



MILWAUKEE COUNTY COURTHOUSE

PHASE II – NON-COURT FUNCTIONS

TPWT COMMITTEE MEETING, MARCH 8, 2017



Agenda



Vision

Mission

Review
Phase II
Report

Q&A
Discussion

Vision

- 1 Reflects a Culture of Quality, Efficiency and Innovation.
- 2 Provides a Safe and Secure Environment.
- 3 Is Fiscally and Environmentally Sustainable.
- 4 Includes a Healthy Learning Environment.
- 5 Operates as Part of a Cooperative Regional System.

Mission

- PHASE I Identify a consolidated, redesigned space for the people working in and served by Milwaukee County Courts; and identify the highest and best use of the Milwaukee County Courthouse.
- PHASE II Define a consolidated, redesigned space for the people working in the areas of non-court functions within the Milwaukee County Courthouse and Public Safety Building. Establish existing conditions and identify opportunities for increased efficiencies.
- PHASE III Determine ultimate space locations for all Departments associated with Phases I and II. Complete space programming, designing and build outs for swing space required for completion of Phases IV and V. Determine preferred ownership, financing, and delivery methods for interim and ultimate solutions.
- PHASE IV Complete planning, programming, and design of the new Criminal Courthouse and other required facility improvements.
- PHASE V Construct a new Milwaukee County Criminal Courthouse, complete other required facility improvements and relocate Departments to ultimate locations.

Project Process, Tasks & Progress

1

Programming

1. Tour, identify and verify groups in Courthouse and Safety Building
2. Understand County's design and planning standards
3. Departmental meetings
4. Develop departmental adjacencies diagrams

100%

2

Blocking & Stacking

1. Apply "courts" blocking from Phase I Study
2. Analyze potential scenarios for blocking and stacking- driven by courts
3. Create blocking and stacking for "non-courts" functions
4. Incorporate engineering input into overall blocking and stacking planning

100%

3

Swing Space

1. Research other projects to utilize temporary locations for criminal and other courts
2. Conceptual identification of swing-space scenarios and potential locations
3. Incorporate blocking and stacking into identified spaces

100%

4

Safety Building Due Diligence

1. Review previous study on Safety Building
2. Understand potential scenarios for potential re-use of building, portion or demolition.
3. Incorporate blocking and stacking into any feasible scenario

100%

5

Vacant Site Due Diligence

1. Develop conceptual costs for two greenfield developments:
 - A. "Everything " with structured parking
 - B. "Everything" with surface parking

100%

Key Findings

1

Programming

- Existing departmental space metrics & headcounts.
- Administrative growth projections & adjacencies.

2

Blocking & Stacking

- Efficiencies gained through incorporation of County space standards via extensive renovations.

3

Swing Space

- Historic Courthouse today = 317 SF/Person
- Renovated Courthouse = 215 SF/Person
- New Building = 193 SF/Person

4

Safety Building
Due Diligence

- Mezzanines could be dedicated to non-office functions, such as training rooms, shared conferencing and mechanical functions.

5

Vacant Site
Due Diligence

- **Conclusion: Efficiencies are realized through application of County space standards, allowing flexibility for placement of shared spaces and mechanicals.**

Key Findings

1

Programming

2

Blocking & Stacking

3

Swing Space

4

Safety Building
Due Diligence

5

Vacant Site
Due Diligence

- Best systems solution - Light Court mechanical rooms and new electrical rooms on each floor, respectful of existing courtroom locations.
- Where adjacencies are honored, non-court space that is public facing and/or operates in a historic space remains in that location.
- Comparable renovation costs are understood through multiple ways of stacking non-court space.
- Planning Scenarios: Four initial planning scenarios generated in order to better understand footprint strategic needs.
- **Conclusions:**
 - **Minimum of four facilities required based on tenant makeup: Historic Courthouse, New Criminal Courthouse, CJF & leased facilit(ies)**
 - **Historic Courthouse renovation strategies are a critical issue regarding implementation and feasibility of overall program.**

Key Findings

1

Programming

2

Blocking & Stacking

3

Swing Space

4

Safety Building
Due Diligence

5

Vacant Site
Due Diligence

- Benchmarking other counties nationwide suggests a similar process that utilizes swing space.
- Renovation of the Historic Courthouse will likely require phased construction, increasing the need for swing space.
- **Conclusion: ~159,000 SF of swing space is required due to the displacement of Safety Building tenants.**



Figure 3.1 - Phasing diagram showing ideal quadrant divisions

PROJECTS STUDIED

The following represent examples of projects which are most related to the approach and scope of the Milwaukee County Courthouse project:

- Metro Nashville Davidson County Courthouse Renovation
Nashville, TN
- Birch Bayh Federal Building & U.S. Courthouse Renovation
Indianapolis, IN
- Polk County Courts
Des Moines, IA
- Willows Courthouse
Glenn County, CA
- Broward County Courthouse
Fort Lauderdale, FL
- Governor George Deukmejian Courthouse
Long Beach, CA

Key Findings

1

Programming

- Floor to floor heights of the PSB are not adequate for modern office standards.

2

Blocking & Stacking

- Frequency of column spacing is not typical of modern office standards.

3

Swing Space

- Inefficient design as well as deferred maintenance backlog make re-use a less than ideal solution.

4

Safety Building
Due Diligence

- **Conclusion: Phase II validates Phase I findings by concluding that the County's goals are best met with the demolition of the Safety Building, allowing a new Criminal Courthouse to be constructed in its place.**

5

Vacant Site
Due Diligence

Key Findings

1

Programming

2

Blocking & Stacking

3

Swing Space

4

Safety Building
Due Diligence

5

Vacant Site
Due Diligence

- A vacant site study was conducted to evaluate the implications of a stand alone new Courthouse Complex at an alternate location.
- Consistent with Phase I findings the development of a new Courthouse Complex does not align with Milwaukee County's strategic goal of:
 - *Identify the highest and best use for the Historic Courthouse and optimize adjacencies to other County facilities and functions (Criminal Justice Facility and other core municipal operations).*
- The costs cited below include the initial \$185 MM identified in Phase I for a Criminal Courthouse only. The additional costs are to provide space for Civil Courts and administrative functions that currently operate within the Historic Courthouse and Safety Building.
 - Option 1 \$460 MM (16 acres with structured parking)
 - Option 2 \$415 MM (24 acres with surface parking)
- **Conclusion: Construction of a new Courthouse complex on a vacant site is not recommended for the County.**

Open Discussion & Questions