# Police Facility Task Force 

 June 23, 2015
## Introduction

FY 2013/14 budget to complete a Space Needs Assessment to examine alternatives for making improvements to the Police Department facilities.
$\checkmark$ Construct a new police station on properties to be identified
$\checkmark$ Construct renovations to create a new police station in existing buildings
$\checkmark$ Construct renovations and/or additions to the existing police facility

RFP was issued in July 2013 - along with several site tours.
$\checkmark 10$ submittals were received
$\checkmark$ Staff reviewed and recommended Geddis Architects team
$\checkmark$ City Council awarded contract October 2013
$\checkmark$ City Council appointed Police Facility Task Force November 2014

## Task Force Meetings

## The Task Force have had eight meetings held on December $9^{\text {th }}$, January $13^{\text {th }}$,

 February $12^{\text {th }}$, March $10^{\text {th }}$, April 21, May 13, May 28 and June 5.
## Meetings included:

$\checkmark$ Selected Chairperson.
$\checkmark$ Tour of existing facility and review of history of PD operations, review history of maintenance of existing building.
$\checkmark$ Tour of Genesee County Sheriffs Facility, reviewed best practice design for municipal police stations.
$\checkmark$ Review of 6 locations recommended in report including site conditions, environmental concerns, challenges, etc.
$\checkmark$ reviewed "other sites" that were considered but not in final report.
$\checkmark$ Discussed and identified other sites not in final report: Alva Place and 35 Swan St.
$\checkmark$ Reviewed detail of cost estimate for each site.
$\checkmark$ Reviewed grant and financing options. Included review of the City current and future debt service and reserve fund balances.
$\checkmark$ Toured current facility with historic architects to discuss feasibility of 10 W . Main St.
$\checkmark$ Completed selection matrix to narrow list to three sites.
$\checkmark$ Visited final three sites.

## Current Study Methodology

## Phase 1-Situation Analysis Phase

$\checkmark$ Met with City and BPD leadership, identified project goals and objectives, along with various tasks that needed to be assigned and completed.

## Phase 2-Data Collection, Analysis and Evaluation Phase

$\checkmark$ Collected and reviewed data and statistics and conducted staff interviews to better understand operations.
$\checkmark$ Interviews provided additional insight to the strengths and weaknesses of current space.
$\checkmark$ Created detailed space program considering current space use and recommendations to address current space deficiencies and future needs.
$\checkmark$ Potential site locations were identified.

## Phase 3-Concept Design Phase

$\checkmark$ Utilized all collected data to generate design alternatives for most suitable sites.
$\checkmark$ New construction block diagrams were created for vacant sites.
$\checkmark$ With existing PD developed more detailed schematic design to best identify accurate level of renovation. Assisted with Haz. Mat. Assessment.
$\checkmark$ Developed schematic site plans to show access, site movement and parking.
$\checkmark$ Through this process certain sites became more suitable than others.

## Phase 4-Findings and Report Phase

$\checkmark$ All information was reviewed and evaluated and alternatives were based on pre-determined criteria (Selection Matrix).

## Needs Assessment \& Functional Program

Current and future facility space needs were determined by using the following process:
> Understanding of current operations, working conditions, impact of facility on conducting efficient, effective and safe policing.

* Included tours of facility with BPD staff, observing and asking questions.
* Reviewed existing drawings of facility and taking inventory of existing people, functions and space.
$>$ Reviewed information on population growth and demographic changes.
$>$ Conducted two rounds of interviews:
* First round - obtain detailed information on operations, current conditions, opinions on future changes within community, department, initial estimates of space needs. Compared this to industry standards for municipal police departments of similar size, and New York State requirements.
* Second round - took information collected and discussed perceived space requirements, separation of 'needs' from 'wants' and more detailed analysis of the functions. This formed based for draft space and function program.


## Staff \& Space Summary

|  <br> Civilian Personnel - See Table 2) |
| :--- |
| 1- Administration |
| 2 - Uniform Division |
| 3 - Detective Division |
| 4 - Youth Office |
| 5 - Training |


| Support Spaces |  | Exist Req'd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 - Common Areas |  | 933 | 1,780 |  |
| 7 - Staff Amenities |  | 1,090 | 1,475 |  |
| 8 - Public Areas |  | 383 | 370 |  |
|  | Subtotal - Net Area | 2,406 | 3,625 | sq.ft |
|  | Total Net Area | 6,619 | 9,475 | sq.ft |
|  | Grossing Factor | 2.55 | 1.40 |  |
|  | Total Gross Floor Area | 16,910 | 13,300 | sq.ft |


| 400 - Garages/Storage |  |  | Exist | Req'd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9-Garages \& Storage |  |  | 700 | 2,880 |
|  |  | Net Area | 700 | 2,880 sq.ft |
|  |  | Grossing Factor | 1.00 | 1.10 |
|  |  | Gross Floor Area | 700 | 3,200 |
| Total Staff \& Space Requirements Current Future |  |  | Exist | Req'd |
| Building Total 40 | 7\% | Subtotal - Net Area | 7,319 | 12,355 sq.ft |
|  | Growth | Avg. Grossing Factor | 2.31 | 1.34 |
|  |  | Total Gross Floor Area | 16,910 | 16,500 sq.ft |
| Internal Circulation, Existing Space - some existing areas include internal circulation, therefore comparison of net/usable ratios are not possible between existing and proposed space. |  | Additional GFA Required |  | (410) sq.ft |
|  |  | Space/Person (all areas) | 423 | \#VALUE! sq.ft |
|  |  | Existing Gross Area | 6,010 |  |
|  |  |  | 5,430 | (excl. Parole) |
|  |  |  | 5,470 |  |
|  |  |  | 16,910 |  |

Alternative Sites and Scenarios


## Alternative Sites and Scenarios

The final report consider a total of six (6) possible construction scenarios and provides observations regarding each site.

1. 56 Ellicott Street - Santy's property
2. $96-98$ Jackson Street - Salvation Army property
3. 26 Evans Street - south of ice arena
4. Park Road - co-location with Genesee County Sheriff
5. 10 W. Main Street - Current location substantial renovation (Scheme A)
6. 10 W . Main Street - Current location less smaller renovation (Scheme B)

The Task Force identified two (2) additional sites:

1. Alva Place Parking Lot
2. 35 Swan Street

## Current Conditions

The current Police Facility is a historic building originally constructed as a private residence by George Brisbane in 1855. In 1918 it was acquired by the City and converted into City Hall. An addition was added in 1963, re-organizing space. In 2004 a new City Hall was built and the structure was retained for sole use of the BPD.

## Operational Challenges:

- Building entrance is not secure.
- Public entry area is too small.
- Prisoner transfer and booking is not secure.
- Prisoner and public entrance is one and the same.
- Interview rooms are not isolated or secure.
- Storage of weapons and gear is insufficient and not co-located.
- Officer locker rooms are not adequate.
- Parking areas for police vehicles are commingled with public


## Physical Challenges:

- Building egress is inadequate and not code complaint.
- Building is not ADA compliant.
- Building infrastructure is outdated and in need of replacement.
- Hazardous Materials exist.
- Installation of modern equipment (i.e. camera system) requires major work be done


## Cost Considerations

## Police buildings are very specialized:

Stringent construction codes
24/7 operations with low risk of failure
Designed to support uninterrupted police operations in times of emergency
This project is a significant investment for the City:
It must meet needs for many years
Requires robust construction and systems

## Budget includes all costs necessary to complete project:

Furniture and specialized police furnishings
Security, Communications and IT systems
Design fees, legal fees, project management fees, permits
Land acquisition, repurposing costs for the existing building, environmental
assessment \& remediation
Project, design and construction contingencies and inflation

## Cost Comparisons

## Site's I, II and III

- Located in the Special Hazard Flood Area (SHFA) and require additional site preparation and construction to account for flood potential.
- Have confirmed or speculated environmental contamination requiring clean up prior to construction.
- Site's I and II have existing structures that will need hazardous material abatement and demolition.
- Requires property to be purchased.


## Site IV

- Stand alone facility. No shared space.
- Require political will of City and County elected bodies and Sheriff.
- Ownership rights would have to be determined.


## Scheme's

- Requires hazardous abatement prior to construction.
- Requires relocation of PD for 12-18 months during construction.
- Unknown costs due to age of building.

| Site I <br> 56 Ellicott | Site II <br> 96 Jackson | Site III <br> 26 Evans | Site IV <br> Park Rd. | Scheme A <br> 10 ww Main | Scheme B <br> 10 w. Main | Site V <br> Ava Lot | Site VI <br> 35 Swan St. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$11.1MM- | $\$ 11.6 \mathrm{MM}-$ | $\$ 11.4 \mathrm{MM}-$ | $\$ 9.9 \mathrm{MM}-$ <br> $\$ 11.9 \mathrm{MM}$ | $\$ 12.9 \mathrm{MM}-$ | $\$ 11.3 \mathrm{MM}-$ | $\$ 9.1 \mathrm{MM}-$ | $\$ 9.8 \mathrm{MM}-$ |
| $\$ 12.3 \mathrm{MM}$ | $\$ 10.6 \mathrm{MM}$ | $\$ 17.2 \mathrm{MM}$ | $\$ 12.2 \mathrm{MM}$ | $\$ 10.0 \mathrm{MM}$ | $\$ 10.9 \mathrm{MM}$ |  |  |

## Selection Matrix

Evaluation Criteria was developed to sort the alternatives developed in the study. These consider factors the city deems most important in choosing a scenario. In addition, the Team ranked the Evaluation Criteria in terms of priority thus creating a weighted ranking system.

1. Provides Good Proximity to Downtown
2. Provides Adequate Parking for Police/Public Vehicles
3. Provides Good Access \& Security for Police Vehicles
4. Can be Readily Acquired
5. Can Readily Achieve Zoning/Regulatory Approvals
6. Minimum Disruption to Police and Public During Development
7. Meets City Development Goals
8. Minimizes Site Development Issues (relocation, environmental remediation, etc.)
9. Minimizes Overall Development Cost
10. Effectively Meets Program and Functional Needs

## Selection Matrix

## Aggregate Matrix of all 7 Task Force Members

| No. | $\frac{\text { EVALUATION }}{\text { CRITERIA }}$ | Criteria Value | Site I <br> Ellicott <br> Street |  | Site II Jackson Street (Salvation Army |  | Site III <br> Evans Street |  | Site IV Park <br> Road (With Sherriff's) |  | Site V Alva Lot (Coner of Alva \& Bank) |  | Site VI Swan Street (35 Swan) |  | Existing PD <br> Scheme 1 |  | Existing PD Scheme 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | score | total | score | total | score | total | score | total | score | total | score | total | score | total | score | total |
| 1 | Provides Good Proximity to Downtown | 3.482 | 3.29 | 11.44 | 3.29 | 11.46 | 2.71 | 9.44 | 1.29 | 4.49 | 3.86 | 13.44 | 3.14 | 10.93 | 3.29 | 11.46 | 3.29 | 11.46 |
| 2 | Provides Adequate Parking for Police/Public Vehicles | 3.285 | 3.00 | 9.86 | 3.57 | 11.73 | 2.14 | 7.03 | 3.14 | 10.31 | 3.00 | 9.86 | 3.71 | 12.19 | 2.00 | 6.57 | 1.86 | 6.11 |
| 3 | Povides Good Access \& Security for Police Vehicles | 3.482 | 3.00 | 10.45 | 3.57 | 12.43 | 3.14 | 10.93 | 2.86 | 9.96 | 3.00 | 10.45 | 3.43 | 11.94 | 2.00 | 6.96 | 1.86 | 6.48 |
| 4 | Can be Readily Acquired | 3.142 | 2.71 | 8.51 | 2.71 | 8.51 | 3.00 | 9.43 | 2.86 | 8.99 | 3.57 | 11.22 | 3.43 | 10.78 | 3.71 | 11.66 | 3.71 | 11.66 |
| 5 | Can Readily Achieve <br> Zoning/Regulatory Approvals | 3 | 2.71 | 8.14 | 2.86 | 8.58 | 3.00 | 9.00 | 2.86 | 8.58 | 3.43 | 10.29 | 3.43 | 10.29 | 3.57 | 10.71 | 3.57 | 10.71 |
| 6 | Requires Minimum Disruption to Police and Public During | 3.142 | 3.57 | 11.22 | 3.86 | 12.13 | 3.57 | 11.22 | 2.71 | 8.51 | 3.57 | 11.22 | 3.86 | 12.13 | 1.43 | 4.49 | 1.57 | 4.93 |
| 7 | Meets City Development Goals and has Positive or No Impact on | 3.285 | 2.57 | 8.44 | 3.00 | 9.86 | 2.43 | 7.98 | 2.43 | 7.98 | 3.43 | 11.27 | 3.29 | 10.81 | 2.86 | 9.40 | 2.86 | 9.40 |
| 8 | Minimizes Site Development Issues (relocation, temporary | 3.142 | 2.57 | 8.07 | 3.14 | 9.87 | 2.29 | 7.20 | 3.14 | 9.87 | 3.57 | 11.22 | 3.57 | 11.22 | 1.43 | 4.49 | 1.43 | 4.49 |
| 9 | Minimizes Overall Development Cost | 3.571 | 2.42 | 8.64 | 2.57 | 9.18 | 2.29 | 8.18 | 2.57 | 9.18 | 3.71 | 13.25 | 3.57 | 12.75 | 2.14 | 7.64 | 2.14 | 7.64 |
| 10 | Effectively Meets Program and Functional Needs | 3.857 | 3.29 | 12.67 | 3.43 | 13.23 | 3.29 | 12.69 | 2.43 | 9.37 | 3.43 | 13.23 | 4.00 | 15.43 | 2.43 | 9.37 | 2.57 | 9.91 |
|  | Total |  | 2.9 | 97.4 | 3.2 | 07.0 | 2.8 | 93.1 | 2.6 | 87.2 | 3.5 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 18.5 | 2.5 | 82.8 | 2.5 | 82.8 |
|  |  | RANK |  | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -7 |  | 17 |

## Final Sites

35 Swan St. Site


## Questions

