part of Phase III of the Courthouse Complex Planning Program.

The Phase I report was presented to the Transportation, Public Works and Transit Committee in March of 2016. Planning and design for the demolition of the Safety Building, new Criminal Courthouse, and other infrastructure improvements would occur in Phase IV, with implementation of

¹ If it is assumed that there is no fiscal impact associated with the requested action, then an explanatory statement that justifies that conclusion shall be provided. If precise impacts cannot be calculated, then an estimate or range should be provided.

the improvements in Phase V. Future appropriations will be requested as a part of the capital budget process and budgeted in future capital improvement budgets.

D. Since the cost estimate is a restatement of the amount in the consultant's report, any assumptions and interpretations would be a reflection of information in that report. The future appropriations are based on the scope of work under Capital Project WC14801 - Courthouse Complex Planning Phase III in the 2017 Adopted Capital Improvements Budget.

Department/Prepared By Jeremy Theis, Director, Facilities Management Division,
Department of Administratives Services

Authorized Signature



Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review? Yes No
Did CBDP Review?² Yes No Not Required

² Community Business Development Partners' review is required on all professional service and public work construction contracts.